AGENDA

MAYOR AND CABINET

Date: WEDNESDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2015 at 6.00 pm

Committee Rooms 1 & 2
Civic Suite
Lewisham Town Hall
London SE6 4RU

Enquiries to: Kevin Flaherty 0208 3149327
Telephone: 0208 314 9327 (direct line)
Email: kevin.flaherty@lewisham.gov.uk

MEMBERS

Sir Steve Bullock  Mayor (L)
Councillor Alan Smith  Deputy Mayor - Growth & Regeneration (L)
Councillor Chris Best  Health, Well-Being & Older People (L)
Councillor Kevin Bonavia  Resources (L)
Councillor Janet Daby  Community Safety (L)
Councillor Joe Dromey  Policy and Performance (L)
Councillor Damien Egan  Housing (L)
Councillor Paul Maslin  Children & Young People (L)
Councillor Joan Millbank  Third Sector and Community (L)
Councillor Rachel Onikosi  Public Realm (L)

Members are summoned to attend this meeting

Barry Quirk
Chief Executive
Lewisham Town Hall
Catford
London SE6 4RU
Date: Wednesday, 11 February 2015

The public are welcome to attend our committee meetings, however occasionally committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of reports can be made available in additional formats on request.
ORDER OF BUSINESS – PART 1 AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page No.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Declaration of Interests</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>5 - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Matters Raised by Scrutiny and other Constitutional Bodies</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Outstanding Scrutiny Matters</td>
<td>18 - 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>LGA Peer Challenge</td>
<td>20 - 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Remodelling Day Care Services</td>
<td>49 - 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2015 16 Revenue Budget Savings</td>
<td>81 - 591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2015 16 Budget Report</td>
<td>592 - 693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Reconfiguring Healthy Eating and Physical Activity</td>
<td>694 - 702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Greyhound Public House Update</td>
<td>703 - 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Blackheath Events Policy</td>
<td>713 - 738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Phoenix Community Housing Board</td>
<td>739 - 742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Exclusion of Press and Public</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Housing Property Acquisition Lee Green</td>
<td>744 - 757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public are welcome to attend our Committee meetings, however, occasionally, committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of reports can be made available in additional formats on request.
RECORDING AND USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

You are welcome to record any part of any Council meeting that is open to the public.

The Council cannot guarantee that anyone present at a meeting will not be filmed or recorded by anyone who may then use your image or sound recording.

If you are intending to audio record or film this meeting, you must:

- tell the clerk to the meeting before the meeting starts;
- only focus cameras/recordings on councillors, Council officers, and those members of the public who are participating in the conduct of the meeting and avoid other areas of the room, particularly where non-participating members of the public may be sitting; and
- ensure that you never leave your recording equipment unattended in the meeting room.

If recording causes a disturbance or undermines the proper conduct of the meeting, then the Chair of the meeting may decide to stop the recording. In such circumstances, the decision of the Chair shall be final.
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; and

(b) 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 not 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)
**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the minutes of that part of the meeting of the Mayor and Cabinet which were open to the press and public, held on January 14 2015 be confirmed and signed as a correct record. (copy attached).
PRESENT: Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor), Alan Smith, Chris Best, Kevin Bonavia, Janet Daby, Joe Dromey, Damien Egan, Joan Millbank and Rachel Onikosi.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Paul Maslin.

106. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Joe Dromey declared a personal interest in item 21 as an LEA appointed School Governor for Grinling Gibbons and Lucas Vale Schools.

Councillor Janet Daby declared a personal interest in item 10 as a Board Member for Phoenix Housing.

Councillor Millbank declared a personal interest in item 16 as a Council representative at the London Councils Grant Scheme.

107. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of that part of the meetings of the Mayor and Cabinet which were open to the press and public, held on December 3 and December 17 2014 be confirmed as a correct record.

108. Matters Raised by Scrutiny and other Constitutional Bodies

No matters were raised.

109. Outstanding Scrutiny Matters

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

110. Setting the Council Tax Base, the NNDR Base & Discounts for Second Homes and Empty Homes

Having considered an officer report, and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Resources, Councillor Kevin Bonavia, the Mayor agreed to:

(i) Recommend to Council for agreement, at its meeting on 21 January 2015, a Council Tax Base of 75,526.1 Band D equivalent properties for 2015/16;

(ii) Note the Council Tax Base calculation for 2015/16, as set out in the annual Council Tax Base government return, attached at Appendix A to the report;

(iii) Recommend to Council a budgeted Council Tax collection rate of 96.0%;
(iv) Recommend to Council that the existing policy of a 0% discount for second homes for 2014/15 be continued, as set out in section six of the report;

(v) Recommend to Council that the existing policy of a 0% discount for empty homes – Class A (an empty property undergoing structural alteration or major repair to make it habitable) be continued, as set out in section six of the report;

(vi) Recommend to Council that the existing policy of a 100% discount awarded for a period of four weeks and then a 0% discount thereafter, for empty homes – Class C (a substantially empty and unfurnished property) be continued, as set out in section six of the report;

(vii) Recommend to Council that the existing policy of an empty homes premium of 50% in respect of long term empty properties be continued, as set out in section six of the report; and

(viii) Recommend to Council the proposed National Non Domestic Rate (NNDR) estimated net yield of £48.055m, based on the NNDR3 for 2013/14, attached at Appendix B to the report.

(ix) Recommend to Council the proposed Council Tax Reduction Scheme amount for 2015/16 as set out in section 11 of the report.

111. Bakerloo Line Consultation

Having considered an officer report, and a presentation by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Alan Smith, the Mayor agreed the formal response to the Bakerloo Line Consultation as included in Appendix A of the report.

112. Boroughwide 20 mph speed limit

In considering the proposals the Mayor stated that it was necessary people were made aware that within Lewisham they should drive at 20 mph unless they see a sign that says 30mph. He added that he was delighted with the proposals. Having considered an officer report, and a presentation by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Alan Smith it was:

RESOLVED that

i) the proposed approach for the implementation of a 20mph limit on all borough roads, including the proposed programme for planning and delivery of the new limit and mitigation;

ii) to authorise officers to initiate the statutory procedures to extend the coverage of 20mph limits to all roads for which Lewisham is the Traffic and Highway Authority;
113. River Corridors Improvement Plan

Having considered an officer report, and a presentation by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Alan Smith the Mayor agreed:

(i) the draft River Corridors Improvement Plan SPD for public consultation in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement, and recommend that the Council do the same; and

(ii) to delegate authority to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to make any minor changes to the text and format of the document prior to the document going to public consultation.

114. Local Flood Risk Strategy

Having considered an officer report, and a presentation by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Alan Smith, the Mayor agreed

(i) the draft Local Flood Risk Management Strategy be approved for public consultation; and

(ii) To delegate power to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to make any minor changes to the text and format of the document prior to the document going to public consultation.

115. New Homes Better Places Phase 3 Update

In considering the report the Mayor extended his thanks to officers for the report which he said was very encouraging. The Mayor added that he look forward to the next update. Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Damien Egan:

RESOLVED that

(i) the progress made in delivering new Council homes in the Borough be noted;

(ii) the progress made in reviewing sites for their potential for new build housing be noted;
(iii) the proposal for the ten sites identified below be approved, to proceed with more detailed design and resident consultation exercises, with a view to developing them to the point that they would constitute phase three of the New Homes, Better Places programme. The ten sites proposed for this phase would provide up to 124 new homes.

New build schemes (98 homes):
• Eliot Bank, Forest Hill Ward (21 homes)
• Hillcrest Clubroom, Sydenham Ward (7 homes)
• Kenton Court, Bellellingham Ward (29 homes)
• Greystead Road, Forest Hill Ward (30 homes)
• Somerville Court, Telegraph Hill Ward (11 homes)

Conversions programme (26 homes):
• Foreman House, Telegraph Hill Ward (2 homes)
• Slaithwaite Community Room, Lewisham Central Ward (1 home)
• Sector J Club Room, Telegraph Hill Ward (4 homes)
• Honor Oak Housing Office, Telegraph Hill Ward (6 homes)
• Pepys Housing Office, Evelyn Ward (13 homes)

(iv). It be noted that the previously agreed tenure split of 80% rented and 20% sale is maintained and that the location of the units proposed for sale will be presented to Mayor and Cabinet in the next update report. This will take into account the market conditions at the time and professional sales advice;

(v) It be noted that final approval to proceed with these sites is expected to be sought in September 2015;

(vi) in order to maintain maximum pace with delivering the programme, planning permission be sought for the demolition of Kenton Court and Somerville, as soon as possible after they have been decanted and to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Customer Services to let a demolition contract in situ;

(vii) the progress made by Phoenix Community Housing in developing plans for a 60 unit extra care scheme at Hazelhurst Court in Bellingham, as set out in section 10 be noted, and;

(viii) the use of Section 106 funding to support the delivery of that scheme, as set out in section 10 be approved and authority be delegated to the Executive Director for Customer Services, in consultation with the Director of Regeneration and Asset Management and Head of Law, to finalise the terms of that grant agreement.

116. Homeslessness Lewisham Homes Property Acquisitions

The Head of Law provided an addendum setting out an amendment to the Legal Implications to correct typographical and minor errors. At Paragraph 12.4, the reference in the first sentence to “Section 1 of the
Local Government Act 2011” should have read “Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011”.

at 12.9 under the heading “Procurement” should have read “As Lewisham Homes is a wholly owned subsidiary and as all of its turnover currently relates to activities for the Council, it is exempt from the EU Procurement Regime. Any new build activity will not jeopardise this as Lewisham Homes will continue to deliver a substantial housing management and maintenance service to the Council. Case law suggests that 90% of turnover should be for the controlling authority. The new draft Public Contract Regulations 2015 which will transpose the 2014 EU Procurement Directive into UK law and are shortly to be introduced, reduces this percentage to 80%. The proposed value of the new build works is around 10% of Lewisham Homes turnover and will not breach the EU Legislation as it stands with greater scope to be given to it once the new Regulations are in force”.

Having considered an officer report together with the addendum provided, and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Damien Egan:

(i) the continuing extreme levels of demand faced by the Council from homeless households in the borough, and the progress in previously agreed measures that have been implemented to meet that demand be noted;

(ii) the previously agreed budget for capital works for Hamilton Lodge and 118 Canonbie Road, as set out in section 5 of this report be extended;

(iii) the business case for an additional programme of property acquisition, to be carried out by Lewisham Homes, as set out in section 6 of this report be noted.

(iv) the Council provide a loan of up to £20m to Lewisham Homes, on the terms set out at section 8 of the report, to enable Lewisham Homes to acquire up to 100 new units as an additional intervention to help manage homelessness demand, and that the authority to finalise the terms of the loan agreement be delegated to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration;

(v) the proposed changes to the Management Agreement between the Council and Lewisham Homes and to Lewisham Homes’ Articles of Association as set out in section 9 of the report be agreed, to enable Lewisham Homes to acquire and own property, and to initiate discussions with the HCA regarding obtaining Registered Provider status, and agreed that authority to finalise and approve further minor amendments as a result of discussions with Lewisham Homes’ Board in this regard be delegated to the Executive Director for Customer Services; and

(vi) the timetable and scope of the proposed project to review and consider an extension of Lewisham Homes’ Management Agreement
after its expiry in 2017 be noted, including the potential ways in which Lewisham Homes might further evolve to help meet the Council’s housing priorities, as set out at section 10 of the report.

117. Redevelopment Heathside and Lethbridge Phase 4 Update

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Damien Egan, it was,

RSOLVED that

(i) subject to Secretary of State’s consent under Section 19 of the Housing Act 1985 being obtained, the appropriation of the Council owned land within Phase 4 of the Heathside and Lethbridge Estate re-development scheme, shown in bold edging on the attached plan attached to the report, from housing purposes to planning purposes under Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 be agreed; and

(ii) the making of an application to the Secretary of State under Section 19 of the Housing Act 1985 for consent to the appropriation be approved.

118. Housing Regeneration Leaseholder BuyBacks Part 1

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Damien Egan, it was:

RESOLVED that any properties in the schemes set out which were previously sold under the Right to Buy be repurchased by the Council at market value (to include reasonable professional fees) where agreement can be reached with leaseholders in advance of a Compulsory Purchase order being made by the Council and to delegate authority to the Head of Corporate Asset Services in consultation with the Head of Law to negotiate, agree and conclude the acquisition terms.

119. CIL Adoption

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Alan Smith, the Mayor:

(i) approved the:

• Lewisham Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule as set out at appendix 1 to the report
• Lewisham CIL Regulation 123 List as set out at appendix 2 to the report.
• Lewisham CIL Installments Policy as set out at appendix 3 to the report; and

(ii) recommended that Full Council adopt the:

• Lewisham Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule as set out at appendix 1 to the report
• Lewisham CIL Regulation 123 List as set out at appendix 2 to the report.
• Lewisham CIL Installments Policy as set out at appendix 3 to the report.

With an implementation date of 1st April 2015.

120. Planning Obligations SPD Adoption

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Alan Smith, the Mayor:

(i) approved the Planning Obligations SPD;

(ii) recommended that Council adopt the Planning Obligations SPD; and

(iii) delegated power to make any minor editorial changes to the text and format of the document prior to consideration by full Council, to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration.

121. London Councils Grants Scheme

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for the Third Sector and Community, Councillor Joan Millbank, it was:

RESOLVED that

(i) the overall expenditure for the London Councils Grants Scheme in 2015/16 of £10.5m be agreed; and

(ii) a sum of £306,024 in respect of the London Borough of Lewisham’s contribution be agreed.

122. Redress Schemes for Lettings Agency Work and Property Management Works

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for the Public Realm, Councillor Rachael Onikosi, it was:
RESOLVED

(i) to delegate the implementation and enforcement arrangements for The Redress Schemes for Lettings Agency Work and Property Management Work (Requirement to Belong to a Scheme etc.) (England) Order 2014 (2014 No.2359), to the Executive Director of Community Services in consultation where appropriate with the Head of Strategic Housing;

(ii) that the penalty for non-compliance with the Order shall be £5000; and

(iii) the Executive Director for Community Services be authorised, in consultation with the Head of Strategic Housing, to periodically review the monetary penalties for non-compliance with the Order, taking the recommendations of Department of Communities and Local Government guidance into account and to subsequently determine an alternative penalty level if considered appropriate. This will include any decision on whether to allow any penalty reduction for ‘prompt’ payment or a penalty reduction or waiver in extenuating circumstances.

123. Provision of Grounds Maintenance Services Lewisham Homes

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Damien Egan, the Mayor:

(i) approved, in principle, Lewisham Homes to take over the management of the estates element of the grounds maintenance service either in partnership with an external contractor or deliver it internally through their Direct Labour Organisation (DLO); and

(ii) approved the consultation proposals as outlined in paragraph 5 of the report.

124. Management Report Overview

Councillor Best was told that she would be sent a briefing on the current situation on payment of invoices.

Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Policy and Performance, Councillor Jo Dromey, it was RESOLVED that the Management Report be noted.

125. Annual complaints report
Having considered an officer report and a presentation by the Cabinet Member for Policy and Performance, Councillor Jo Dromey, it was:

RESOLVED that

(i) the contents of the report be noted; and

(ii) any amendments be made to the Council’s complaints policy felt necessary following the contents of the report or concerns raised by the Independent Assessor be agreed.

126. Reconstitution of Governing Bodies

Having considered an officer report and presentation, it was:

RESOLVED that

(i) the Instrument of Government for the schools identified below, and set out in Appendices 1-29 of the report be made by Local Authority order dated 14 January 2015 be agreed;

Addey and Stanhope - Appendix 1
Ashmead - Appendix 2
Baring - Appendix 3
Brent Knoll - Appendix 4
Chelwood Nursery - Appendix 5
Childeric - Appendix 6
Clyde Early Childhood Centre - Appendix 7
Coopers Lane - Appendix 8
Dalmain - Appendix 9
Deptford Park - Appendix 10
Good Shepherd - Appendix 11
Greenvale - Appendix 12
Grinning Gibbons and Lucas Vale Federation - Appendix 13
Holbeach - Appendix 14
Horniman - Appendix 15
John Ball - Appendix 16
Kilmorie - Appendix 17
Marvels Lane - Appendix 18
New Woodlands - Appendix 19
Rathfern - Appendix 20
Rushey Green - Appendix 21
Sandhurst Infant and Nursery - Appendix 22
Sandhurst Junior - Appendix 23
Sir Francis Drake - Appendix 24
St Bartholomew’s - Appendix 25
St John the Baptist - Appendix 26
St Stephen’s - Appendix 27
Sydenham - Appendix 28
Watergate - Appendix 29
Appendices 1 to 29 detail the Instrument of Government the Local Authority is proposing to make by order. Where appropriate, the Instrument of Government has also been agreed by the Southwark Diocesan Board of Education or the Education Commission, Trustees and Foundation Governors and the Local Authority.

127. Instrument of Government Leathersellers Federation of Schools

Having considered an officer report and presentation, it was:

RESOLVED that

(i) the Governors of the Leathersellers’ Federation of Schools decision be noted, to change the names of schools in the Federation from:

- Prendergast Hilly Fields College to Prendergast School.
- Prendergast Ladywell Fields College to Prendergast Ladywell School,
- Prendergast Vale College to Prendergast Vale School; and

(ii) the Instrument of Government for The Leathersellers’ Federation of Schools be made by Local Authority order dated 14 January 2015.

128. Appointment of LA Governors

Having considered an officer report and presentation, it was:

RESOLVED that

(i) the person set out in paragraph 6 of the report be appointed as a Local Authority governor;

(ii) the information concerning the recommended new governor in Appendix 1 of the report be noted;

(iii) the persons set out in paragraph 7 of the report be nominated as Local Authority governors; and

(iv) the information concerning the recommended nominated governors in Appendix 2 of the report be noted.

129. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED that in accordance with Regulation 4(2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 and under Section
100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs [3, 4 and 5] of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act, and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information:

25. Housing Regeneration Leaseholder BuyBacks Part 2

130. Housing Regeneration Leaseholder BuyBacks Part 2

This item was considered in conjunction with the open report. The Mayor;

(i) agreed that any properties in the schemes set out which were previously sold under the Right to Buy be repurchased by the Council at market value (to include reasonable professional fees) where agreement can be reached with leaseholders in advance of a Compulsory Purchase order being made by the Council and to delegate authority to the Head of Corporate Asset Services in consultation with the Head of Law to negotiate, agree and conclude the acquisition terms.

(ii) noted the financial information provided;

(iii) agreed that the budgets already programmed into the Capital programme be brought forward to 2015/16 to enable the buy backs to proceed.

(iv) agreed to delegate authority to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to agree the programming of the required budget.
### Purpose of Report

To report back on any matters raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel following their consideration of the decisions made by the Mayor on January 14 2015 or on other matters raised by Select Committees or other Constitutional bodies.
1. **Purpose of Report**

   To report on items previously reported to the Mayor for response by directorates and to indicate the likely future reporting date.

2. **Recommendation**

   That the reporting date of the item shown in the table below be noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Responding Author</th>
<th>Date Considered by Mayor &amp; Cabinet</th>
<th>Scheduled Reporting Date</th>
<th>Slippage since last report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments of the Children and Young People Select Committee on Raising the Participation Age</td>
<td>ED CYP</td>
<td>3 December 2014</td>
<td>18 February 2015</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments of the Healthier Communities Select Committee Autism Spectrum Housing</td>
<td>ED Community</td>
<td>17 December 2014</td>
<td>18 February 2015</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments of the Healthier Communities Select Committee Public Health</td>
<td>ED Community</td>
<td>17 December 2014</td>
<td>18 February 2015</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND PAPERS and AUTHOR

Mayor & Cabinet minutes 3 & 17 December 2014 available from Kevin Flaherty 0208 3149327 or at:

http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=139&Year=0
Agenda Item 5

Chief Officer Confirmation of Report Submission
Cabinet Member Confirmation of Briefing Report for: Mayor
Mayor and Cabinet
Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)
Executive Director

Information □ Part 1 □ Part 2 □ Key Decision x

Date of Meeting 11 February 2015

Title of Report Lewisham Peer Challenge:
Key Points, Response and Action Plan

Originator of Report Barry Quirk Ext. 46447

At the time of submission for the Agenda, I confirm that the report has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Comments from Exec Director for Resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Comments from the Head of Law</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Implications</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Implications</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Implications/Impact Assessment (as appropriate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed Adherence to Budget &amp; Policy Framework</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment Comments (as appropriate)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Urgency (as appropriate)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: [Signature] Executive Member

Date: 3/2/15

Signed: [Signature] Director/Head of Service

Date: 03/02/15

Control Record by Committee Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed on Schedule of Business/Forward Plan (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Report Cleared at Agenda Planning Meeting (not delegated decisions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted Report from CO Received by Committee Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Date for Call-in (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be Referred to Full Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

1. This report summarises the outcome and key learning points from the Local Government Association (LGA) Peer Challenge. The final LGA Peer Challenge report is attached at Appendix A. A suggested action plan is attached at Appendix B.

Recommendations

2. The Mayor is asked to:
   i) note the contents of this report
   ii) note the LGA Peer Challenge report at Appendix A
   iii) note the attached areas for action and agree the suggested action plan at Appendix B
   iv) note the role of the Lewisham Future Board in taking forward actions
   v) refer to Overview & Scrutiny for their observations and comments

Policy context

3. Lewisham is home to some 290,000 residents, about one in four residents are aged 0 -19, whilst one in ten are aged 65 and older. The borough's population is ethnically diverse and over the next 20 years will be amongst the fastest growing in London.

4. Across the borough, the Council plays a key role in promoting the social, economic and environmental well being of local residents, taxpayers and service users. In 2014-15 the Council will oversee the expenditure of some £1.2bn across the borough. Of this some £268m, is revenue spend covering the provision of services as diverse as adults & children’s social care, Council Tax collection & housing, libraries & leisure centres, street cleaning & waste disposal, street lighting & crime reduction.
5. Since the onset of the Coalition Government’s spending cuts programme in 2010, the Council has achieved revenue budget savings of some £95m. However, up to 2018 a further £86m in budget savings is required (nearly a third of the Council’s current revenue budget).

6. Over the coming years, the Council faces tough choices. These choices are made tougher by the need to balance improving the quality of life and life chances for all, with the need to support some of the most vulnerable residents in the community. Furthermore, these choices will be made against a backdrop of unprecedented national policy reform that has seen the introduction of new legislation on welfare, social care, housing allocation, schools and local government finance.

7. Going forward, the Council priorities as well as the Mayor & Majority Party’s manifesto provide the policy framework within which choices and decisions about the future will be made. Together these describe the specific contribution that the Council will make towards delivery of the Sustainable Community Strategy through the following themes:

- community leadership and empowerment
- young people’s achievement and involvement
- clean, green and liveable
- safety, security and visible presence
- strengthening the local economy
- decent homes for all
- protection of children
- caring for adults and older people
- active healthy citizens
- inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

**Background**

8. Between 2000 and 2010 much of the system wide approach to local government performance management and improvement effort was subject to rigorous external assessment through the Audit Commission. At one time the Audit Commission brigaded the external appraisal of Councils with the Government’s other service specific regulators (including both Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission). These arrangements came to an end in 2010, when the new Coalition Government announced its decision to abolish the Audit Commission. This left the Ofsted and the CQC regimes as the principal means of independently appraising service delivery and outcomes - albeit that these applied to only one-half of Councils’ functional responsibilities and expenditure.

9. In 2011, the Local Government Association created a “Peer Challenge” programme to enable honest, independent and helpful peer appraisal to Councils. The peer challenge programme is now part of the LGA’s broader sector-led improvement strategy and it aims to assure effective self-regulation and self-management across the local government
community. This sector led approach is broadly effective although it has to be noted that it is based on the participation of “the willing” and relies upon Councils being open to external enquiry and challenge.

10. Few London Councils had taken part in this process up to 2014 and the London region lagged well behind Councils in other regions. Lewisham became one of the first London authorities to actively engage with the peer challenge process; although now several others have scheduled peer challenge sessions.

11. At the time of Lewisham’s Peer Challenge in September 2014, nearly 130 councils had been through the programme. Lewisham was one of the 50 councils due to go through the on-site assessment this year. The members of the LGA Peer Challenge team for Lewisham were as follows:

- Michael Coughlin, (then) Executive Director of the LGA
- Cllr Claire Kober, Leader of Haringey Council
- Joanna Sumner, Assistant Chief Executive of Hackney Council
- Max Wide, Strategic Director of Business Change, Bristol City Council
- Andrew Winfield, Peer Review Programme Manager
- Lisa Williams, LGA Peer Support Officer

**Scope and coverage of the Peer Challenge**

12. The LGA Peer Challenge process is structured around a series of questions designed to test organisational and business resilience. These questions are as follows:

- does the Council understand its local context and has it established a clear set of priorities?
- does the Council have a financial plan in place to ensure long term viability and is there evidence that it is being implemented successfully?
- does the Council have effective political and managerial leadership and is it a constructive partnership?
- are effective governance and decision-making arrangements in place to respond to key challenges and manage change, transformation and disinvestment?
- are organisational capacity and resources focused in the right areas in order to deliver the agreed priorities?

13. It has to be said that most external assessment is about the past and the present. Mostly, external assessors advise on what has happened and they describe the strengths and weaknesses of current arrangements. We wanted the team to look to the future and offer us advice on future direction, to comment upon Lewisham’s readiness for change and our appetite for the challenges ahead. We realised that this was a tall order
for the team but we wanted to use the opportunity of this assessment to help us shape our future changes rather than simply describe our past. In particular, we asked them to comment on two additional areas as follows:

- governance, community partnership and community engagement at a time of significant demographic growth and budget pressures
- how is the Council getting to grips with the scale of the savings to be made?

14. Prior to their arrival on-site, the Council provided the Peer Challenge team with a list of documents for the purposes of orientation and desk-top analysis. Once on-site the team undertook a wide-range of activity including a tour of the borough, observation of various meetings and interviews with over 90 people including the Mayor, Councillors and Council officers. Others included representatives of partner organisations, the business community, neighbouring councils and the local press.

Key findings

15. At the end of the four day Peer Challenge the team highlighted a number of key findings. The point of reflection here is that these findings are not comments or evidence based observations from professional inspectors. Instead they offer us external insights from expert political and managerial practitioners in our sector. We should therefore consider them in this vein. The main points are set out below, with full details contained in the final report attached at Appendix A.

16. In summary, the Peer Challenge team noted that Lewisham continues to be a strongly performing Council. We were advised that in their view the team considered us to be a “four star” Council (the highest level) if they had to appraise us against the old Audit Commission” star rating” standards. In drawing these conclusions, Peers referenced the specific contribution made by the Council’s overall political and managerial continuity and stability.

17. Commenting on the Council’s approach to change, the team noted that Lewisham’s progressive, pragmatic, structured and incremental approach had served it well. The team noted that Lewisham had a good understanding of its past and a clear awareness of the challenges that required focus and attention going forward. The team also commented positively on the Council’s adaptability, capacity for innovation and focus on delivering positive outcomes for residents and businesses.

18. In addition to the above, the team highlighted the strong directorate based approach to managing service delivery while suggesting that this might need to alter in the future. The team also commented on the highly positive sentiment in which the Mayor is held across the community. The team commented that they found, “a remarkable consistency in positive views of the Council amongst partners and staff.” This, according to the team, provides powerful levels of goodwill towards the Council in the
public's understanding of the implications of spending pressures on local
government and support to the Council in changing its working
arrangements to respond to the scale and pace of this challenge.

**Peer Challenge team's suggestions for our consideration**

19. The team offered a series of future focussed suggestions for the Council
to consider. They all focus on our managerial and governance stance for
the future. They include:

**governance & community engagement**

i) review the governance relations between the Mayor, Cabinet
Members and Scrutiny to respond to the new political and
financial environment

ii) ensure a greater focus on place and locality when determining
priorities and budgets

iii) reconsider the role of Local Assemblies having regard to the
changing nature of the relationship between residents and the
Council

iv) develop, clarify and support councillors to develop their roles as
community leaders

v) adopt an asset based and capacity building approach to work
with voluntary organisations to shift the relationship and reduce
dependency over time

vi) adopt a more proactive and co-ordinated approach to
community capacity building, supported by a personal
commitment from Mayor and Chief Executive

**management**

vii) communicate more innovatively, assertively and consistently
throughout the organisation, the community and with partners

viii) invest in capacity to drive the Lewisham Future Board
programme, service transformation and wider change across
the Council

ix) ensure greater consistency of management of staff

x) adopt a more robust approach to managing underperforming
individuals

xi) ensure that senior officers model the behaviours and changes
required arising from the soon to be introduced Balanced
Scorecard approach to their appraisals; to lead and drive those
changes through the organisation
Response

20. The Peer Challenge has been very useful to the Council. We now have an independent, honest and reliable assessment of the effectiveness of our overall approach to improving life and life-chances in Lewisham. The team’s comments on our strengths and weaknesses are recognised and acknowledged. And the team’s challenge to us about our future work is fully accepted.

21. The suggestions for review of the Council’s governance and community engagement merit detailed consideration by the Mayor and Council. The suggestion for review of the relations between Mayor, Cabinet and Scrutiny merit consideration both for this Administration as well as over the medium term.

22. The Council has a clear governance framework which includes the Mayor’s scheme of delegation; Mayor & Cabinet decision making; formal decision making by Council Committees; and scrutiny that is engaged in policy development as well as searching enquiry of public decision makers locally. The essence of the Mayoral model of governance is the mayor’s visible accountability to the wider public. Retaining a wider Council to agree policy priorities and budget setting helps to ensure that Mayoral decisions are consensually based. However, Members may wish to consider the scope for streamlining governance and reducing the possible overlap and duplication for considering issues across the Council. For as the Council’s responsibilities and budgets are being reduced substantially, so the Council needs to consider how to improve the overall cost-effectiveness of its governance.

23. Moreover, the approach we have adopted for Local Assemblies is very useful in placing ward councillors at the centre of place based community leadership. Of course there is a degree of variety in the effectiveness of our 18 Local Assemblies in respect of their community engagement. But the Assemblies display very many examples of excellent practice of engagement between local councillors and civil society. That noted, Members may want to reflect further on the effectiveness of this approach for both governance and community engagement purposes.

24. The managerial aspects of the Peer Challenge’s comments are broadly accepted. We need to be stronger at internal communications; have a more consistent approach to managing people and their performance; refresh our strategic approach to service redesign; and update our stance to service performance management. Moreover, the general commentary about the need for us to adopt a more corporately driven approach through the Lewisham Future Board is also accepted. Steps have already been taken to implement these managerial changes (the action plan for these changes is attached).
25. The Peer Challenge team were right to point to the level of future uncertainty that the Council faces. And they were right to suggest that stronger communication (both internally to staff and externally to partners and stakeholders) is required on how the Council is to shape its future. However, since the time of the Peer Review the Autumn Statement (in December 2014) has solidified the fiscal challenge facing local government even further. The National Audit Office, among several others, have pointed to the nature of the service pressures and uncertainties facing the whole of the local government sector. Given the scale of uncertainty in the policy and funding landscape in this General Election year, the Council’s pragmatic approach to organisational leadership needs to be developed further. The Council’s organisation needs to be more flexible and agile if it is to adapt successfully. The scale of the fiscal challenge (a £95m reduction in our net revenue budget over the next three years) requires a step-change in our general approach.

26. In conclusion, the Council remains positive about its future vision for the borough as a place. It is recognised that this vision needs to be more clearly articulated and that the whole organisation of the Council needs to be more adaptive. Steps have already been taken in respect of clarifying our communications and the Lewisham Future Board is addressing the issue of organisational change.

Legal implications

27. There are no specific legal implications for this report, save for noting that the Authority’s choices and decisions about the future will need to be compliant with the principles and provisions of the Equality Act 2010.

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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.
31. 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.

32. 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/](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/)

33. 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

34. 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/](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/)

**Financial implications**

35. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

**Crime and disorder implications**

36. Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act (1998) places a duty on partners to do all they can to reasonably prevent crime and disorder in their area. The level of crime and its impact is influenced by the decisions and activities taken in the day-to-day of local bodies and organisations.
37. The responsible authorities are required to provide a range of services in their community from policing, fire protection, planning, consumer and environmental protection, transport and highways. They each have a key statutory role in providing these services and, in carrying out their core activities, can significantly contribute to reducing crime and improving the quality of life in their area.

Environmental implications

38. There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

Background documents to this report

The LGA ‘Peer Challenge’ Final Report appears at Appendix A.

Contacts

For further information about this report please contact Paul Aladenika, Head of Policy and Partnerships on 020 8314 7148.
Dear Barry

London Borough of Lewisham - corporate peer challenge
On behalf of the peer team, thank you for your invitation into Lewisham Council to deliver the recent corporate peer challenge. The team felt privileged to be allowed to conduct its work with the helpful support of you and your colleagues who were open and engaged with the process. It was clear that a significant amount of effort had been committed by the Council in support of the peer team.

You asked the peer team to provide an external view of the Council and to give recognition of progress made; and supportive challenge and feedback on what it could do better, do differently and the appetite for change.

In particular you asked the team to provide specific feedback by testing the Council’s thinking on the following:

1. Governance, community partnership and community engagement at a time of significant demographic growth and budget pressures

2. How is the Council getting to grips with the scale of the savings to be made?

In addition the peer team considered the ability, resilience and capacity of the Council to deliver its future ambitions by looking at:

- Understanding of local context and priority setting: does the Council understand its local context and has it established a clear set of priorities?
- Financial planning and viability: does the Council have a financial plan in place to ensure long term viability and is there evidence that it is being implemented successfully?
o Political and managerial leadership: does the Council have effective political and managerial leadership and is it a constructive partnership?

o Governance and decision-making: are effective governance and decision-making arrangements in place to respond to key challenges and manage change, transformation and disinvestment?

o Organisational capacity: are organisational capacity and resources focused in the right areas in order to deliver the agreed priorities?

The background reading, along with the Council’s opening session presentation (which described Lewisham Council’s phases of development since 1994), and early on-site work suggested to the team that the focus of the review should be largely forward looking with an assessment of likely continued future success in light of the challenges faced. The Council agreed with this approach.

Consequently, the structure of our feedback is to describe the current characteristics, activities and new ways of working that we believe will underpin the future Council (which we have called ‘Future Lewisham’). This is followed by the more traditional and, in some cases, less effective ways of working that may hinder or undermine progress, and future success (which we have called ‘Past Lewisham’) and may require re-modelling. Finally, to identify the Key Issues which the Council will need to be aware of and, in our view, act upon.

It is important to stress that this was not an inspection. Peer challenges are improvement-focused and tailored to meet individual councils’ needs. They are designed to complement and add value to a council’s own performance and improvement plans. The peers used their experience and knowledge of local government to reflect on the information presented to them by people they met, things they saw and material that they read.

This letter provides a summary of the feedback that was presented at the end of our recent on-site visit. (Also attached are a set of slides that summarise the peer challenge feedback. The slides are the ones used by the peer team to present its feedback at the end of the on-site visit.)

In presenting this the peer challenge team has done so as fellow local government officers and members, not professional consultants or inspectors. Our intention is to provide recognition of the progress Lewisham Council has made in recent years while also stimulating debate and thinking about future challenges.

**Overall message**

The Council’s consistently high performance over the last twenty years is underpinned by senior managerial and political stability, and the matching of high ambition with adaptability to shifting circumstances and available resources.
It is clear to the peer team that Lewisham continues to be a strongly performing Council, which approaches local government delivery and practice in an innovative way, with a focus on positive outcomes to residents and businesses.

This is supported by a remarkable consistency in positive views of the Council amongst partners and staff. This provides powerful levels of goodwill towards the Council, in understanding the implications of public spending pressures on local government, and to support the Council in changing its working arrangements to respond to these pressures.

In recent years the Council’s “progressive pragmatism” approach to change has served it well and has avoided the management-speak of visions and mission statements. Instead its approach has been one of structured and focused incrementalism that has adapted, as required, over time. The Council has a good understanding of its past development through previous phases and of the priorities that will inform the next iteration.

At the same time the Council is keenly aware that significant financial pressures are going to reshape it for a new phase. Some of the features of these changes are already emerging while others remain to be determined.

There is a widespread understanding of the financial pressures that the Council is facing. The Council has a strong record of savings achieved and has devised a new programme for delivering future savings. The Mayor asked the peer team to consider whether or not the Council would be able to change at the pace and scale needed to address the unprecedented financial pressures now faced. This is addressed in more detail later in this letter.

These pressures include the budget savings of £85m required over the three years 2015-16 to 2017-18. The scale of financial savings is presenting significant difficulties for councils in England where Children’s and Adult services require a large and increasing proportion of total council spend. Lewisham told us that 48 per cent of the Council’s net spend is on 8,000 children and adults in the borough from a population of 286,000. The Council has defined a challenge for the next phase as redesigning the “next generation of public services” for 150 other core services that can support the priorities of residents and businesses, whose relevance and benefit to the wider community can be readily recognised.

A challenge for the Council is there are many voices, inside and outside the organisation, that remain uncertain about the future council, what this will look like and whether the way it has worked in the past will be sufficient. This may require the Council to set out how the next phase Lewisham Council will be developed, what this might look like and the new styles of working that might define this.
In summary, Lewisham Council is a strongly performing council with a well-developed understanding of its recent past and with plans to guide its future. The remainder of this letter seeks to offer supportive feedback on what the Council might do better and differently to meet the challenges ahead. There is no question of the organisational awareness of the need for change but the appetite, capacity and capability can be greatly enhanced by stronger communications and increased consistency in management practices.

Local context and priority setting

The council is facing major demographic pressures. The current population of 286,000 grew by 28,000 between 2001 and 2011 and is projected to rise to 332,000 by 2030. The current population is amongst the most diverse in London and has high levels of deprivation, being 31st out of 326 councils nationally.

Land values are lower in Lewisham comparative to the rest of London and this provides potential for the Council, working with partners, to lead in shaping future growth. However, land values are increasing in the north of the borough and there is pressure across the capital for development land. This will require continuous oversight to balance growth ambitions with the resource levers that the Council is able to deploy.

There is an impressive record of regeneration across the borough; planned around defined ‘regeneration and growth areas’ designated in the Council’s adopted Core Strategy. This is primarily located in the northern corridor, incorporating Deptford/New Cross, Lewisham and Catford. In particular there is a major development planned at Convoys Wharf. At 40 acres, Convoys Wharf is the single largest development site in the borough, with plans including: up to approximately 3,500 new homes (over 500 of which would be affordable); a hotel, shops, restaurants, cafes; public open spaces and public transport improvements.

Transport infrastructure is an important element for the current and future economy. There are 136,000 working residents in Lewisham but most of these (an estimated 60 per cent) are travelling to work in other parts of London. Given London’s projected future growth this is a key factor for lobbying, with other London Boroughs, for an extension of the Bakerloo line.

Housing is a priority for the Council to both meet need and to seek to balance the housing market and with plans to build more than 17,000 homes between 2012 and 2026. Rising house prices, increasing labour mobility, the growth in the buy-to-let market, reduced level house building and more single person households, have contributed to the growth of the private rented sector, which now constitutes 30 per cent of households in the borough; up from 14,100 in 2001 to 28,000 in 2011. For the Council this includes a programme of house building, through the arm’s length management organisation (ALMO), being the first new build Council homes for nearly than 30 years and an innovative programme of re-deployable housing to provide temporary accommodation on vacant development land.
The Council has a strong understanding of the borough and its interdependence with the rest of the capital. It is clearly understood that the London economy is key to Lewisham’s future and the opportunities this presents to improve the life chances of Lewisham’s residents. This is complemented by a strong and caring community focus, emanating from the Mayor that permeates the place and Council.

This understanding is transposed into a good alignment between local context, priorities and commitments set out in the Council’s ten ‘enduring’ priorities. Lewisham’s vision is: ‘Together, we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn’. This vision, ‘enduring’ priorities and values suggest stability and continuity.

However, these priorities and commitments may not be sufficiently focused for the next phase of the Council’s progress. The strategic priorities of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) were developed before 2008 and predate the financial collapse of that year and the subsequent public service austerity programme. Although these priorities are ‘enduring’, there will be a need to focus on fewer of them in light of the forthcoming and ever more acute financial pressures.

**Future Lewisham**

The focus for the Council continues to be to improve the lives and outcomes for people who live and work in the borough. One telling comment to the peer team was that Lewisham partnerships work by slow build with the implication that partnerships are built over time to provide resilience and durability.

In defining the next phase of organisation the Council is already developing some key features. These seem to the peer challenge team as some of the characteristics that will shape the future Council.

There are innovative models of partnership working that are developing partnership capacity and achieving efficiencies. An example of innovative partnership transformation is the pilot Whole Place Community Budget initiative with Lambeth, Southwark and Jobcentreplus in addressing local delivery of universal benefits support, employability and skills and pathways to employment. The triage arrangements provide early assessments and improved arrangements for directing residents to appropriate support.

The Lewisham Health and Wellbeing Board has recognised the importance of pace and scale of integration to improve user experience and outcomes but also to achieve savings across the partnership with the Council, Lewisham Hospital and the Clinical Commissioning Group. This has led to multi-agency integrated, neighbourhood based health and social care with the aligning of the four General Practitioner (GP) neighbourhoods and future provider units (Community Connections); establishing single multi-disciplinary teams at neighbourhood level bringing together a range of
services in a unified and collaborative system, for example Health Visitors, Children’s Centres; social workers, community development, etc.

There are some examples of emerging co-design and rich community engagement, for example the provision of children’s nurseries – with volunteer parents taking on service delivery, Generation Play Clubs and youth services provision via an employee-led mutual and a local ‘food bank plus’ model. Despite these examples this approach does not yet appear to be well supported or co-ordinated across the Council.

The relationship with Lewisham Homes – the ALMO that manages the Council’s housing stock – is refreshingly entrepreneurial. With the national reform of council Housing Revenue Accounts (HRA), Lewisham Homes has worked closely with the Council on how they might contribute to meeting local housing needs and has assembled a land and finance package in readiness for house building 500 units over a five year period. This will include a mix of market and social housing, with derived income to stimulate a continuing programme of building. This commercial outlook is an important facet of the new Council model for working in partnership.

This is mirrored in the new strategic approach to obtaining revenue income from assets. Shifting from the traditional approach of disposing of assets for a capital receipt, the Council is moving quickly to more commercial land use to derive income. It has purchased land of strategic value and is open to future purchases. This is important at a moment when land values are comparatively lower than other parts of London and where the Council can use this, not only to support the delivery of its priorities on housing, economic growth and enabling local employment, but also to create an income stream. This change of approach in asset use is scheduled to deliver £5.7m of income/savings by 2021.

Transformation of place is evident across the borough and no clearer than the Deptford town centre and High Street and illustrates the significant level of place making the Council is facilitating, in partnership.

The Deptford Lounge complex is an impressive, multi-award winning community hub that provides a wide range of facilities and services to residents in one place, including: public library, computer labs, study and performance areas and café. The Lounge’s programme of events is managed by Albany Theatre. The Deptford Lounge is co-located with a new Tidemill Academy primary school for 480 children. The £27m build cost was funded from an assembled partnership, including Transport for London, the Council, Section 106 monies for market housing development and Government funding. This exemplifies the Council’s approach to working with the community on the transformation of place and with developers and housing associations to structure a viable financial package.

The Council’s library service is another example of working with communities to deliver change. In response to a Mayoral Commission the
Council transferred five library buildings to the community and established a sixth community library. Activity has moved to varied usage, including: work clubs, business start-up advice sessions, computer training, etc. This led to savings of £1m while, at the same time, increasing resident satisfaction – from 62 to 74 per cent from 2009 to 2012. This deployment of new service models to achieve savings is founded on working with and involving communities in change proposals and change delivery while, at the same time, achieving savings and improved services.

The Lewisham Future Board is a principal vehicle to strategically oversee the shaping of the next council phase in response to budget savings. This will not only refashion the high spend services of children and adult social care, and how they are provided, but also the other 150 core services that are important for the people and businesses of Lewisham. The Council established the Lewisham Future Board in 2013 and this is chaired by the Chief Executive and comprises the executive management team (EMT) as well as a number of other senior officers with particular financial and transformation responsibilities. This is an important inclusive and co-ordinated approach, which recognised that a new methodology would be required, following the savings achieved since 2010, to achieve future savings targets.

For example, this approach is entirely open on what may emerge from service savings reviews. These have been given a carte blanche to consider any service delivery options that can deliver savings and, so far as possible, maintain services although these may be in a different form, for example via mutual, social enterprise/voluntary sector delivery, community asset transfer, co-operative models etc.

A report to Cabinet states that, “…we cannot approach changing all of the Council's 150 or so services in the same way. We need radically to reform and redesign our services and functions in ways that are appropriate to their purposes.” This means the new model of achieving savings will be a profound driver in the configuration of future Council services and the shape of the future Council will emerge from these wide-ranging reviews.

Despite the changes wrought in recent years to achieve financial savings the peer team encountered high levels of loyalty to the Council, low levels of staff turnover and very committed middle managers. These are important organisational strengths that, allied with high levels of pride in working for the Council and an appreciation that it has a record of innovation and flexibility, will be important for making the transition to the next organisational phase. However, it will be important to ensure that workforce development builds on this strength to ensure that future skills and competencies can be developed to support change and equip staff to deliver this.

Past Lewisham
The Council has historically emphasised the importance of working with the voluntary sector and these links are strong, in particular with the umbrella body Voluntary Action Lewisham. The work with the voluntary sector is an important means of engaging with community interests and is highlighted in the work of the Local Assemblies. The peer team were told how the councillor role on the Assemblies was important to have ward level contact and visibility as a community leader. This relationship is also important for exploring opportunities for future joint working arrangements, for instance the earlier example of achieving savings while supporting community groups to lead on library service delivery.

However, in the future the council should consider shifting the balance of this relationship. Until now the relationship appears to have been almost one of dependency rather than a mature discourse of working together to deliver shared priorities. In many respects the former relationship has been reinforced by a generous Grant Aid programme of £5.9m which has been unaffected by cuts hitherto. However, this is expected to change significantly for 2015-16 with programme cuts of 25 per cent proposed and a requirement that funding is prioritised for those bodies that are aligned to the Council’s social values and priorities and can demonstrate growing self-reliance and independence from the Council.

This provides an important opportunity for the Council to refashion its relationship with the voluntary sector to a more mature one of co-working, co-design and co-delivery. This will enable it to develop voluntary sector capacity, skills and confidence during transition to new ways of co-working.

There has been only limited work on co-working and co-delivery with neighbouring councils. An exception is the employment and skills work with Lambeth and Southwark programme referred to earlier. There can be very good reasons for this with councils working to different priorities, contracts working to different times, and political sensitivities. These uncertainties are evident in the Future Lewisham programme where an expected £12m of savings are expected from shared services but there is no detail on how this is to be achieved. Councils in London will need to consider and be ready to respond to the prospects of increased devolved powers in England, following the recent referendum in Scotland, and the form(s) that this might take in London.

The Council is working well in strong Directorates and providing high quality services to residents and businesses. The obvious examples are safeguarding and looked after children services judged as ‘Outstanding’ in recent Ofsted inspections (2012). The peer team saw evidence of excellent services being delivered across the council, from award winning parks and open spaces, the bold regeneration programmes being implemented, the parking policy review, paying the London living wage etc. However, while there certainly are examples of effective cross-Directorate working, in particular around planning, asset management and housing, the peer team did not gain a strong sense of strategic, cross-
cutting work across Directorates. This would be an area to develop through the Lewisham Future programme, which is certainly one of its intentions with themed reviews and service cross-cutting projects.

The Council’s performance management arrangements seemed to reflect a ‘CPA mind set’. The current monthly report is a sizable document of 71 pages of performance data and key performance indicators that must require considerable effort to collate. It was unclear who the audiences were for this and questioned by some on the value provided. The Council would benefit from considering: the different audiences for performance data, their different needs and manage a shift to a more qualitative set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure performance against Council priorities.

Partners and staff don’t feel the Council is articulating its future direction well enough. The Council’s approach of strategic and focused pragmatism has served it well in the past and is a key feature of the Lewisham Future programme, with the future form of the Council emerging. However, staff and partners told the peer challenge team that they would value a clearer articulation of the future direction so that they could work with this. The Council’s priorities and Mayoral commitments set out the ‘why’ and ‘what’ of the future, but less is obvious about the ‘how’. Those the team spoke with would find this helpful in order that they can better align with, and work alongside the Council, on the behaviours, activity and processes that will support the achievement of the shared priorities. Although some work has been done on this with the Council’s paper on ‘Lewisham Future Direction to 2020’ this needs further development and much wider communication.

The peer team were impressed by the positive progress made on improvements to the Revenues and Benefits service achieved by the investment and implementation of information technology and supported by changed working practices. This achieved savings of £500k in the first year and led to a move from face-to-face transactions of 2,000 per month to just two. However, across the Council it was acknowledged that not enough progress had been made to make the most of technology internally, or to fully exploit the opportunities afforded by social media in communicating and/or providing services to the public.

Information and Computer Technology (ICT) support to the Council is within the final two years of an externalised contract. This provides an important opportunity to consider future options. This would include an organisational evaluation of how ICT can: extend and support innovative ways of service delivery; promote community engagement; and contribute towards savings targets. This would then inform future delivery options, including shared service arrangements with neighbouring councils.

The team felt that the lead time for some of the more ambitious savings plans is not sufficient at present to allow for detailed planning and risk management, particularly as not all savings required for 2015-16 are fully
derived and finalised. There is a risk that insufficient time could lead to shortfalls in savings targeted and/or decisions made on new forms of delivery that may not be successful due to insufficient planning.

The peer team were told of inconsistent management practices across the organisation. These included:

- although we met staff who regularly receive personal development reviews (PDRs) just as many said that there had been a significant gap or had none at all
- staff who received directed and supported training and development for new ways of working, while others did not
- some frontline staff felt engaged in service reviews while others did not
- flexible working arrangements for some but not others
- intra-Council communications were effective for some but not all
- some staff acknowledged that although the Council was ‘open, honest and fair in all we do’ for residents and service users that this did not always apply for staff
- and many didn’t think that senior managers were visible enough to provide the level and type of personal communication that they would find helpful (and reassuring).

This consequence of inconsistent management practices is that although a good number of staff appreciate working for Lewisham and feel valued, not all do and this weakens the ability of the Council to take all staff with it during a time of change. Many of the above points chime with findings from the most recent Talkback 2012 employee survey and reinforce the need for corrective actions.

These are important elements of communication, workforce planning and managing performance that are not applied consistently in all parts of the organisation. For example, there is a high level Framework for Engagement strategy 2013-2015 and an Annual Communications Plan but these are comparatively simplistic and could be more ambitious and reflect current best practice. For instance, they merge internal and external communications and seemed to the peer team to be insufficiently focused at a time of great change. The peer team felt that there would be benefit in separating these elements so that there is a dedicated focus for each.

**Key Issues**

1. **FINANCE**

The Council has an impressive record of savings during the public spending austerity programme with £93m savings over the five years 2010-11 to 2014-15. For this period the Council launched a Change and Save programme, involving staff and providing team development sessions and workshops to support this.
However, the challenge ahead continues with a further £85m savings required over the next three years (2015-16 to 2017-18). Although 95 per cent of the savings target of £20.9m for 2014-15 has been achieved there is still the remaining 5 per cent to be achieved in year.

A recent budget pressure has been the no recourse to public funds (NRPF) families. This work has led to a service overspend for 2013-14 and the Council is currently overspending at £5.4m but is coordinating work across four boroughs, with expenditure monitored by EMT, with the expectation that spend for the year will be contained within budget.

The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) sets out a number of areas from which major savings will be drawn, with targets for these, including shared services, health and social care integration and early intervention. There were differing views, and levels of confidence, within the Council as to whether these will deliver required savings. For example, the shared services option is targeted to deliver savings of £12m yet there is no detail on how this will be achieved and, in some quarters, reservations that this is achievable.

Despite the fresh approach initiated by the Lewisham Future Board, the 2015-16 budget savings approach is still largely departmentally and ‘cuts’ focused, although most of the savings required have been identified. This provides some leeway for the Council to prepare and adapt its approach for 2016-17, which will need to be driven by sharper priorities and greater risk appetite. This will also require a greater emphasis on cross-cutting and thematic savings, if the scale of reductions and the relevance of the Council’s spend of its remaining funding is to be optimised.

Specific capacity to drive the change required is not adequate to meet the challenge the Council faces. This will need a good understanding within the Council of the service and corporate capacity and competency to support such reviews commissioned by the Lewisham Future Board. Corporate capacity is limited to two officers, which to the team appears insufficient, while there seems to be a mixed picture of how successfully the Council was identifying and providing training and development in the skills/competencies to support change. The Council should give consideration to bringing in additional support to drive the extent of transformation required, as well as ensuring that responsibility, capacity and competencies for transformation are shared and spread more widely amongst the body of staff (and not seen to be just located in the corporate team).

2. GOVERNANCE

The Mayor is highly respected and valued within the Council and the community. This provides an important focus and authority that can be used to address the number of critical issues faced by the Council. This could be used beneficially to set the agenda for: savings, new forms of service delivery and partnership engagement; recasting community leadership and engagement and discussing the future form of the Council to serve the community.
Related to this are the Council’s governance structures that were designed and established at a very different time to that which local government now finds itself. The world has changed greatly since the mayoral model was introduced in 2002 and there would be benefit to review these arrangements so that the council can satisfy itself that the potential of all Councillors as community leaders is fully harnessed, within the context of the future Council.

Local Assemblies are held in affection by those involved and they are considered to have provided an important means for the Council to engage with local communities, social enterprises and the voluntary sector. The disbursement of the £15,000 of allocated funding devolved to each of the 18 Assemblies is a means of promoting community engagement and partnership activity.

The peer team recommends that it is timely for the Council to review its approach to community engagement, to ensure maximum effectiveness, impact and value for money. For example, the Council acknowledges that it needs to catch up with the community adoption of digital technologies and the extended development of information technology to support ‘channel shift’, new ways of working and community engagement.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

As agreed with you on-site, we have collated a number of issues arising from the peer challenge into some firm and quite specific issues for your consideration. These fall, almost by default, into the categories of ‘Leadership’, ‘Governance’ and ‘Management’ and are intended to act as prompts for action by the Council, in pursuit of continued Council development and success.

LEADERSHIP

Residents, staff, elected councillors and partners would value greater clarity and communication about the future direction of Lewisham and the role(s) of the Council. This is not to close off strategic intuition, that is a feature of organisations moving through change, but to set out in more detail the approaches that might underpin future working, for example increased social entrepreneurship in service delivery, greater community involvement in supporting children’s and adults services, speeded up progression of health and social care integration etc. The team suggests that the Council, at the same time, sets out how the other 150 core Council services will look different to the way they do now but how they will continue to serve residents and communities in new ways.

Given the significant and highly regarded personal position of the Mayor it would be helpful to restate his commitment, in relation to the challenges the Council and Lewisham faces and the journey it is on, as the next phase of Lewisham Council is being defined.
This letter has mentioned that the savings for 2015-16 have been largely achieved. This provides an important opportunity to use the next 12 months to plan, prepare and initiate an evolutionary (as opposed to revolutionary) programme of change, building on the foundations and successes to date. This will be an important platform to support shaping the future Council.

It will be important for the Council to be alert, proactive and agile in response to opportunities that might be developed around Combined Authorities and increased devolution to London councils.

**GOVERNANCE/ENGAGEMENT**

Review the governance arrangements between the Mayor, Cabinet Members and Scrutiny Committees, to respond to the new and future political and financial environment.

Ensure a greater focus on place, as opposed to Council and/or budget savings, when determining priorities and budgets. It will be essential that the role and relevance of the Future Council is evident to all and not seen as simply managing decline.

Reconsider the Local Assemblies having regard to the changing nature of the relationship between residents and the Council.

Develop, clarify and support Councillors in their role as local community leaders.

Adopt an asset-based and capacity building approach to work with voluntary organisations to shift the relationship and reduce dependency over time.

Adopt a more proactive and co-ordinated approach to community capacity building, supported by a personal commitment from Mayor and Chief Executive.

**MANAGEMENT/CAPACITY BUILDING**

Communicate more innovatively, assertively and consistently throughout the organisation, the community and with partners.

Invest in capacity to drive the Lewisham Future Board programme, service transformation and wider change across the Council.

Move beyond ‘service redesign’ to resident-centred innovation and transformation.

Ensure greater consistency of management of staff.

As positive are the Council staff working relations the peer team were told that underperformance of some was tolerated and that this can cause ill will. The
Council should adopt a more robust approach to managing underperforming individuals.

Ensure that senior officers model the behaviours and changes, required arising from the soon to be introduced Balanced Scorecard approach, to their appraisals; to lead and drive those changes through the organisation.

**Next steps**

You will undoubtedly wish to reflect on these findings and suggestions made with your senior managerial and political leadership before determining how the council wishes to take things forward.

As part of the peer challenge process, there is an offer of continued activity to support this. The LGA’s Principal Adviser will be pleased to work with the council to address any and all of the other issues mentioned in the letter.

In the meantime we are keen to continue the relationship we have formed with you and colleagues through the peer challenge to date. Heather Wills, Principal Adviser is the main contact between your authority and the Local Government Association. Heather can be contacted via email at heather.wills@local.gov.uk (or tel. 07770 701188) and is willing to help the council address any and all issues mentioned in the letter and can provide access to our resources and any further support.

In the meantime, all of us connected with the peer challenge would like to wish you every success going forward. Once again, many thanks to you and your colleagues for inviting the peer challenge and to everyone involved for their participation.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Winfield
Peer Challenge Manager (Local Government Support Team)
Local Government Association
Tel. 07786 542754
Email andrew.winfield@local.gov.uk

On behalf of the peer challenge team:
- Michael Coughlin, Executive Director for Workforce, Leadership and Productivity, Local Government Association
- Councillor Claire Kober, Leader, London Borough of Haringey (Labour)
- Max Wide, Strategic Director of Business Change, Bristol City Council
- Joanna Sumner, Assistant Chief Executive, London Borough of Hackney
• Lisa Williams, Programme Support Officer, Improvement Support, Local Government Association (shadowing role)
• Andrew Winfield, Peer Challenge Manager, Local Government Association
### Appendix B: LGA ‘Peer Challenge’ action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Area for action</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Deadline for completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Set out how Council services will look different to the way they do now and how they will continue to serve residents and communities in new ways.</td>
<td>Lewisham Future Programme Board (LFPB) report to Mayor &amp; Cabinet/ Overview &amp; Scrutiny</td>
<td>April/ May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Communicate more innovatively, assertively and consistently throughout the organisation, the community and with partners.</td>
<td>LFPB</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Invest in capacity to drive the Lewisham Future Board programme, service transformation and wider change across the Council.</td>
<td>LFPB</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ensure greater consistency of management of staff and adopt a more robust approach to managing underperforming individuals.</td>
<td>LFPB</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ensure that senior officers model the behaviours and changes, required arising from the soon to be introduced Balanced Scorecard approach, to their appraisals; to lead and drive those changes through the organisation.</td>
<td>LFPB</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Restate the commitment of the Mayor, in relation to the challenges the Council and Lewisham faces.</td>
<td>Mayor of Lewisham</td>
<td>Mayor’s AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Use the next 12 months to plan, prepare and initiate an evolutionary programme of change, building on the foundations and successes to date.</td>
<td>LFPB report to Mayor &amp; Cabinet/ Overview &amp; Scrutiny</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Area for action</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Deadline for completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Remain alert, proactive and agile in response to opportunities that might be developed around Combined Authorities and increased devolution to councils in London.</td>
<td>LFPB report to Mayor &amp; Cabinet</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Review the governance arrangements between the Mayor, Cabinet Members and Scrutiny Committees, to respond to the new and future political and financial environment.</td>
<td>Mayor &amp; Cabinet/ Overview and Scrutiny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ensure a greater focus on place, as opposed to Council and/or budget savings, when determining priorities and budgets. Ensure that the role and relevance of the Future Council is evident to all and not seen as simply managing decline.</td>
<td>Mayor &amp; Cabinet</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Reconsider Local Assemblies having regard to the changing nature of the relationship between residents and the Council.</td>
<td>Mayor and Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Develop, clarify and support Councillors in their role as local community leaders.</td>
<td>Council (as part of a review of the Member Development Programme)</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Adopt an asset-based and capacity building approach to work with voluntary organisations to shift the relationship and reduce dependency over time.</td>
<td>LFPB report to Mayor &amp; Cabinet/ Overview &amp; Scrutiny</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Adopt a more proactive and co-ordinated approach to community capacity building.</td>
<td>LFPB report to Mayor &amp; Cabinet/ Overview &amp; Scrutiny</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Area for action</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Deadline for completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Move beyond ‘service redesign’ to resident-centred innovation and transformation.</td>
<td>LFPB</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report sets out proposals as to how day services and related transport could be remodelled to deliver the £1.3m of savings that was previously considered by Mayor and Cabinet on 12th November 2014. It includes a number of options and associated recommendations which Mayor and Cabinet are requested to agree for consultation. The recommendations reflect the current focus of Adult Social Care services on delivering the national and local strategic agendas of personalisation and community inclusion.

1.2. The report recommends a change to the configuration of the in-house day service provision as follows: the consolidation of the Council directly managed transport offer to specific groups of people with complex needs; the consolidation of the general older adults day service offer to other providers; and a wide spread application of personal budgets, through direct payments, to all other people currently using the service with the exception of a group of people with a learning disability whose needs can be met by a to be commissioned drop in service. The paper also includes a recommendation to reduce the Council’s transport service Door2Door by: offering direct payments to cover the cost of transport to day services to most adults with a learning disability; and stopping financial support for transport to evening clubs.

1.3. As part of this reconfiguration, the report recommends that the four existing day centres used for the in-house provision (Ladywell, Leemore, Naborhood and Mulberry) be retained and their function expanded for use as community hubs for three, with the fourth being retained as a ‘disability specific’ centre. This option is being considered alongside a parallel set of proposals being managed by the Culture and Community Development Team in its review of grant aided organisations and.

1.4. Most of the recommendations represent significant change to the current model of service and therefore a formal consultation with service users is required for all but the transport to evening clubs. After formal service
users consultation further recommendations will be brought back to Mayor and Cabinet in June 2015. Healthier Communities Select Committee at its meeting on 14\textsuperscript{th} January 2015 asked officers to work with Lewisham Mencap to explore the possibility of alternatives for transport to the evening clubs.

1.5. In addition to implications for service users and their families, the recommendations also have implications for staff employed by the Council. Should the recommendations brought back to Mayor and Cabinet be approved then a further formal 28 day consultation with council employed staff in the day service and the transport service may be required. The report also sets out an outline consultation timeline which reflects both consultations.

1.6. These proposals, should they be agreed, will deliver part year savings in 2015/16 with the remainder being realised for the beginning of 2016/17.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. Mayor and Cabinet are asked to agree that officers may proceed to a formal three month consultation with service users and their families on the following proposals for the future modelling for day services and transport, and their associated savings as follows:

2.2. That the Intensive Support (ISR) service for people with profound learning disabilities and complex needs currently at Leemore to move to the Ladywell Centre.

2.3. That a drop in service be commissioned for those adults with a learning disability who need only ‘light touch’ support.

2.4. That the Council’s directly provided day service offer be consolidated and the Council be the direct service providers only for those people with the most complex needs, specifically the specialist Dementia Service, the Challenging Needs Service (CNS) and the Intensive Support Service (ISR). Additionally, that the in-house service retains management of its sheltered employment schemes.

2.5. That the older adults service users (i.e. the non-Dementia service) offer be consolidated with the existing providers of older adult day services in the borough; Housing 21 at Cinnamon Court, Cedar Court and Hestia at the Calabash Centre.

2.6. That all other service users, primarily adults with a learning disability and adults with physical disability/long term conditions be allocated a personal budget/direct payment and supported to plan their own service using those budgets either individually or through pooling the budgets with others.
2.7. That the Ladywell Centre be identified as the core complex needs centre for adults with disabilities and be the recognised as the main office base for the in-house provision.

2.8. That the buildings known as Mulberry, Leemore and Naborhood remain open but are developed as community hubs rather than specific day centres. The buildings will thus become multi use centres for service delivery with an established presence for disability services, but will also be used by third sector providers who help deliver the Council’s community inclusion and neighbourhood agendas. This proposal will be developed in partnership with the Culture and Community Development Team’s as part of the review of grant aided organisations and assets.

2.9. That the buildings are considered as part of the Community Services Asset portfolio and thus rental and running costs are not recovered as income but agreed to be offset by savings or capital receipts currently related to other assets which can be rationalised.

2.10. That the use of in-house Door2Door transport be reviewed, with some routes for the most complex service users being retained, but otherwise, where an individual meets the eligibility threshold for Council funded transport, they are offered a direct payment to arrange their own transport separately or with others.

2.11. That the discretionary transport service to the evening clubs be withdrawn, with some discretionary transitional support put in place where there may be significant detriment for current passengers who live on their own or at home with their families. Officers to work with Lewisham Mencap as well as affected users and their families to explore alternatives.

2.12. The change to transport arrangements for the evening clubs does not require formal consultation as these are not commissioned services and people are not referred to them as part of their care plan. However, officers will as a matter of good practice consult with affected users, their families and Lewisham Mencap as a separate process within the same timescale.

2.13. Prior to agreement to consult, Mayor & Cabinet are asked to note that officers will have held a number of briefing and information sessions on the proposals with affected service users and their families to ensure that the proposals are clear and to begin a Frequently Asked Questions sheet to ensure further clarity through the formal consultation process.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1. The function of Adult Social Care is to ensure that vulnerable adults receive services appropriate to their needs within the framework of statutory duties and agreed policies. For adults, this is determined through the completion of an assessment in accordance with section 47, of the
NHS and Community Care Act (1990), now replaced by the Care Act 2014, followed by the application of the appropriate eligibility criteria and service decisions.

3.2. There have been a number of government documents which set out the pathway of ‘Personalisation’ as a way of meeting those needs so that eligible service users have both greater flexibility about the service they receive and greater control over how they are delivered (for example: ‘Putting People First’ (2007); ‘Transforming Social Care’ [LAC (DH) 2008]; ‘Caring for Our Future: reforming care and support’ (2012)). These policy and guidance documents have promoted the provision of Direct Payments whereby eligible adults are given an assessed sum as cash to purchase their own service and the local authority’s role, rather than being one of a direct provider of services, becomes one more focused on market development and shaping.

3.3. The Care Act 2014 (The Act) is the most substantial piece of legislation relating to adult social care to be implemented since 1948. It has taken previous legislation, common law decisions and other good practice guidance and consolidated them. The Care Act places a wide emphasis on prevention, the provision of advice and information, changes to eligibility, funding reform and market shaping and commissioning. This final aspect of the Act also emphasises the use of personal budgets and direct payments; and requires the Council to promote appropriate service supply across the provider market and assure quality and diversity to support the welfare of adults in the community. It also requires the Council to engage with providers and local communities when redesigning services and planning for the future.

3.4. The final report of the Local Government Association’s Adult Social Care Efficiency (ASCE) Programme published in July 2014, sets out a number of initiatives that Councils across the country have put in place to deliver services that will meet the requirements of the Care Act in the current financial climate. It sets out advice on how to agree a new contract with citizens and communities, managing demand, transforming services, improving commissioning and developing more integrated services.

3.5. The Programme report’s ‘big lessons’ mirror what Lewisham is already undertaking in order to develop services which consider workforce optimisation, cultural change and creative approaches to delivering care and support while managing demand. The ASCE report offers a specific focus on managing demand and utilising community offers to help deliver personalisation, prevention and early intervention; improving commissioning using outcome-based approaches which maximise independence; and integrating services putting people at the centre of care and support.

3.6. The recommendations set out in this report to Mayor and Cabinet seek to make further progress in the delivery of the Council’s Sustainable
Communities Strategy priorities of ‘empowered and responsible’ and ‘healthy, active and enjoyable’.

4. BACKGROUND

Social care modernisation

4.1. Adult Social Care has been delivering a programme of modernising its local day service offer in line with the principles of choice and control by promoting the use of personalised budgets and direct payments. This programme has included looking at ways of supporting Third Sector partners in developing alternative day services and activities which promote the delivery of day services in a general community setting. The principles of day service modernisation promote people as valued and active citizens, encouraging independence and, particularly for working aged adults, support employment.

4.2. As the social care Resource Allocation System (RAS) is rolled out, there is increasing scope for more personalised service responses. There has been an increase in the number of direct payments and personal budgets in Lewisham, reflected in an uptake in the use of personal assistants who support the person to directly choose their own activities and create their own routines and rhythms to the day. The day service modernisation programme has also included efficiency on its list of outcomes and has looked to support the savings programme.

4.3. This work has already identified a clear reduction in the demand for services directly managed by the Council. The roll out of the social care RAS will reduce this demand still further and it is therefore timely for the Council to review its role in direct provision of day care for adults.

4.4. The Council has been working with partners to develop more local, and sometimes neighbourhood specific, opportunities in anticipation of legislative requirements, in particular the Care Act, which has begun the process of reshaping what is available to people as day activities. This has been achieved particularly through the ‘Communities that Care’ and Faith Grants programmes, which are now providing a wide range of alternatives within Lewisham. These developments are also helping people to remain actively known within their community. Alongside the direct service procurement activity, there is now a much wider range of choice than there was four years ago. These developments are discussed in paragraphs 4.20 to 4.23 below.

4.5. In recognition of this shift, the Community Services Directorate has been repositioning itself into a role more focussed on quality assurance so that provision for its most vulnerable citizens continues to meet their needs in a way that is both competent and skilled, such as developing a ‘quick to view’ quality assurance dash board.
4.6. The next step in the day service delivery programme is to strategically support the pooling of direct payments which will require the Council to take a more active role in supporting people to design and commission their own service provision. To help deliver this adult social care has developed the new role of Support Planners who will work with individuals and small groups to creatively think about how they want to spend their allocated financial resource.

4.7. The proposals set out in this paper were considered at Healthier Communities Select Committee at its meeting of 14th January 2015. A member of the public was also invited to address the Committee on these proposals set out in the version of then paper presented to that Committee. This version of the paper has been amended to reflect the Healthier Communities Select Committee comments on the proposals.

Current service provision

4.8. The Council directly funds and/or manages building based day services to a total of 359 adults a week (for 1,022 days). 199 people are older adults (438 days) and 160 younger adults (584 days). 128 of the younger adults have a learning disability and 32 are adults with a complex physical disability and/or other long term conditions. These services are delivered in seven day centres across borough, four of which are directly managed by the Council and three by the third sector organisations. A breakdown of attendance by each group at each centre is set out in tables 1 and 2 below.

4.9. In addition to these 359 Lewisham clients, the in-house service also supports 4 people with learning disability who are funded by neighbouring boroughs. All but one of these people were originally Lewisham residents whose families then moved to neighbouring boroughs.

4.10. Three of the Council managed centres are currently nominated as learning disability specific day centres: the Mulberry Centre in New Cross, the Leemore Centre in Lewisham and the Naborhood Centre in Sydenham. There are specific bespoke services for people whose behaviour is challenging at the Mulberry Centre (the CNS Service), and for people with a profound learning disability and complex physical support needs (the ISR service) at the Leemore Centre. The fourth centre, the Ladywell Centre, is currently nominated as a centre for older adults and people with physical disabilities. The specialist Dementia day service, which was recently extended, is located there.

4.11. The Council also purchases building based day services for older adults at Cedar Court and Cinnamon Court managed by Housing 21. In addition building based day services for older adults are also funded at the Calabash Centre managed by Hestia Support and Care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>5 days</th>
<th>4 days</th>
<th>3 days</th>
<th>2 days</th>
<th>1 day</th>
<th>Total days</th>
<th>Total users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Ladywell long term conditions</th>
<th>Mulberry General</th>
<th>Mulberry CNS</th>
<th>Naborhood</th>
<th>Leemore General</th>
<th>Leemore ISR</th>
<th>Cinnamon Court</th>
<th>Cedar Court</th>
<th>Calabash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Day Services Usage - Under 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>5 days</th>
<th>4 days</th>
<th>3 days</th>
<th>2 days</th>
<th>1 day</th>
<th>Total days</th>
<th>Total users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell dementia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell Older adults</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry General</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naborhood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leemore General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamon Court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabash</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Day Services Usage - over 65

4.12. The current cost of the service totals £4,954,100 with an associated transport cost of £2,443,268. A breakdown of the Day Service figures is given in table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Centre</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell Day Centre</td>
<td>£510,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell Dementia Services</td>
<td>£234,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leemore Day Centre</td>
<td>£453,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Day Centre</td>
<td>£414,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naborhood Day Centre</td>
<td>£355,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Opportunities Business Support</td>
<td>£198,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyles Admin</td>
<td>£46,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle Intensive Support Resource</td>
<td>£402,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyles Challenging Needs Service</td>
<td>£790,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Change Project</td>
<td>£15,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabash Day Centre</td>
<td>£309,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Court</td>
<td>£304,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamon Court</td>
<td>£189,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health COS Teams</td>
<td>£729,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,954,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Centre Transport</th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared D2D routes</td>
<td>£1,331,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care D2D routes</td>
<td>£1,026,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Club</td>
<td>£85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,443,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Day service and Transport budget breakdown

4.13. There is also an associated income from charges for individual service users or the payment made by other boroughs for clients placed in the in-house service.

4.14. The staffing structure across the Day Service is detailed in table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Title</th>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Service Managers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support Team Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Service Coordinators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Services Officer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Service Support Worker</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Service Support Worker apprentices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Day Services staffing

4.15. There have been changes in referral patterns to all centres over the past 5 years, with a noticeable downward trend in numbers due to an increase in people using Direct Payments and Personal Budgets to purchase their own support. Analysis of how Direct Payments and Personal Budgets are used is challenging due to their flexible nature. People can buy services and change them as they want in order to meet
their identified needs. Evidence from Public Health and Joint Commissioning audits suggest that there are increases in the numbers of people accessing health and leisure centres; and increased enrolment in community education, why can represent proxy measures.

4.16. There is a significantly reduced referral rate for people with a physical disability/long term conditions to the Ladywell Centre. This reflects societal shifts in expectations and assumptions about people with physical disability, particularly expectations regarding independence, competence and employability. Developments in IT and assistive technology have also supported people with a disability to be more self-determining.

4.17. A community focussed approach, and the development of alternative opportunities has also reduced the number of older adults requiring building based day services generally. This has impacted on both the Council’s provision and also that of other commissioned services.

4.18. The Council also funds 24 hour supported living and residential care services in borough adults with a learning disability. Currently there are 231 people who live in Supported Living, 184 in 24 hour supported accommodation, 23 in residential care and 34 who receive non-24 hour supported living. In 2011 the Council worked in partnership with those providers to develop alternative ways of meeting the need for structured day activities for those people. This has also resulted in a significant decrease in the use of day centres.

4.19. Also affecting day service numbers in the borough is the fact that many young people with learning disabilities who attend out of borough schools tend to remain out of the borough once their education is completed. This means that fewer young people transition from Children’s services to Lewisham based Social Care though they live with their families in the borough. Those young people who are eligible for funded care when they transition to adult services have different expectations and preferences from the generally older day centre population who make up the majority of the direct service users. They are more likely to seek out a different kind of offer with other providers, particularly those more clearly and directly related to employment and education.

4.20. The day centre buildings are now, and unless there is a shift in approach, will continue to be significantly underused.

4.21. The Council’s grants programme particularly the ‘communities that care’ category has provided seed corn funding for specific community based offers such as:
   - ‘Meet me at the Albany’ for older adults,
   - Time Banking which has significantly promoted volunteering among adults with a learning disability who use or who might otherwise have used day services,
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• ‘Community Connections’ which among other developments, has supported 413 people, 55% of them referred from adult social care, to get connected to their local communities,
• Heart’n’Soul’s weekly ‘Allsorts’ programme which around 50 Lewisham Citizens with a learning disability attend.

4.22. Procurement of learning disability day services has particularly focussed on delivering employment as an outcome (for example Nexus ‘The M’Eating Place’ cafe and ‘Clickstart’ projects, PLUS’s ‘Cup Cakes’ café, and Aurora’s office cleaning social enterprise). Additionally, local learning disability providers have developed a wide range of other employment and leisure opportunities including horticulture projects, service industry skills, arts and crafts, and IT related skills as part of their 24 hour services.

4.23. Procurement for older adult day services has also reflected a reduction in demand for building based services for this group. The contract with Housing 21 for day services in its provision at Cedar Court and Cinnamon Court was reduced by 10 places a day 3 years ago, and is reflecting a further under delivery on the current contract number of approximately 10 places a day on a contracted 50 places a day.

4.24. The day service for Older Adults from Black and Ethnic Minority backgrounds at the Calabash Centre was recently recommissioned. The new contract, agreed by Mayor and Cabinet on 16th July 2014, reflected a reduction in funded places from 51 places a day to 25 reflecting reduced take up of the service. It was also a key outcome of that procurement process that the Calabash Centre would continue to be available to the self-managed ‘Active Elders Groups’ to maintain a more lively and outward looking service for older adults. It is also a requirement of the new contract that use of the Centre be extended to other client and wider citizen groups during the day and at evenings and weekends. Since the Centre reopened in October 2014, a small group of people with learning disability have begun to have their day service delivered there and the successful providers (Nexus and Hestia) have also developed opportunities for supported employment, volunteering and apprenticeships as part of the service delivery model.

The Council's directly provided transport

4.25. The Council’s Door2Door transport service is currently organisationally linked with specific day centre locations: the Council’s own provision (Ladywell, Leemore, Naborhood and Mulberry), the Calabash Centre and Cinnamon and Cedar Courts. A number of buses are shared with education and a number are used solely by adult social care. Changes as to how people want their service to be delivered, along with the impact of the adult social care transport policy, is highlighting the inherent inflexibility of this arrangement in delivering the personalisation agenda, and is increasingly reflecting an inefficient use of Council assets. In a bid to address this, two routes to the Naborhood Centre were merged into
one in 2014, and a reconfiguration of the day service offer the year before resulted in the Wesley Halls route becoming redundant. However, some routes continue to have low numbers of passengers while the demand for council funded taxis rise.

4.26. Table 5 below illustrates the clear and continuing reduction in number of people using Door2Door transport between 2011 and 2014.

![Graph showing reduction in Door2Door service users](image)

**Table 5 – total number of day care service users needing Door2Door Transport**

4.27. As personalised support and packages become the norm, it is increasingly clear that the Door-2-Door service will not be able to meet the transport needs of people choosing day services away from historical and traditional building bases. It cannot offer cost effective, flexible, transport at times or days outside of the core hours of 9-5, Monday to Friday. Despite the collapsing of some routes, the number of people on Door2Door routes can on average be less than 5 people. In addition it has become increasingly challenging for Door2Door to provide a service for people with severe and complex physical disabilities due to risks associated with transporting them and the additional support they require. However, this is a growing group of day service users who meet the eligibility threshold for Council funded transport.

4.28. Door2Door has worked with adult social care and has evidenced willingness and flexibility in supporting new routes for new clients, for example as part of the Calabash Centre re-commissioning. However, while the routes shared with education will need to be subject to a wider and more long-term projection of need and demand, there is potential for the funding relating to the buses that are not shared to be used more flexibly to deliver the wider adult social care service modernisation programme.

4.29. Door2Door historically also supports some discretionary transport (i.e. transport to people who do not meet eligibility criteria) to out of hours
clubs, particularly the Lewisham Mencap clubs on Monday Tuesday and Thursday evenings but also the Seals swimming club on a Friday. This is met through an additional overtime payment to drivers and escorts which is funded from the adult social care budget even though it is not a statutory service. With the growing demand on the adult social care budget, the ability of the Council to continue to fund transport costs for people who do not have an assessed need for the service should be reviewed.

5. PROPOSALS FOR REMODELLING DIRECT SERVICE DELIVERY

5.1. The Council is currently the major provider of day care in the borough. However, the local service market has been growing and is now sufficiently well developed to support the general population of people meeting eligibility criteria for day care. There are a small number of people with complex care needs where the market remains relatively immature. It is timely, therefore, for the Council to consider its role as a continuing direct provider of day services.

5.2. Officers have considered a number of proposals relating the directly managed day services, and its related transport, to reshape them to support a cost effective modernised day service. Some of the proposals detail internal reconfiguration of the services, which will require a consultation with service users and their families. However, there are also options which require agreement by Mayor and Cabinet.

5.3. The proposals and options for remodelling Council managed day services are set out in section 5 paragraphs 5.10 to 5.16 with the officer recommended option set out in Section 6. Proposals and recommendations for changing how Door 2 Door is used are set out in section 7. Section 8 references related proposals which Adult Social Care are seeking to develop in partnership with the Culture and Community Development Team as part of the vision for service modernisation: the opening up of three of the four Council managed day centres to become outward facing community hubs where day services are also delivered.

5.4. The proposals have been shaped in part by consultation which officers undertook in 2013/14 with service users, their families and staff from the learning disability day centres. This consultation consisted of reference group meetings every six weeks for a year with representatives of family carers, people with learning disabilities and staff; plus three quarterly meetings for each of the service users and carers. There was no similar in depth consultation with users and carers at the Ladywell centre. Though there were some briefing sessions.

5.5. The learning disability service consultations considered activities, transport, meals and buildings usage as part of their agendas. In particular, there was discussion about rationalising the three learning disability centres: from three to one single day centre, or ‘supercentre’ or,
the strongly expressed preference, to retain all the existing centres. While the ‘supercentre’ option had the advantage of remaining client group specific and families felt that users would be safer, the disadvantage would be loss of choice of location and geographical spread across the borough and a continued inward focus.

5.6. While the expressed preference of users is to retain all of the centres, officers in developing these proposals are also mindful of the need to make best use of Council assets. The Community and Cultural Development team are consulting on a number of proposals which may have synergy with the reconfiguration of day services which would support the maintenance of a specific disability service as well as a day service related presence in the other centres. Officers consider that the Ladywell Centre best lends itself as a disability specific day centre because of its accessibility on the ground floor, its specialist facilities and the fact that the newly expanded Dementia Service is already located there and as a self-contained unit within the main building. Leemore, Naborhood and Mulberry are well located close to a range of local facilities and transport to develop as community hubs.

5.7. Some of the recommendations, if agreed, will require formal statutory consultation with service users and their families. The option regarding transport to evening clubs does not require formal consultation as the clubs are voluntary sector offers which people are not referred to as part of their care plans. However, as a matter of good practice the impact of their withdrawal on existing users and families be considered and transitional mitigation put in place if necessary. Healthier Communities Select Committee has also asked officers to work with Lewisham Mencap to explore other potential sources of funding.

5.8. Should the recommended options for the directly managed services, both the in-house day services and Door2Door, be agreed following the formal consultation, there may also be a requirement for a further formal consultation with affected staff.

Options

5.9. The following paragraphs set out options to consider for the future management of the service. All of the above service redesigns can still apply independently of decisions on the following options by Mayor and Cabinet. The importance that service users and carers place on their friendships and relationships is recognised and whichever option is agreed officers will be mindful through the consultation process how these relationships are maintained.

5.10. **Option 1** – That the management of the in-house provision continues as is. The advantages are that users and carers would be supportive as the service and its staff are well known and well regarded. Some savings may be made. The disadvantages are that opportunities for further market developments are potentially stifled, making it difficult for the Council to
fulfil its new duty to promote market development under the Care Act. Furthermore a rigid service does not provide the flexibility and individual focus required to enable adults to fully realise the potential of their Direct Payments and with the Council as a provider, users may find the range of choice and flexibility of services on offer to them decrease on the long term at a higher cost overall. The anticipated level of savings will not be achieved by this option.

5.11. **Option 2** – That the Council closes its directly managed service to new referrals who are referred instead to other providers. The advantage of this option is that existing users and families are very likely to support the proposal. There is also potential to tailor the staffing levels to client usage in a planned manner. The disadvantages are that there may be a perception of a two-tier service with continuing service users receiving a declining service while new service users feel aggrieved that they cannot access the in-house service. Potentially it will fragment the service, making it difficult to pool budgets and design new service offers which again frustrates the full potential of the use of Direct Payments and Personal Budgets. The staff: client ratio within the in-house service may not be adequate to ensure client safety and also be efficient, thereby preventing potential for efficiency savings on staffing costs and possibly representing a cost pressure. Additionally the buildings will become increasingly empty and represent a poor use of assets.

5.12. **Option 3** – That the in-house service continues to support service users but its location is rationalised to a single centre. The advantages are that there is potential saving in management costs and some rationalisation in front line staff through increased staff: client ratios. There would be a rationalisation of capital assets, and the use of transport to a single location. Families would be likely to support it because the service remains directly managed by the Council. The disadvantages are the risk of continued institutional service delivery and ‘warehousing’, with fewer activities delivered to larger groups and more ‘engaging’ clients drawing disproportionate staff attention. There are additional potential risks associated with client mix (e.g. people with complex care needs sharing space with people with challenging behaviour). Families may view this option as not meeting individual client needs and minimising choice. This option also fails to promote market development, which again may be contrary to the Councils overall duties to promote market diversity and personalisation.

5.13. **Option 4** – Full outsourcing of the in-house service development through formal procurement or as a ‘mutual’. The advantages are continuity for service users and their families, the identification, or development of new, third sector partner(s) who could deliver the modernisation agenda for the Council, a high degree of control by existing staff over service design, delivery and efficiencies in staff costs over time. The disadvantages are the potential impact of TUPE on any efficiency savings. Also, during the consultation with staff in 13/14, the idea of a staff
mutual was discussed and there was little enthusiasm from the staff team for the idea and there has been no approach from the staff team subsequently. Service users and families are likely to express concerns that the service is not directly managed by the Council, and complex clients might not have their needs fully met by a non-Council provider in an undeveloped market.

5.14. There are additional commissioning challenges around developing a procurement exercise, including soft market testing, which may add additional delay in achieving efficiency savings, regardless of outsourcing to a partner or mutual. There is a mix of in-house, outsourced and mutual led organisations that provide day services for other councils in the South East. However, it is notable that Councils which previously outsourced to a single provider are now refining their current procurement programmes to include more providers.

5.15. **Option 5** - That the Council consolidates its directly delivered services to include only those people with complex needs (specifically the ISR, Dementia and CNS services) and its sheltered employment services. Older adults not part of the specialist Dementia services are supported to move to other older adult providers, and all other service users (except for a small number of current service users whose needs could be met by a commissioned drop in service) be allocated a personal budget and supported to design and purchase their services from other providers delivered in the Community hubs. As part of this proposal the ISR service currently located at the Leemore Centre would transfer to the Ladywell Centre. The specialist dementia is already located at Ladywell and the Challenging Needs Service (CNS) located at Mulberry would stay where they are as would the employment schemes.

5.16. The advantages are that the Council would retain management responsibility for its most complex clients, promote the potential for market development for a the wider group of adults, there would be increased flexibility of the choice and shape of offers for individuals and groups, it would not preclude personal budgets being made available to CNS, ISR and Dementia service users, there are readily available building based day services for older adults in the borough, minimises unused day service places of older adults in other contracts, the required level of savings could be achieved relatively quickly, it would support both a clearly identifiable ‘disability base’ while also supporting service presence across the day centres. The disadvantages are that service users and their families may prefer their service to be managed by the Council, there will be concerns about maintaining friendship groups, families may be concerned that a personal budget/ direct payment is another job for them to have to do, some service users will move to another service location, there would be some challenges in managing the logistics of a large simultaneous number of personalised services, and there would be a need to develop new shared space protocols with a potentially large variety of providers.
6. DETAILS OF THE RECOMMENDED OPTION

6.1. Officers recommend option five to the Council as it meets a number of strategic outcomes. It allows the council to retain its management responsibility for complex clients where the market is underdeveloped. It promotes the extension of personalisation and also the sustainability of local third sector providers in the local market through the application of direct payments/ personal budgets and support to service users to commission their services from community groups as well as service specific providers. It capitalises on the retention of a ‘disability specific’ centre while maintaining specific service provision at the three remaining centres. All of this supports an outward looking service which would be strengthened by the centres being opened up to an even wider range of community groups as part of the Culture and Community Service Team’s proposals (see section 8). The option overall builds in future flexibility to how the service and the buildings can operate, as different parts of the service offer can be changed differentially depending on individual preference. It also offers best value to the Council through the delivery of savings as set out in paragraph 6.5, the avoidance of any TUPE implications relating to outsourcing, the added value to service users from their direct payment being able to purchase more form the third sector than it can form the Council and the filling of contracted day service vacancies elsewhere in the borough.

6.2. The proposed retained services by the Council are:
   - services for people with complex physical and learning disabilities (the Intensive Support Resource or ISR)
   - services for people whose behaviour presents significant challenges (the Challenging Needs Service or CNS).
   - The specialist Dementia Service.
   - The in-house employment pathway services
     - The ‘Tuck Stop’ café at the Waldron Clinic.
     - The ‘Grow’ project
     - The Café/ shop at the Naborhood Centre (incorporating the existing Arts and Crafts design project).

This would not preclude service users requesting a personal budget to purchase a service from another provider: for example an ISR user could ask for their service to be delivered at the Calabash centre where there is currently a service managed by Lewisham Nexus.

6.3. For some (approximately 30) of the current day centre users, particularly but not exclusively those people with a learning disability, a ‘light touch’ support service would be sufficient to meet their needs. It is proposed therefore to commission a specific ‘drop in’ service which would operate out of Ladywell, enhancing its use as a disability specific service base and capitalising on its location near to Lewisham and close to transport links and leisure opportunities. This would not preclude an option of people choosing to meet up at the communal areas in community hubs. The
service will be specified in such a way that it is flexible enough to allow it to be purchased over time by others: people who have greater support needs and eligible for a personal budget/direct payment could opt into this service to be with their friends; people who may not meet eligibility for funded services could opt to pay for the service from their own resources.

6.4. The remaining service users (i.e. most of the people with a learning disability and most of the people with a physical disability/long term conditions) would be allocated a personal budget/direct payment and with the assistance of support planners, design the service that they would like to have and to commission that service from other providers. Where those people express a preference to continue to use their Council’s building assets (irrespective of the provider), their personal budget rate will be top sliced in recognition of a service in kind commensurate with the cost of a similar resource in another location.

6.5. Whilst some of the savings identified below could be delivered by other options, only the full level of savings is likely to be delivered with this option, in addition to avoiding the potential cost pressures of the other options such as TUPE. This option will deliver savings totalling £570K (plus reduction in 1:1 staffing previously required) in the following areas:

- £130K will be saved through a management restructure of the in-house service reflecting the reduced size of the directly managed provision.
- £40K will be saved through the consolidation of building based day care for older adults from the Ladywell Centre.
- £60K will be saved by consolidating users currently funded in other building based day services to the newly redesigned Dementia Unit which has allowed five additional places a day within the existing budget plus the cost of what were additional 1:1 staffing which is also no longer required.
- £65K will be saved through the development of a ‘drop-in’ facility will deliver a reduction in current cost of package reflecting the more independent needs of a group of current users.
- £275K will be delivered through top slicing the Personal Budget rate for people who plan for their services to be delivered in the centres.

7. PROPOSAL TO REDUCE THE USAGE OF DOOR2DOOR

Transport to day services

7.1. The past year has seen a more independence focussed approach to transport. In previous years, through the targeting of grant funding, the Council has increased volunteer driver schemes and expanded the Community Transport service. The social care assessment process has taken more account of what transport assets people already have available to them (e.g. mobility allowance, taxi cards, bus passes) and has also been more focussed on targeted travel training for adults with a learning disability. These developments, alongside the reduction in day centre attendance overall as discussed previously in this report, has
resulted in a year on year reduction in the use of Door2Door, the Council’s in-house transport provider. This service can no longer fully meet the transport needs of assessed eligible adults in terms of flexibility and availability.

7.2. The biggest challenge to rationalising transport routes is that approximately two thirds of the busses used by Social Care are shared with, and priority is given to, Education. Eleven routes out of 34 provided by Door2Door are dedicated to supporting Day Care service users and not shared. Those routes specifically service the learning disability centres at Leemore, Mulberry, and the Naborhood. These specific routes equate to a cost to Social Care of £675K annually. Table 6 below details the number of service users using the bus at the three centres, the buses being used and the approximate charge of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment</th>
<th>Number of buses</th>
<th>Service Users</th>
<th>Days Attending</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leemore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>£355K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>£178K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>£142K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Dedicated ASC Door2Door routes

7.3. These routes which are social care specific and used entirely for transport for people with a learning disability most easily lend themselves to a more flexible approach to transport which will further promote independence choice and control of location of service and how to get there. The link between transport routes and specific locations needs to be disestablished to deliver fully personalised day services.

7.4. Social care will retain specific routes for three client groups (i) people with challenging behaviour (CNS) and specifically the Mulberry mini bus, (ii) people with complex physical support needs (ISR) and (iii) people using the specialist dementia service. However, it is proposed that all other users with eligible needs for transport will be offered a personal budget allocation as a direct payment to maximise other more flexible and personalised ways to support arrival at day activities. This may represent a contribution to petrol costs, or be used to fund travel buddies or fund the cost of taxis, either individual or shared. The Council will make its Framework list available to eligible users. The Framework lists a number of transport companies approved by the Council and ensures important standards such as DBS checks are in place.

7.5. The use of Door2Door for transport for shared routes, and therefore transport for older adults generally, is unlikely to be affected by this proposal, although there may be an increased number of people on some routes should the proposal for older adults to move from Ladywell to other day service provision be agreed.
7.6. While some of the busses are leased on a short term basis, there are a number of busses that are owned by the Council. The Council may need to sell the lease on to other organisations pending the end of the lease period. The proposals may also have redundancy implications for drivers and escorts.

7.7. The proposal to shift to direct payments for transport may raise concerns for some families who may view having to organise transport as an additional task they need to be responsible for. Also, Door2Door is viewed as a reliable transport offer. However, a number of families already successfully use alternative transport arrangements and therefore it is expected that while there may be some transitional issues, concerns will settle over time.

Transport to Evening Clubs

7.8. The Council has historically funded transport to evening clubs, primarily the Lewisham Mencap Monday, Tuesday and Thursday clubs and also to SEALS, a swim club for people with a physical disability. These are not services commissioned to meet eligible social care needs and funding such transport is discretionary. The transport to the clubs is funded by overtime payments to Door2Door drivers and escorts on three bus routes each evening from the social care budget which is neither appropriate nor sustainable.

7.9. The Council recognises the value of the clubs to the people who attend them both for their social value to people with a learning disability themselves and their respite value to families. Healthier Communities Select Committee expressed a ‘consensus of concern’ regarding impact of this loss of amenity on the future of the clubs in the longer term. At their 14 January 2015 meeting they asked that officers work with Lewisham Mencap, as the main evening clubs for whom this transport is used, to identify other sources of funding including consideration of other budgets within the Council. The proposals in that paper to Healthier Communities Select Committee have been slightly amended to reflect this request.

7.10. Eighty two named individuals use the transport to the Lewisham Mencap Gateway clubs. All but 4 of the 82 people who use the transport also receive other significant packages of social care support. Thirty-two of the 82 live in 24 hour supported services and could be supported by those service providers to make alternative arrangements for transport. Providers already assist service users in pooling their money for other purposes. Forty six receive day care support. Of the remaining 4, one of them is placed in residential care in Lewisham by another borough. 30 of 82 use the transport to attend more than one club a week. Take up of the SEALS transport is a maximum of three people and sometimes none although the Council still has to meet the overtime costs.

7.11. Who accesses the transport is historical and inequitably linked to people who have attended day centres. By definition there is no
assessment for the transport as it is not a social care service. Not everyone who attends the clubs is reliant on this transport to get there. If the Council were to identifying ongoing funding to support the clubs, paying overtime to Door2Door might not be the most efficient way to do so. The following paragraphs set out some options for the future of the evening club transport.

7.12. **Option 1** – Continue to fund the transport as is. The advantage is that it would be popular with Lewisham Mencap and with families. The disadvantage is that this will continue to cost the Council £84k plus, in a difficult financial climate, the money is spent on a group of people who are mainly already in receipt of a significant package of care to meet their assessed social care needs.

7.13. **Option 2** – Stop funding transport entirely. The advantage is a direct saving for the Council. The disadvantage is that this may have a more disproportionate effect on some people and their families than others, and Mencap have stated at Healthier Communities Select Committee that the clubs would close.

7.14. **Option 3** – Attendees could pay Door2Door directly for the cost of this service. The advantages are that 'specialist' transport with escort would continue to be available. Disadvantages are that though the Council has Public Carriage Vehicle (PCV) licences no organisation external to the Council is allowed to hire them. Also, it is unlikely that individuals would be able to afford the related costs or commit consistently to meeting the cost of transport and some people might not want to pay for transport to the clubs.

7.15. **Option 4** – Attendees can pay Community Transport Services for transport to the clubs. The advantage is that this is likely to be more affordable for people. The disadvantage is that people might not want to pay for transport to the clubs, and people might not see it as a reliable service. Also, while this is feasible in theory, Community Transport may not be able to provide the service 3 evenings a week.

7.16. **Option 5** – Stop the provision of transport for people living in 24 hour funded services and liaise with providers to develop an alternative offer. Develop transitional transport arrangements for attendees either living at home with their families or living independently depending on their circumstance. The advantages are that people who may otherwise be isolated can continue to attend at least one club, the preventive role of the club is maintained and people are not caused significant detriment to their health and well-being. The disadvantages are that it will take time to transition from Door2Door to alternative services, the full saving will not be made in year..

7.17. **Option 6** – that Door2Door offer transport during the winter, but not summer, months. The advantage is that people would not have to travel in the dark. The disadvantage is that the Council will continue to provide a
non-statutory service for the foreseeable future, people may not attend
during the summer months.

7.18. **Option 7** – Officers to work with Lewisham Mencap to identify other
ways to fund the transport to the clubs. This could include the use of
discretionary Council grants. The advantages and disadvantages are as
set out in Option 1 above.

**Details of the recommended option**

7.19. Officers recommend option 5. This option reflects that transport to
evening clubs is not a statutory service and is not reflected in people’s
care plan as meeting an eligible need as these are being met through
other packages of care and support. There may be some families for
whom the transport service is indirectly serving as a break from providing
care and support. Also, there may be some individuals who do not
generally meet the Council’s eligibility criteria for any service, but for
whom the clubs offer the opportunity for social engagement. Some
transitional support would be put in place to manage the impact of this,
and the three people who receive no service could be assessed as to
whether this change would cause significant detriment and, if they met the
social care threshold for transport, could be considered for a direct
payment. While this approach would not deliver the maximum saving in
the first instance it would support people’s general health and wellbeing,
and therefore may help prevent pressure on the social care budget in the
future.

7.20. Option 4 also deserves further consideration in partnership with
Lewisham Mencap. Option 4 could be considered a sub component of
option 7, which officers have been required to consider, which is a more
general approach to funding transport through the identification of other
sources.

7.21. The savings that will be achieved by changing how Door2Door is used
is estimated to save a total of £300K in two ways:

1. Assessing service users attending Mulberry Lifestyles, Leemore
   Lifestyles and the Naborhood with a view to offering them a direct
   payment to organise their own transport £260K.

2. Evening Clubs £84K, though this might be reduced in the first
   instance to £60K to allow mitigation of £24K transitional funding in
   2015/16.

7.22. Officers will continue to work with colleagues in the Children and
Young People Directorate to assess wider opportunities for further
transport savings on shared routes.

**8. COMMUNITY HUBS, NOT DAY CENTRES**

8.1. Paragraphs 4.1 – 4.3 reported that the current day centres, particularly
the three learning disability centres, are underutilised. Should the
recommended option (section 6) for the remodelling of direct service delivery be agreed, consolidating the older adult offer along with the falling demand for funded day services for people with physical disabilities/long term conditions will also result in an underutilisation of Ladywell. While this might signpost that a number of the centres should be closed, it is already clear that this would not best serve the social care agenda, and would be particularly unpopular with the families of adults with a learning disability. However, the space that will be available with in the current day centres presents an opportunity to consider how the buildings could be best used, to deliver wider strategic outcomes for the Council overall.

8.2. The Culture and Community Development Team’s review of grant aided organisations and their assets, has allowed consideration of a potential opportunity to maintain a borough wide service presence while also supporting the service to be part of a more integrated outward focused approach to service delivery. That is to say, there is potential for synergy between the day service / centres and the wider third sector which would allow a main centre to be identified for people with disabilities while also maintaining a presence in the other three centres. Working together, adult social care and the Culture and Community Team could combine their visions and re-designate three centres as community hubs managed by a consortium of voluntary organisations for use by organisations, thereby delivering part of the pathway for delivering the Council’s macro (and social care’s micro) vision for inclusive citizenship and the development of social capital.

8.3. Mayor and Cabinet (12 November 2014) have been previously advised of the development and savings proposals relating to the Culture and Community Development Team’s process of rationalising its public buildings and proposal to develop the assets as Community Centres. There are currently 41 council assets within the community premises portfolio including 23 community centres, 3 sports grounds and 15 buildings housing Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) organisations. In addition there are other properties used by VCS organisations that are not part of the community premises portfolio. These neighbourhood based facilities will be predominantly geared to providing services at a neighbourhood level with equitable support arrangements across the portfolio.

8.4. It is recommended that three of the four day centres, Leemore, Naborhood and Mulberry be included as part of these wider considerations to support the best possible outcomes for the Community Services grant and asset programme. Along with the Calabash Centre, these three centres would be considered part of the Community Services Assets portfolio and thus no charges/rental would be required from those third sector organisations to offset the savings in the Main Grants Programme or delivery of capital receipts as a result of the grants and asset review. The Culture and Community Development Team are consulting on the principles of their proposals with organisations now,
reporting to Mayor and Cabinet in March 2015 and a final paper in May. Their activity represents a parallel time line for decision making for the proposals contained in this paper (12.5).

8.5. A defined presence for use for social care would be established as part of this wider offer. Such an offer would facilitate the pooling of personal budgets and widen the choice of service locations. These community hubs would be in addition to the use of general public spaces by service users e.g. as a meeting place before going onto other activities.

8.6. The Mulberry, Leemore and Naborhood centres all have ‘Changing Places’ standard personal care facilities. Their development as community hubs would also include those facilities being made available to all people with disabilities who need access to specialist personal care facilities, using a radar key or similar. This will have many benefits to people eligible for social care services, but will also benefit those without and support the Council’s wider prevention agenda. The absence of good personal care facilities are a limiting factor for many people to any wider access to everyday opportunities such as shops, libraries, restaurants and leisure facilities. Additionally, facilities would be available to disabled children as well as adults.

8.7. Savings and efficiencies that may be delivered by the Culture and Community Development Team proposals are not included here.

9.1. The proposals outlined in this paper will affect a number of Council employees who work in the Council’s directly managed day services and the Door2Door transport service.

9.2. Should these proposals be agreed there is potential for redundancy at both management and front line level both in the day service and in Door2Door. The day service currently operates using a high number of agency staff, therefore redundancy of front line staff is likely to be minimal as substantive staff could be deployed into those posts. The transport service also uses some agency drivers and escorts which will also minimises potential redundancy.

9.3. The proposals do not recommend an outsourcing of the service and much of the reconfiguration is unlikely to reflect a continuation of the same service. However, there is also a possibility that TUPE may apply to relevant Council employees.

9.4. Therefore appropriate consultation with staff and their trades unions will take place in line with the Council’s Management of Change policy and the Council’s TUPE transfer guidance and statutory requirements.

10. OTHER RELATED SAVINGS
10.1. The Care Act requires the Council’s assessment of need to be focused on a person’s identified outcomes across a wide range of functions rather than on providing a traditional service delivery model. There is also an emphasis on prevention and early intervention and helping people to remain within their communities; and be actively supported by them.

10.2. The Council envisions a key role for prevention and early intervention across all client groups is best played by Community Connections.

10.3. The Community Opportunity Services (COS) delivered by SLaM to support people with mental health issues has been reconfigured in order to provide better value for money and work in conjunction with Community Connections. It now focuses on prevention and recovery, and in particular the impact of the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) services on helping people remain in work and maintaining recovery through structured lives and routines. This budget is delivering £200K of savings towards the overall day care savings target.

10.4. Access to support is through professional assessment of need, guided by nationally set eligibility criteria. Local Authorities can take their own resources into account when determining how those assessed needs should be met and may use the most cost effective solutions available. In some situations the assessment will be the only service that is provided directly by the Council, particularly when care and support needs do not reach the eligibility criteria or when needs can be met by opportunities available from within the community or from the person’s network of support and their own resources. The new social care support planning service will be well placed to help people to define the outcomes which will meet their needs, and how their personal assets and available social capital can be combined to deliver them.

10.5. This approach is expected to reduce the overall number of days support and activity that the Council will need to fund directly. Care will be taken to ensure that these different ways of meeting need do not destabilise any individual’s ability to manage at home, and that families are not overwhelmed by their caring duties, thus escalating need from day services into residential care. Attention will be given in particular to ensuring that no one person loses all of their existing service offer thus maintaining some consistency for them and their family. The “community based” approach to meeting needs is not about cutting services from a specific group of people, but redefining how those needs are met without necessarily requiring specific funding from the Council, and viewing an individual as part of the community first.

10.6. This approach is estimated to deliver £200K in savings representing an equivalent reduction in existing Council funded or directly delivered day services of between 77 and 96 days a week dependent on the cost of the current service.
11. OTHER POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES

11.1. This paper makes a series of recommendations for the redesign of directly managed day services and transport which also deliver savings and efficiencies to the Council. The recommendations reflect a number of key outcomes in the ongoing programme of day service developments to promote personalisation and the take up of direct payments/individual budgets, while also identifying an effective role for the Council as a direct service provider and making best use of the existing day centres in partnership with other parts of the Community Services Directorate. However, the specific recommendations in this paper are not exhaustive and there are a number of other options and opportunities that officers will continue to explore in line with the strategic direction of travel and with potential to deliver further savings or income for the Council.

11.2. Public Health – There are a number of public health programmes, such as 'Healthy Eating' where identification of venue e.g. a kitchen in one of the day centres, may deliver a saving to the public health budget or represent potential income.

11.3. The Ladywell, Leemore, Mulberry and Naborhood Centre Kitchens – The way that meals are provided has already changed at the Learning disability day centres. The kitchens at the Leemore, Mulberry and Naborhood centres will be mainly surplus to requirements. There is a remaining requirement for a meals service for the Dementia unit in Ladywell. However, all kitchens could be made available to colleges or other training or supported employment providers to generate income or avoid cost. The service priority to identify an operating partner for would be the Ladywell Kitchen.

11.4. The Ladywell Gym – Savings in the youth service will potentially result in reduced use of the gym located at the Ladywell Centre. The Culture and Community Development Team will explore the potential to identify a sports organisation who can run the gym as a social enterprise or community interest company. This will ensure its ongoing availability for use by local people. This could represent a potential income source and/or could support public health or other wellbeing agendas for both children and adults.

11.5. Extra Care Services – The Council is developing a number of Extra Care services as part of its “Housing Matters” programme and the older person’s housing strategy. The developments are explicitly addressing an avoidance and prevention agenda as part of which service specifications require the development of inclusive day time offers in the schemes public spaces, including the meals offer. The first of three new schemes at Conrad Court in Deptford has recently opened and will be shortly offering access for exercise classes and ‘spa’ type activities, as well as the restaurant facilities to the wider older adult population. The contracts for the second of these schemes, Campshill in Lewisham, has been awarded for delivery in late 2016 and a third service is in development in...
partnership with Phoenix Housing in Bellingham for delivery in early 2016. These schemes collectively will give scope for managing cost pressures on day service budgets for older adults.

12. TIMESCALES AND NEXT STEPS

12.1. The proposals outlined in this paper represent in some parts a significant variation to how the Council delivers its day care and associated transport services. Should Mayor and Cabinet agree that officers may proceed to consult on the proposals, some will require a formal 3 months formal consultation process.

12.2. The recommended change to funding transport for the evening clubs does not require formal consultation as it does not represent change to statutory services or services which are part of a person’s care plan. However, officers will engage with affected users and families reflecting best practice. Healthier Communities Select Committee has also asked that officers work with Lewisham Mencap to explore the potential for other sources of funding and transport offers outside of the adult social care budget.

12.3. Officers recognise the complexity of the detail of the options set out in this paper. In recognition of this, offers have, prior to the presentation of this report to Mayor and cabinet, held a series of information/ briefing session with service users and families: a meeting with the LD Service User Forum, and two meetings for the families of people who use the LD service on the 28th January; a meeting with the users and families at the Ladywell Centre on 30th January, a discussion with the pensioners forum on the 21st January, and a Lewisham Mencap UNICUP meeting on the 4th February. There has also been a number of additional small briefing meetings with service users.

12.4. There have also been informal staff briefings regarding the proposals in this paper and these will continue through the period of formal consultation with service users and families. Formal staff consultation will not take place pending any decision that Mayor and Cabinet may take following the formal consultation period. Staff consultation will require a further 28 days.

12.5. The changes to the evening club transport will be consulted on separately from the consultation regarding changes to the day service and associated transport.

12.6. Officers will work closely with third sector partners in this work, such as Lewisham Mencap, Lewisham Speaking Up, Community Connections, Voluntary Action Lewisham, and the Lewisham Disability Coalition among others, as well as recognised service providers such as Headway, Hestia, Housing 21, PLUS, Nexus, Aurora Options, Three Cs, Entelechy, Heart’n’Soul and so on.
12.7. The following is an outline timetable for the main consultation and decision making process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Cabinet</td>
<td>11 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Scrutiny</td>
<td>17 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation start</td>
<td>18 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation end</td>
<td>18 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor &amp; Cabinet</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Scrutiny</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Consultation start</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Consultation ends</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full implementation of changes</td>
<td>1 October 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1. The 2015/16 savings proposals considered by Mayor and Cabinet on 12th November 2014 included £1.3m from day care and associated transport. This report describes how this saving will be delivered in a full year.

13.2. The current budget for the day care service is summarised in table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Care Type</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house budgets for care</td>
<td>£3,421,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased day care</td>
<td>£803,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health (COS)</td>
<td>£729,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,954,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport budgets</td>
<td>£2,443,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7,397,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 – Overall cost of day service and transport

13.3. The savings proposals described in the body of the report are summarised in table 8 below. Savings from 1:1 arrangements have not yet been quantified but are expected to exceed the £30K required to fully achieve the £1.3m savings sought.
Table 8 – Day service savings proposals summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Saving £K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconfiguration of in house provision</td>
<td>230 + 1:1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access and service redesign</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Mental Health day service</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in days of service delivered</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in use of Door2Door</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,270 + 1:1 costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.4. These costs exclude capital costs for redesign of the building for communal use (e.g. IT costs, key coded doors, remedial building works).

13.5. The paper highlights that there may be costs relating to redundancy or potential for TUPE transfer of existing members of staff. However, the full implication of this will not be known until the conclusion of the formal staff consultation period and the Council’s DR/VR process. No estimate is included in the costs in table 2 above.

13.6. The needs for service user consultation followed by staff consultation means that implementation by April 2015 will not be possible and therefore a full year saving will not be achieved in 2015/16. Current estimates are that a part year saving of £953K will be delivered in 2015/16 and the residual £317K of saving relating to this programme being delivered into 2016/17.

13.7. A separate report considers options for alternative uses of the four buildings currently used by the in-house day care service.

14. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

14.1. The main legal implications are contained in the body of the report.

14.2. The National Assistance Act 1948 places both duties and powers upon local authorities to assess the needs of, and provide services to support such needs including residential accommodation, to people aged 18 years and over who because of their disability are in need of care and attention not otherwise available to them. In changing or altering services provided under Social Care legislation each individual’s needs for services must be individually reassessed before changing the service or manner of delivery. In addition, in making proposals for service changes overall, there must be proper and meaningful consultation with service users, their families and any stakeholders, to enable and facilitate clear understanding of the proposals and enable stakeholders to express their views effectively.

14.3. In the event that Mayor and Cabinet agree the proposals relating to day services and transport changes, there is the possibility of redundancies and the application of TUPE for relevant council employees. Appropriate consultation with staff and their trade unions will take place in line with the Council’s TUPE guidance, redundancy policy and statutory requirements.
14.4. The Equalities Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. In summary the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regards to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited under 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.

14.5. The duty continues to be a “has regard” duty, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor to decide, 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.

14.6. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has issued “Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty” and statutory guidance the “Equality Act 2010: Services and 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 in particular 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 www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal_and_policy/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/

14.7. The EHRC has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the 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

14.8. The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duty 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:
15. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

15.1. An Equalities Analysis Assessment (EAA) has been completed for these proposals.

15.2. It suggests that:
   • Across all services included in this paper and given the nature of the services being delivered, people with learning and physical disabilities as well as people with mental health issues will be negatively impacted by the specific nature of the services subject to these proposals.
   • Broadly, no ethnic group will be disproportionately affected by the proposals, though some specific services have slightly more impact than others.
   • In terms of age the majority of services are for younger adults under 65, which will mean they will be disproportionately affected by the proposals compared to other social care services.
   • There are proportionately more males in day care settings which will be affected by these proposals than women when compared to the population of day services users across Social Care.
   • There is only a limited amount of data available for carers. Across Day Services only a small percentage carers have a long term health condition or disability; thought at the Neighborhood 35% of family or carers have a health condition. Approximately a third of parents or carers are working and a third is over the age of 65.

15.3. The impact across all protected characteristics affected by these proposals will be low as the services being provided will be delivered differently rather than being removed. Additional services will be developed in conjunction with the Voluntary and Community Sector in order to provide a broader range of services than that currently available.

15.4. The EAA for Transport suggests that:
   • Service users of the age of 65 are more likely to be affected by the proposals than younger adults attending Day Services.
   • Women will be disproportionately affected, but the numbers are broadly similar to the percentage of women receiving support from social care.
   • Though there are more white people receiving transport to Day Services the numbers are comparable to those in Social Care.

15.5. All services users will be negatively impacted by the proposed changes to transport to Day Services, though alternative arrangements have been developed in partnership with Voluntary and Community Sector organisations which will mitigate this impact. In addition service users will be provided the opportunity to organise their own transport as part of the
Personal Budget/Direct Payment, meaning that transport will still be provided for.

16. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

16.1. There are no specific environmental implications arising from this report.
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. This report updates the Mayor on the work of the Lewisham future programme and revenue budget savings proposals that, if taken, will support the separate budget report for Mayor & Cabinet in February 2015. The funding position remains that, the Council faces an £85m budget gap over the three years to 2017/18 with an estimated £39m gap for 2015/16.

1.2. The report follows on from the savings report taken by Mayor & Cabinet in November 2014. The status of the savings proposed are set out in section 7. In particular, the results of the consultations and further work that was agreed by the Mayor in November on the savings to return to Mayor & Cabinet (£26.4m, of which £18.5m is for 2015/16) and bringing forward two new proposals L3 and L4 (£0.4m for 2015/16). A summary of the proposals are presented in section 8 of the report, with the supporting details for individual proposals in the Appendices.

1.3. The Council is now in the fifth year of an eight year long period of resource reduction. 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.

1.4. This report continues the work of the Lewisham future programme board 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.

1.5. The report then sets out the necessary financial, human resources, legal and equalities implications that are required to be considered in respect of these proposals (sections 9, 10, 11 and 12), supplemented by further details for individual proposals in the appendices.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

2.1. To update Mayor & Cabinet on the further work and results of consultations in respect of the revenue budget savings proposals presented to Mayor & Cabinet on
the 12 November 2014. And ask that these are now agreed to enable a balanced budget for 2015/16 to be put forward to Council in February 2015.

3. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 It is recommended that, subject to proper process and consultation where appropriate and if required, the Mayor:

3.1.1 note the decision at Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 to endorse previously agreed savings of £1.480m for 2015/16;

3.1.2 note the decision at Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 to delegate to officers, subject to proper and consultation where appropriate, the implementation of £11.833m of savings, of which £8.558m are for 2015/16;

3.1.3 consider the comments of the Public Accounts Select Committee of the 5 February 2015, which incorporates the views of the respective select committees;

3.1.4 agree the following savings:

- A1: Adult Care cost effective care packages £2,680k – App 2
- A2: Learning Disability care packages £1,500k – App 3
- A3: Reconfiguring sensory services provision £150k – App 4
- A4: Remodelling building based day services £1,300k – App 5
- A6: Public Health part I £1,500k – App 6
- A8: Public Health part II £1,154k – App 6
- A9: Review of services to support people to live at home £250k – App 7
- B1: Reduction and remodelling of supporting people support £2,523 – App 8
- E1: Reorganisation of Regeneration and Asset Management £600k – App 9
- G1: Charging a fee for administering the Blue Badge scheme £24k – App 10
- H1: Restructuring of enforcement and regulatory services £800k – App 11
- K2: YOS reorganisation, intervention changes, contract reduction £200k – App12
- L1: Review of main voluntary & community grants programme £1,500k – App 13
- L3: Community Services development £240k – App 14
- L4: Broadway theatre £180k – App 15
- N1: Reduction in maintenance of some parts, highways & mngt. £340k – App 16
- N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequency & mngt. Costs £400k – App 17
- O1: End of discretionary freedom pass scheme £200k – App 18
- Q1: Improve triage for Childrens’ social care services and re-design Children Centre early intervention offer £5,515k (£3,208 CYP budget and £2,307 LFP saving) – App 19
- Q2: Reduction in Youth Service provision option 1 £1,406 – App 20
4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Executive summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose of the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Structure of the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lewisham Policy Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lewisham Future Programme: Process, Principles and Timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Savings proposals by thematic review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Financial implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Legal implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Equalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Background documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. BACKGROUND

5.1. This savings report builds on that published in September 2014 for scrutiny and presented to Mayor and Cabinet on the 12 November 2014. The context set out by the Chief Executive and summary of how the Lewisham Future Programme approached the challenge of preparing savings proposals for the period 2015/16 to 2017/18 was presented in the 12 November 2014 report.

5.2. This report concentrates on the decisions of the 12 November Mayor & Cabinet and progresses the savings proposals to align with the budget report. The budget report will be presented to Mayor & Cabinet and full Council in February 2015. The decisions from the 12 November 2014 meeting were:

- to endorse savings proposals for 2015/16 agreed in previous years;
- following due process in relation to certain identified proposals to delegate decision making to officers; and
- in respect of all other proposals require officers to bring a full report on the savings proposals back to Mayor & Cabinet for decision no later than 11 February 2015.

5.3. The report presents the results of the work undertaken since the 12 November on all those proposals returning as requested to the Mayor & Cabinet. In addition, two new proposals in the Community and Culture area (L3 and L4) and an overall summary on the equalities impact of the savings presented (delegated and returning to Mayor & Cabinet) for 2015/16 are presented in this report.

6. LOCAL POLICY CONTEXT

6.1. The Council’s strategy and priorities drive the revenue budget savings process, with changes in resource allocation determined in accordance with policies and priorities. *Shaping our future* is Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy. It covers the period for 2008 to 2020 and sets out a vision for Lewisham and the priority outcomes that organisations, communities and individuals can work towards to make this vision a reality. The key priorities are set out at Appendix 1B for reference.
6.2. We have embarked 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.

6.3. In taking forward the Council’s Budget Strategy, in engaging our residents, service users and employees, and in deciding on the future shape, scale and quality of services, we will be driven by the Council’s four core values:

- We put service to the public first.
- We respect all people and all communities.
- We invest in employees.
- We are open, honest and fair in all we do.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Savings required</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£m</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. For consistency, the referencing and structure for presenting the savings proposals in this report follows that introduced in the 12 November 2014 Mayor & Cabinet report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LFP Area</th>
<th>Lewisham future programme work strand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Smarter &amp; deeper integration of social care &amp; health (incl. Public Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Supporting people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sharing services (incl. third party spend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Efficiency review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Asset rationalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.4. 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.

7.5. 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/delegated, 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.

7.6. The detail of the savings proposals are then provided in the appendices, including any specific legal implications and supporting appendices such as full reports with consultation papers and equalities analysis to enable Members to make decisions.

8. SAVING PROPOSALS BY THEMATIC REVIEW

8.1. To assist the reader with the navigation of the savings information in this report it is structured as follows:

- Summary of savings by value and work strand shown by their current status (previously agreed, delegated, returning to M&C, and new) in section 8;
- Overview of the individual savings by work strand (A to R), including short description, value, consultation required (staff, public), and reference to appendix with supporting details, in section 8;
• Navigation table of individual proposals and their current status identifying where further information is provided in the report, in Appendix 1A; and
• The savings proforma presented in November 2014 and additional supporting papers for each savings proposal returning to M&C, individual appendices.

8.2. 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/delegated, proposed and expected) and proposals for the future years 16/17 and 17/18.

Table 3: Summary of savings (agreed, delegated, proposed) to 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LFP Area</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,909</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>39,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Agreed</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated by M&amp;C Nov 14</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>11,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C Feb 15</td>
<td>18,451</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>26,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New M&amp;C Proposals</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously agreed</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated by M&amp;C Nov 14</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>11,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>2,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C Feb 15</td>
<td>18,451</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>26,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3. 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.

8.4. 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

8.5. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals - A</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,659</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6. 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 Local Government Association’s - Towards Excellence in Adult Social Care tool) savings proposals for 2015/16 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.

8.7. 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.

8.8. 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.

8.9. 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.

8.10. 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 was provided in the November papers.

**Summary of proposed savings**

8.11. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £'000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 2</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 3</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfiguring sensory services provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C - App 5</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remodelling building based day services and associated transport costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Charging for Adult Social Care Services.</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 6</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health programme review (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Supporting People

#### 8.12. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals - B</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed now</strong></td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Select Committee**

Healthier Communities

8.13. 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.

8.14. 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 was provided in the November papers.

**Summary of proposed savings**

8.15. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td><strong>Returning to M&amp;C – App 8</strong> Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity, reductions in service capacity, service closures, a review of mental health services across the**</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

---
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £'000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

C. Shared Service

8.16. Overview

Proposals - C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed now</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee: Public Accounts

8.17. 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.

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

D. Efficiency Review

8.19. Overview

Proposals - D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed now</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee: Public Accounts

8.20. 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.

8.21. There are no further specific saving proposals at this time.
E. Asset Rationalisation

8.22. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals – E</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>2,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed now</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>2,701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee Sustainable Development

8.23. 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 9 Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration &amp; Asset Management Division.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Efficiencies in the current facilities management contracts and optimising the current operational estate (reduction in the quantum of office accommodation).</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>New ways in generating income from assets.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Energy efficiency measures</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub total – for February 2015 M&C** | 309 | 760 | 985 |
**Total** | 909 | 760 | 985 |

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

8.25. 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 may only be delivered by 2021, beyond the timeframe for the Lewisham future programme.
8.26. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals - F</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee: Public Accounts

8.27. 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

8.28. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Establishment of a centrally located, corporate business support service which combines a general support function with specialist service hubs.</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

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

G. Income Generation

8.30. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals - G</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee: Public Accounts

8.31. 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

8.32. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.
### Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | SI | PC
---|---|---|---|---
| 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | |
| G1a | Reviewing charges to our School Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and reviewing the council’s current investment strategy. | 450 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| G1b | Improving debt collection. | 500 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| G1c | Returning to M&C – App 10 Changes to our fees and charges structures. | 24 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| **Sub total – for February 2015 M&C** | **950** | **0** | **0** | |
| **Total** | **974** | **0** | **0** | |

**Key:**
- SI - Staff Implications
- PC - Public Consultation Required

8.33. The required consultation report for the blue badge element of this proposal was put on hold by Mayor & Cabinet in November, to be revisited in February 2015.

8.34. 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

8.35. **Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals - H</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed now</strong></td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Select Committee** - Safer Stronger Communities

8.36. 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**

8.37. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

8.38. Appendix 5 provides further details on this saving proposal.
### I. Management and corporate overheads

8.39. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

8.40. 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J. School Effectiveness

8.42. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

Select Committee
Children and Young People
8.43. 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

8.44. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £'000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

K. Crime Reduction

8.45. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals – K</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed now</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee
Safer Stronger Communities

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

Summary of proposed savings

8.47. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £'000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>The Prevention and Inclusion service will be tendering a number of services to increase efficiencies while reducing and targeting provision such as residential rehabilitation.</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td><strong>Returning to M&amp;C – App 12</strong> Restructure of YOS service and changes in interventions and</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.48. This work strand had anticipated bringing forward a further £350k of savings proposals for 2015/16. However, these have not been identified at this time. Work continues on this strand and will for part of the Lewisham future programme work in 2015/16.

L. Culture and Community Services

8.49. Overview

8.50. 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 main 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.

8.51. There are two new proposals here for £420k, L3 and L4, in respect of some development budgets and the theatre respectively.

Summary of proposed savings

8.52. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 13</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of VCS grants programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Libraries staff reorganisation.</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 14</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in number of development budgets and an increase in income from Glass Mill car park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 15</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the operating period within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ref | Description | Amount £’000 | SI | PC
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | | |
| | the Broadway Theatre | | | | | | |
| Sub total – for February 2015 M&C | 1,545 | 375 | 0 | |
| Total | 1,825 | 375 | 0 | |

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

8.53. Further work has lead to two new savings proposals of at £420k for 2015/16. This work relates to the budgets for Arts and Sports Development, Leisure, Theatre and the Local Assemblies. The detailed savings are presented at Appendices 14 and 15.

M. Housing Strategy and non-HRA funded services

8.54. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals – M</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee: Housing

8.55. 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

8.56. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Transfer of non-housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

N. Environmental Services

8.57. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals – N</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.58. 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

8.59. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 16 Green scene</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 17 Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

O. Public Services

8.60. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals – O</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed now</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee  
Public Accounts

8.61. 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

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

8.63. Further information on the discretionary freedom pass proposal is attached at Appendix 18. The consultation was put on hold by Mayor & Cabinet in November, to be revisited in February 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 18 End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Review Parking Contract Client Team.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total – for February 2015 M&C  200  0  0

Total  650  200  0

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

P. Planning and Economic Development

8.64. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals – P</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee Sustainable Development

8.65. 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

8.66. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Restructure of planning service and Cutting funding for legal locum to deal with s106 agreements that is no longer required</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total – for February 2015 M&C | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total | 229 | 0 | 0 |

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

Q. Early Intervention and Safeguarding

8.67. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals – Q</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree/delegated to officers</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>5,587</td>
<td>-3,208</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Committee | Children and Young People

8.68. This strand of work is in two parts:

i) Early intervention and safeguarding

8.69. 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.

8.70. 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

8.71. This strand proposes savings of £1.46m 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. Originally two possible options for the service were proposed. However in November 2012 the Mayor decided to proceed only with Option 1, rejecting Option 2.

8.72. Option 1 is to proceed with considering 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 service will report back to Mayor & Cabinet on the possibility and risks (governance, finance, service etc.) associated with proceeding with a mutual prior to committing to this or any other structural option. The proposal sets 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.

8.73. 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

8.74. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals put forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 19</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>-3,208</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These proposals involve a realignment 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C – App 20</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Youth Services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total – for February 2015 M&amp;C</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
SI - Staff Implications
PC - Public Consultation Required

8.75. 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.
8.76. The required reports for both the Q1 and Q2 proposals are attached at Appendix 19 and 20 respectively.

R. Customer Service Transformation

8.77. Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals - R</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed/delegated to officers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.78. 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

8.79. 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.

8.80. 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 direct financial implications from the level of savings agreed in terms of the ability to agree a balanced budget for 2015/16.

9.2. Any savings not agreed or for which only a part year effect can be achieved following completion of due process and the decision to implement will require other resources to be used to balance the budget. This risk is considered in the separate budget report for February 2015.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

In Year Budget Savings 2015/2016 & 2016/2017 & 2017/2018

10.1. There are 25 budget proposals for the financial years 2015/2016 and 2016/17 and 2017/2018 that are likely to have HR implications. All of these have HR implications for 2015/2016. Until detailed restructuring proposals have been finalised, it is not possible to specify exactly how many redundancies there might be. It is estimated that in the areas identified there are 1,133 staff employed, and there could potentially be up to 289 staff in a redundancy situation based on the level of financial savings identified.
10.2. However, this is based on an average salary estimate and the number of potential redundancies is likely to be much nearer 200 based on early assessment of restructuring current proposals.

**Breakdown of staff in affected areas by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>46.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>53.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3. There are more women employed in the areas identified in the budget proposals, this is slightly lower than the percentage of those employed in all Council areas (i.e. 61.5%). The budget proposals do not appear to disproportionately impact on women at this stage. This will continue to be carefully monitored as the final proposals are drawn up.

**Breakdown of staff in affected area by Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>33.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>58.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4. The breakdown of staff in the affected arrears shows a slightly lower percentage of BME staff in areas impacted by the budget proposals, than employed in the Council i.e. 37.19%. The budget proposals do not appear to disproportionately adversely impact on BME staff at this stage. This will continue to be carefully monitored as the final proposals are drawn up.

**Breakdown of staff in affected area with disabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>97.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5. The impact of the proposals for disabled staff appears proportionate at this stage but will continue to be monitored as more detailed proposals are drawn up.

10.6. Where agency workers are on placement in affected areas these arrangements will be terminated if the work they are doing would provide suitable alternative employment for displaced staff. These figures will continue to be refined as greater detail emerges from consultation documents.

10.7. Consultation with affected staff and the Trade Unions will take place on proposals with staffing implications in accordance with the Council’s Management of Change Policy.
10.8. Significant numbers of staff are likely to be affected by these proposals and the Council will continue to offer support and advice to those staff placed in a redundancy situation. This will be delivered by working with partners agencies and will include financial advice, CV writing, interview skills, setting up your own business and career change advice. The Council completed a Voluntary Severance round in January 2015. This has resulted in over 100 staff leaving the Council, thereby mitigating the need for compulsory redundancies in some cases where service reorganisations are underway or likely.

10.9. Where proposals result in a change in the way that services are delivered, managers will be looking at how staff can be supported as part of the post implementation process. Advanced notification of redundancies has been sent to The Insolvency Agency who also have a statutory requirement to assist employees facing redundancy.

11. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Savings proposals - General Legal Implications**

**Statutory duties**

11.1. 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**

11.2. 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**

11.3. Depending on the number of any redundancies, the Council would have to comply with the requirements for collective consultation under Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992. This consultation is in addition to consultation with individuals affected by redundancy and/or reorganisation under the Council’s own employment procedures.
Equalities

11.4. 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.

11.5. 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.

11.6. 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.

11.7. 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/

11.8. 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

11.9. 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/
11.10. The EHRC has also issued Guidance entitled “Making Fair Financial Decisions”. It appears at Appendix 7 and attention is drawn to its contents.

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

The Human Rights Act

11.12. 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.

11.13. 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

11.14. 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

11.15. 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

11.16. 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

11.17. 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.
11.18. Members’ attention is drawn to the specific legal implications arising in relation to particular proposals set out in this report and summarised in Appendix 1C.

12. EQUALITIES

12.1. Officers have evaluated the policy and equalities impact of all the delegated and returning to Mayor & Cabinet proposals presented in this report.

12.2. There are 38 proposals of which the greater number of savings proposals, 20 (54%) are judged as likely to have a low / neutral equalities impact. By contrast, 12 savings proposals (33%) are judged as likely to have a medium equalities impact. Six savings proposals (16%) are judged as likely to have a high equalities impact. Further detail on the policy and equalities analysis are provided at Appendix 1D.

13. CONCLUSION

13.1. The Council expects to need to make savings of around £85m between 2015/16 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.

13.2. 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.

13.3. The saving proposals in this report reflect the work of the Lewisham future programme board. This work continues. The report presents £40.6m of potential savings:
   • £1.5m of previously agreed savings endorsed in November 2014 for 2015/16;
   • £11.8m of savings proposals delegated to officers in November 2014, of which £8.6m are for 2015/16;
   • £26.4m of savings proposals returning to Mayor & Cabinet with updates on the consultation and other work completed, of which £18.5m are for 2015/16 (including the £2.5m efficiency saving that is dealt with in the budget report); and
   • £0.4m of new proposals (L3 and L4) from the Culture and Community work strand for 2015/16.

13.4. For 2015/16, assuming all proposals here were agreed, this leaves a gap of £10m. How the gap for 2015/16 will be met is covered in the separate budget report for Mayor & Cabinet in February 2015.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1 is one document.
It sets out the individual templates for specific savings proposals and other documents as listed below.

Appendix 1A  Navigation sheet for savings proposals
Appendix 1B  Lewisham Corporate Priorities
Appendix 1C  Summary of Specific Legal Implications
Appendix 1D  Policy Analysis of 2015/18 Budget Savings
Appendix 1E  Making Fair Financial Decisions

Appendices 2 to 20 are in one document
Appendix 2  A1: Adult Care cost effective care packages
Appendix 3  A2: Learning Disability care packages
Appendix 4  A3: Reconfiguring sensory services provision
Appendix 5  A4: Remodelling building based day services
Appendix 6  A6&8: Public Health parts I and II
Appendix 7  A9: Review of services to support people to live at home
Appendix 8  B1: Reduction and remodelling of supporting people support
Appendix 9  E1: Reorganisation of Regeneration and Asset Management
Appendix 10  G1: Charging a fee for administering the Blue Badge scheme
Appendix 11  H1: Restructuring of enforcement and regulatory services
Appendix 12  K2: YOS reorganisation, intervention changes, & contract reduction
Appendix 13  L1: Review of main voluntary & community grants programme
Appendix 14  L3: Community Services development
Appendix 15  L4: Broadway theatre
Appendix 16  N1: Reduction in maintenance of some parts, highways & mngt.
Appendix 17  N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequency & mngt. Costs
Appendix 18  O1: End of discretionary freedom pass scheme
Appendix 19  Q1: Improve triage for Childrens’ social care services and re-design Children Centre early intervention offer.
Appendix 20  Q2: Reduction in Youth Service provision – option 1
## APPENDIX 1A – Savings Navigation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Saving</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Value £'000</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Comment Consultation / EAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Integration of social care and health (including public health)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Reassessment of Adults Care Packages</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public consultation on meals on wheels contract not yet completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other consultations on individual assessments so no overall EAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Reassessment of Learning Disability Care Packages</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public consultation is part of A5 work – see below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated as part of A5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other consultations on individual assessments so no overall EAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Reconfiguring Sensory services provision</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public consultation no longer required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Remodelling building based day services</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Charging for Adult Social Care Services</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Consultation concludes end of January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Public Health (part I)</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consultation with CCG completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Mental Health Provision</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Other consultations on individual assessments so no overall EAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Public Health (part II)</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consultation with CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Saving</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Value £’000</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>Comment/Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Review of services to support living at home</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Proposal to recoup Health costs</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Supporting People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Reconfiguration of Supporting People programme</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public consultation completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shared Services (and third party spend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Shared Services</td>
<td>No proposals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Efficiency Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Efficiency review</td>
<td>In annual budget report</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Asset rationalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Regeneration &amp; Asset Management restructure</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Facilities management efficiencies</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Generating income from corporate assets</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Generating income from commercial assets</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Energy efficiency measures</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Public consultation re 16/17 &amp; 17/18 elements not yet undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Corporate and business support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Corporate business support arrangements</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Income generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1a</td>
<td>School income and Investment</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Schools Forum consulted re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Saving</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Value £’000</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>Comment Consultation / EAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1b</td>
<td>Improved debt collection</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Agreed by Council in setting CTax collection rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1c</td>
<td>Blue badge administration fee</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public consultation on hold pending decision to consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td><strong>Enforcement and regulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Restructuring enforcement &amp; regulatory services</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td><strong>Management and corporate overheads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Savings in management &amp; corporate overheads</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td><strong>School effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Increase income for school effectiveness work</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Schools Forum consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td><strong>Crime reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Providing Prevention and Inclusion services differently</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>YOS reorganisation, changes in interventions &amp; reduction in contracts</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>Reduction in funding for Integrated Offender Management team</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td><strong>Culture and community services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Reduction in main voluntary and community grant programme</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Public consultation on process completed and agreed at M&amp;C in Nov ‘14 Overall EAA on impact of reduction will be reported to M&amp;C in May ‘15 once bids evaluation completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Saving</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Value £’000</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>Comment Consultation / EAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Libraries service reorganisation</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Community Development budgets</td>
<td>New proposal</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Broadway theatre</td>
<td>New proposal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Housing strategy and non HRA funded services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Transfer of non housing stock HRA to GF</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Environmental services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Alternative maintenance of small parks, highways &amp; church yards</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Reduction in street cleaning frequency</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Public services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Discretionary freedom pass scheme</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Public consultation on hold pending decision to consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Parking contract</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Establish internal enforcement agency</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Planning and economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Planning service reorganisation</td>
<td>Delegated to officers</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Safeguarding and early intervention services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Improve triage for Children social care services and re-design children centre and early intervention offer</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>-3,208</td>
<td>2,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Saving</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Value £’000</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>Comment Consultation / EAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Review of the Youth Service</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Public consultation completed&lt;br&gt;Staff EAA will be completed post decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Customer transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Customer Transformation</td>
<td>No proposals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1B – LEWISHAM CORPORATE PRIORITIES

The six Sustainable Community Priority outcomes, agreed with the Lewisham Strategic Partnership and the Council’s 10 Corporate Priorities are set out as follows:

**Sustainable Community Strategy**

- **Ambitious and achieving**: where people are inspired and supported to fulfil their potential.
- **Safer**: where people feel safe and are able to live free from crime, anti-social behaviour and abuse.
- **Empowered and responsible**: where people can be actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities.
- **Clean, green and liveable**: where people live in high quality housing and can care for and enjoy their environment.
- **Healthy, active and enjoyable**: where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well being.
- **Dynamic and prosperous**: where people are part of vibrant localities and town centres well-connected to London and beyond.

**Corporate Priorities**

- **Community Leadership and Empowerment**: developing opportunities for the active participation and engagement of people in the life of the community.
- **Young people’s achievement and involvement**: raising educational attainment and improving facilities for young people through partnership working.
- **Clean, green and liveable**: improving environmental management, the cleanliness and care for roads and pavements, and promoting a sustainable environment.
- **Safety, security and a visible presence**: partnership working with the police and others to further reduce crime levels and using Council powers to combat anti-social behaviour.
- **Strengthening the local economy**: gaining resources to regenerate key localities, strengthen employment skills and promote public transport.
- **Decent Homes for all**: investment in social and affordable housing to achieve the decent homes standard, tackle homelessness and supply key worker housing.
- **Protection of children**: better safeguarding and joined up services for children at risk.
- **Caring for adults and older people**: working with health services to support older people and adults in need of care.
- **Active, healthy citizens**: leisure, sporting, learning and creative activities for everyone.
- **Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**: ensuring efficiency and equity in the delivery of excellent services to meet the needs of the community.
### APPENDIX 1C – SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Specific Legals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>£2.68m</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Cost effective care packages</td>
<td>Although there is an absolute duty on 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 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. An EAA will be not be required as the actions taken to implement these savings are not at the strategic level; all service users will be assessed and re-assessed on an individual basis, and to attempt to analyse the impact of these proposals across the client group is not meaningful, nor a relevant consideration here- as each care package will have separate reassessment and consideration within existing lawful eligibility criteria, with service decisions being made exercising a lawful degree of discretion as to how to meet eligible need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>£1.5 m</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Negotiated reduction in 24 hr individual prices for care; pathway redesign; charging where historical funding streams have put people outside Council charging</td>
<td>Although there is an absolute duty on 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 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 will be required for the second and third proposal and in respect of negotiated changes to contractual prices, this may only be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Specific Legals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by agreement unless provided for within the contractual terms. A further report will be brought back, following consultation which will deal with all relevant matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>£150k</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Review adult social care sensory services</td>
<td>Direct payments were introduced by the <em>Community Care (Direct Payments) Act 1996</em>. The initial power to provide DPs has been extended to a duty to provide DPs to all those who consented to and were able to manage them, (2003 Regulations pursuant to the Health and Social Care Act 2001), and over all user groups including those with learning difficulty and mental health issues by 2009. The aim of Direct Payments is to increase individuals’ independence and choice by giving them control over the way services they receive are delivered. Direct payments are cash payments made in lieu, either fully or partly, of services from local authority social services. The payment must be sufficient to enable users to purchase services to meet their needs, and must be spent on services that users need. Personal budgets are an allocation of funding given to users after a social services assessment of their needs. Users can either take their personal budget as a direct payment, or - while still choosing how their care needs are met and by whom - leave councils with the responsibility to commission the services. Alternatively, they can have a combination of the two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>£1.3 m</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Remodelling building based day services and associated travelling costs</td>
<td>To meet the statutory requirements to increase the use of personal budgets, a review is necessary as Council services cannot generally be purchased via direct payments. There will need to be consultation if there is any proposal to lose building based services and in relation to any transport changes. On an individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Specific Legals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>£1.5 m</td>
<td>Comm/Public Health</td>
<td>Efficiencies, decommissioning certain services and review of current contracts</td>
<td>Statutory duties for areas of public health were conferred on the Council by the Health and Social Care Act 2012. Specifically Section 12 introduced a new duty to take appropriate steps to improve the health of people living in the area. Regulations require the Council to provide particular services for the weighing and measuring of children, provision of health checks for eligible people, open access sexual health services, public health advisor services and information and advice about local health issues. The Council must be satisfied that it is still able to fulfil these statutory duties despite any change of service provision. Some specific proposals will require consultation and a full report should be submitted. Public health expenditure is ring fenced for public health outcomes until the end of 2015/16. This does not mean that public health expenditure cannot be put to different public health uses than is the case currently. Where expenditure is made under contract is may only be reduced in accordance with the terms of that contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>£250k</td>
<td>Comm/Public Health</td>
<td>Review public health programmes</td>
<td>A number of the public health contracts have a six month notice period. Consultation and an EAA will be required as will a full report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>£250k</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Staffing restructure to realign early intervention services</td>
<td>The general employment legal implications apply. It is not proposed that the proposals if agreed would impact on service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>£2523 over 2 years (£1349)</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Supporting People – service reductions, closures, efficiencies, review of mental health services</td>
<td>These proposals will need a full report following consultation, including an equalities impact assessment. Contracts may only be terminated on notice as provided in their terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Specific Legals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>£600k</td>
<td>R &amp;R - RH</td>
<td>Proposal is a staffing reorganisation</td>
<td>General legal implications apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1c</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Fee for Blue badge admin.</td>
<td>Proposals to charge for blue badges will need consultation and a report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>£800k</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Staff restructure to create community protection hub</td>
<td>General legal implications apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>£200k</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Deletion of one post in the Youth Offending Team; cessation of certain programmes externally funded, overhead reduction</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>£1.5 m</td>
<td>Comms</td>
<td>To reduce the VCS grants programme, new grants to commence on 1 July 2015, to achieve £1.5 million savings over 2015/16 and 2016/17. New criteria to obtain grants are proposed.</td>
<td>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. The Council is bound to consult on its proposals and regard has to be had to the outcome of the consultation upon the new proposed criteria for eligibility for grant funding. EAA assessments will be required to be worked in to the proposals in more depth. A full report will be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>£340</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Broadway theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>£340k</td>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>To increase voluntary participation in parks and reduce management and</td>
<td>General legal implications apply to any staffing changes. There would need to be an assessment of the implications of any such proposal on the parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Specific Legals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management support posts (3 posts).</td>
<td>contract to ensure that it is consistent with its terms, or else seek agreement with the contractor. The Council would need to define the status of the volunteers when engaged on park activity. Legal implications on the parochial churches issue will be available at the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>£400k</td>
<td>Cust</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Section 89(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, the Council is under a statutory duty to ensure that open land under its direct control and to which the public have access is, so far as practicable, kept clear of litter and refuse. Under Section 89(2), the Council is also under a statutory duty, so far as is practicable, to ensure that public highways within its area are kept clean. In deciding what standard is required, the Council must have regard to the character and use of the land or highway, as well as the measures which are practicable in the circumstances. Under Section 89(10), the Council is also required to have regard to the code of practice published by the Secretary of State from time to time. In particular, the code requires the Council to allocate its land into different types or &quot;zones&quot; which must be publicised. The code then sets out cleanliness standards for the different types of land and maximum response times for cleaning an area which has been littered. The duty applies seven days a week. Members of the public may complain to the Magistrates Court where they consider that there is a breach of Section 89. The code of practice is admissible in evidence and the court may take into account any relevant provision in the code of practice. If the complaint is successful, a litter abatement order will be made, failure to comply with which is an offence. The court may also award costs if it is satisfied that there were reasonable grounds for bring the complaint, even if by the time the complaint is heard, the litter has been cleared away or the lack of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cleanliness rectified. In considering any savings proposals in relation to these matters, the Mayor must therefore be satisfied that the Council will still be able to comply with its duties under Section 89 and the requirements contained in the code of practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Specific Legals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>£200k</td>
<td>Cust - RW</td>
<td>The proposal is to withdraw the discretionary FP with effect from 1.1.2015. The impact will be negated by the existing JC + travel discount card and the 60+ London Oyster card. This will however still leave approximately 32% of existing discretionary FP holders unable to have a FP if this proposal is given effect. Currently, discretionary Freedom Passes are issued by local authorities to persons who do not meet either the statutory “retirement” age requirement (60+) or the eligibility criteria set out within s. 151(4) of the Transport Act 2000 for disabled persons (any one of seven criteria of disability). The local discretionary criteria have been applying to those persons who have evidence of either a mobility disability or an enduring mental health condition. Consultation will be required and given the likely impact upon persons of protected characteristics, a full EAA will be required all of which must be the subject of a full report before a decision is made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>CYP</td>
<td>£5.515 m</td>
<td>Reduce child care costs by a number of measures including integration of Early Intervention and Referral and Assessment Teams, fewer assessments, alternative delivery models “resetting of CSC placements budget”</td>
<td>There is a general duty upon local authorities to provide support, in kind, cash or services, to enable children in need to remain with their families and be cared for by them (s17 CA1989). Accommodation can be provided to children in need (S20) and has implications for resources in fulfilling the Council’s statutory duties to Looked After Children. The Childcare Act 2006 (as amended) places a duty on local authorities to improve the well-being of young children under 5 in their area, to reduce inequalities and ensure an integrated approach to services. Specifically, Local Authorities have a duty to provide sufficient designated Childrens’ Centres to meet local need. The Council is also the lead safeguarding agency for child protection, in assessing risk and managing it and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Specific Legals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alleviating it either through the Child Protection procedures or by way of application to the Court. Successful early intervention services divert families from entering safeguarding levels of concern. The Council has a duty to ensure that there are adequate numbers of Social Workers to provide the necessary services. Consultation is required for closure of Childrens’ Centres, although the provision of integrated early years services does not have to be premises – based. Employment issues arising will be dealt with by the Councils HR Procedures. A full report has already been prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (sic)</td>
<td>CYP</td>
<td>£3.208 m</td>
<td>Please see above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>CYP</td>
<td>£1,406m</td>
<td>Either reduce Youth Service provision to a statutory minimum (option 2) or create a mutual and award a contract to it for at least 3 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1D – POLICY ANALYSIS OF 2015/18 BUDGET SAVINGS

1. Policy analysis of 2015/18 budget savings

This policy analysis describes how budget savings proposals for 2015-2018, will impact on the delivery of the Council’s ten corporate priorities which are listed below. Any proposed budgetary savings have to be considered in the light of these priorities and the potential effect on services provided, and outcomes for both service users and the community at large. The effects are assessed as either positive, negative or neutral in terms of real impacts on the Council’s functions and services.

A. **Community leadership and empowerment**: developing opportunities for the active participation and engagement of people in the life of the community.

B. **Young people’s achievement and involvement**: raising educational attainment and improving facilities for young people through partnership working.

C. **Clean, green and liveable**: improving environmental management, the cleanliness and care of roads and pavements, and promoting a sustainable environment.

D. **Safety, security and visible presence**: partnership working with the police and others to further reduce crime levels (and using Council powers to combat anti-social behaviour).

E. **Strengthening the local economy**: gaining resources to regenerate key localities, strengthen employment skills and promote public transport.

F. **Decent Homes for all**: investment in social and affordable housing to achieve the decent homes standard, tackle homelessness and supply key worker housing.

G. **Protection of children**: better safeguarding and joined up services for children at risk.

H. **Caring for adults and older people**: working with health services to support older people and adults in need of care.

I. **Active, healthy citizens**: leisure, sporting, learning and creative activities for everyone.

J. **Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**: ensuring efficiency and equity in the delivery of excellent services to meet the needs of the community.
2. Presentation of analysis

The following analysis has been prepared, using various key headings. These offer a wide-ranging perspective of the impact of the budget savings. Figure 1 and table 1 below illustrates that, of the £38.363m worth of savings identified for 2015/18, £17.5m or 45% are linked to Council priority (J) ‘Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity’. The next highest savings total £7m (just over 18% of the total) is for priority (H) ‘Caring for adults and older people’, followed by £3.3m (nearly 9% of the total) for priority (I) ‘Active, healthy citizens’. It should be noted that these are also the areas of highest spend in the Council’s budget.

By contrast smaller savings, all less than 3% of the overall total, are linked to priority (E) ‘Strengthening the local economy’ £595k; priority (C) ‘Clean, green & liveable’ £790k and priority (D) ‘Safety, security & visible presence’ £1m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate priority</th>
<th>Savings total (£'000s)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Strengthening the local economy</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Clean, green and liveable</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Safety, security &amp; visible presence</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Decent homes for all</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Young people’s achievement &amp; involvement</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Protection of children</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Community leadership &amp; empowerment</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Active healthy, citizens</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Caring for adults &amp; older people</td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness &amp; equity</td>
<td>17,533</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,587</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2, table 2 below shows the value of savings being proposed by each directorate. The table reveals that savings valued at £16.1m (42% of the total) have been proposed by Community Services, some £5.4m worth of savings (14% of the total) have been proposed by the Children & Young People’s Directorate, nearly £5m worth of savings (13% of the total) have been proposed by Resources & Regeneration, whilst Customer Services has proposed savings totalling nearly £2.6m (6% of the overall total).
Figure 2 [Table 2]: Savings by corporate priority and directorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate priority</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>CUS</th>
<th>CYP</th>
<th>R&amp;R</th>
<th>Total '000's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Community leadership &amp; empowerment</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Young people’s achievement &amp; involvement</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cleaner, greener liveable</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Safety, security &amp; visible presence</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Strengthening the local economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>595</td>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Decent homes for all</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Protection of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Caring for adults and older people</td>
<td>6,802</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Active, healthy, citizens</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness &amp; equity</td>
<td>9,400*</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>17,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (£'000's)</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>16,186</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>38,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to annual reduction in the application of non-pay inflation, which affects all directorates

3. Impact of savings proposals on the Council’s corporate priorities

Figure 3 below shows the likely impact of savings proposals upon the delivery of the corporate priorities. These impacts have been identified as positive, negative or neutral. Of those savings proposed for 2015/18, a combined total of £21m or 55% are considered to have an impact that is either ‘positive’ (27%) or ‘neutral’ (28%). A further 45% of savings, totalling more than £17m are described as likely to have a ‘negative’ impact on the delivery of the Council’s corporate priorities. The level of savings with a negative or neutral impact is far higher than in previous years.

Figure 3

4. Geographical impact
All savings proposals for the 2015/18 budget savings round are identified as affecting ‘all wards’. As such, there is no specific ward impact arising from the proposals.

5. Equalities

The Public Sector Equality Duty (set out in the Equality Act 2010) requires the Council to have ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

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, within employment and training. It does not include a socio-economic duty.

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 the Council can demonstrate that they have had ‘due regard’.

Assessing impact on equality is not an end to itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision being made. Whether it is proportionate for the Council to conduct an Equalities Analysis 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 protected groups, including staff.

Where proposals are anticipated to have an impact on staffing levels, it will be subject to consultation as stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies, and services will be required to undertake an Equalities Analysis Assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process.

It is also important to note that the Council is subject to the Human Rights Act, and should therefore also consider the potential impact their decisions could have on human rights.

5.1 Equalities impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 4 [Table 3] Equality impacts</th>
<th>Number of proposals</th>
<th>As a percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High impact</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium impact</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/neutral impact</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4, table 3 below provides a high-level summary of the equality impact of 2015/18 budget savings proposals. The table reveals that the greater number of savings proposals 20 (53.5% of the total number) are judged as
likely to have a low/neutral equalities impact. By contrast, 12 savings proposals equivalent to 33% of the total number are judged as likely to have a medium equalities impact. Six savings proposals (16% of the total) are judged as likely to have a high equalities impact.

5.2 Equalities impact on all protected characteristics

Figure 5, table 4 below looks at the impact of savings proposals on the eight characteristics protected under the Equality Act 2010. The table reveals that the majority of the impacts being reported for each of the protected characteristics will be ‘low/neutral’. However, looking in more detail ‘age’ has the greatest number of savings that will have a ‘high impact’ (8), while ‘age’ and ‘gender’ are the characteristics that will have the greatest number of savings proposals that will have a ‘medium impact’ (12 each).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Religion/Belief</th>
<th>Pregnancy/Maternity</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Gender Reassignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6, table 5 below provides details of all 2015/18 budget savings proposals, which have been identified as having a ‘high’ equalities impact on protected characteristics.
**Figure 6 [Table 5] Proposals with a ‘high’ equalities impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Pregnancy/Maternity</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the cost of learning and disability provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodelling building-based day services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charging for adult social care services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health programme review (II)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructure of the planning service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing income from educational psychologists and learning disabilities teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End discretionary Freedom Pass scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve triage for children’s social care services and redesign children’s centre &amp; early intervention offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary - Improve triage for Children’s Social Care services &amp; re-design Children Centre &amp; Early Intervention offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1E - Making Fair Financial Decisions

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.

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.

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.

2B Aim of this guide
This guide aims to assist decision-makers in ensuring that:
• The process they follow to assess the impact on equality of financial proposals is robust, and
• The impact that financial proposals could have on 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: Hhttp://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/EqualityAct/PSED/equality_analysis_guidance.pdfU

3B The benefits of assessing the impact on equality
By law, your assessments of impact on equality must:
• Contain enough information to enable a public authority to demonstrate it has had ‘due regard’ to the aims of the equality duty in its decision-making
• Consider ways of mitigating or avoiding any adverse impacts.
Such assessments do not have to take the form of a document called an equality impact assessment. If you choose not to develop a document of this type, then some alternative approach which systematically assesses any adverse impacts of a change in policy, procedure or practice will be required.
Assessing impact on equality is not an end in itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision that is being made. Whether it is proportionate for an authority to conduct an assessment of the impact on equality of a financial decision or not depends on its relevance to the authority’s particular function and its likely impact on people from the protected groups.
We recommend that you document your assessment of the impact on equality when developing financial proposals. This will help you to:
• Ensure you have a written record of the equality considerations you have taken into account.
• Ensure that your decision includes a consideration of the actions that would help to avoid or mitigate any impacts on particular protected groups. Individual decisions should also be informed by the wider context of decisions in your own and other relevant public authorities, so that particular groups are not unduly affected by the cumulative effects of different decisions.
• Make your decisions based on evidence: a decision which is informed by relevant local and national information about equality is a better quality decision. Assessments of impact on equality provide a clear and systematic way to collect, assess and put forward relevant evidence.
• Make the decision-making process more transparent: a process which involves those likely to be affected by the policy, and which is based on evidence, is much more open and transparent. This should also help you secure better public understanding of the difficult decisions you will be making in the coming months.
• Comply with the law: a written record can be used to demonstrate that due regard has been had. Failure to meet the equality duty may result in authorities being exposed to costly, time-consuming and reputation-damaging legal challenges.

4B When should your assessments be carried out?
Assessments of the impact on equality must be carried out at a formative stage so that the assessment is an integral part of the development of a proposed policy, not a
later justification of a policy that has already been adopted. Financial proposals which are relevant to equality, such as those likely to impact on equality in your workforce and/or for your community, should always be subject to a thorough assessment. This includes proposals to outsource or procure any of the functions of your organisation. The assessment should form part of the proposal, and you should consider it carefully before making your decision.

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

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

**5B What should I be looking for in my assessments?**

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

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

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

- **Is the purpose of the financial proposal clearly set out?**
  A robust assessment will set out the reasons for the change; how this change can impact on protected groups, as well as whom it is intended to benefit; and the intended outcome. You should also think about how individual financial proposals might relate to one another. This is because a series of changes to different policies or services could have a severe impact on particular protected groups.
  Joint working with your public authority partners will also help you to consider thoroughly the impact of your joint decisions on the people you collectively serve.
  **Example:** A local authority takes separate decisions to limit the eligibility criteria for community care services; increase charges for respite services; scale back its accessible housing programme; and cut concessionary travel. Each separate decision may have a significant effect on the lives of disabled residents, and the cumulative impact of these decisions may be considerable. This combined impact would not be apparent if the decisions were considered in isolation.

- **Has the assessment considered available evidence?**
  Public authorities should consider the information and research already available locally and nationally. The assessment of impact on equality should be underpinned by up-to-date and reliable information about the different protected groups that the proposal is likely to have an impact on. A lack of information is not a sufficient reason to conclude that there is no impact.

- **Have those likely to be affected by the proposal been engaged?**
  Engagement is crucial to assessing the impact on equality. There is no explicit requirement to engage people under the equality duty, but it will help you to improve the equality information that you use to understand the possible impact on your policy on different protected groups. No-one can give you a better insight into how proposed changes will have an impact on, for example, disabled people, than disabled people themselves.
• Have potential positive and negative impacts been identified?
It is not enough to state simply that a policy will impact on everyone equally; there should be a more in-depth consideration of available evidence to see if particular protected groups are more likely to be affected than others. Equal treatment does not always produce equal outcomes; sometimes authorities will have to take particular steps for certain groups to address an existing disadvantage or to meet differing needs.

• What course of action does the assessment suggest that I take? Is it justifiable?
The assessment should clearly identify the option(s) chosen, and their potential impacts, and document the reasons for this decision. There are four possible outcomes of an assessment of the impact on equality, and more than one may apply to a single proposal:

Outcome 1: No major change required when the assessment has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to advance equality have been taken.

Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers identified by the assessment or to better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified?

Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified some potential for adverse impacts or missed opportunities to advance equality. In this case, the justification should be included in the assessment and should be in line with the duty to have ‘due regard’. For the most important relevant policies, compelling reasons will be needed. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact, as discussed below.

Outcome 4: Stop and rethink when an assessment shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination.

• Are there plans to alleviate any negative impacts?
Where the assessment indicates a potential negative impact, consideration should be given to means of reducing or mitigating this impact. This will in practice be supported by the development of an action plan to reduce impacts. This should identify the responsibility for delivering each action and the associated timescales for implementation. Considering what action you could take to avoid any negative impact is crucial, to reduce the likelihood that the difficult decisions you will have to take in the near future do not create or perpetuate inequality.

Example: A University decides to close down its childcare facility to save money, particularly given that it is currently being under-used. It identifies that doing so will have a negative impact on women and individuals from different racial groups, both staff and students.

In order to mitigate such impacts, the University designs an action plan to ensure relevant information on childcare facilities in the area is disseminated to staff and students in a timely manner. This will help to improve partnership working with the local authority and to ensure that sufficient and affordable childcare remains accessible to its students and staff.

• Are there plans to monitor the actual impact of the proposal?
Although assessments of impact on equality will help to anticipate a proposal’s likely effect on different communities and groups, in reality the full impact of a decision will only be known once it is introduced. It is therefore important to set out arrangements for reviewing the actual impact of the proposals once they have been implemented.

6B What happens if you don’t properly assess the impact on equality of relevant decisions?
If you have not carried out an assessment of impact on equality of the proposal, or have not done so thoroughly, you risk leaving yourself open to legal challenges, which are both costly and time-consuming. Recent legal cases have shown what
can happen when authorities do not consider their equality duties when making decisions.

**Example:** A court recently overturned a decision by Haringey Council to consent to a large-scale building redevelopment in Wards Corner in Tottenham, on the basis that the council had not considered the impact of the proposal on different racial groups before granting planning permission.

However, the result can often be far more fundamental than a legal challenge. If people feel that an authority is acting high-handedly or without properly involving its service users or employees, or listening to their concerns, they are likely to become disillusioned with you.

Above all, authorities which fail to carry out robust assessments of the impact on equality risk making poor and unfair decisions that could discriminate against particular protected groups and perpetuate or worsen inequality.

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

www.equality.humanrights.com
APPENDIX 2 – Proforma proposal and update report for savings A1

A – Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

Savings proposals A1 is presented here. It is:

A1 Adult Care cost effective care packages

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Healthier Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
2a A1 Proposal
2b A1 M&C Report
## A1: Cost effective care packages

### Cost Effective Care Packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead officer</th>
<th>Joan Hutton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directorates affected by proposal</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Health, Wellbeing and Older People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee</td>
<td>Healthier Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference no.</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Short summary of proposal

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.

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.

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.

### Financial information

#### 2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure £000’s</th>
<th>Income £000’s</th>
<th>Net Budget £000’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34,725.4</td>
<td>(3,375.4)</td>
<td>31,350.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Description of service and proposal

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.

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.
### 3. Description of service and proposal

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:
## APPENDIX 2a – Proposal for saving A1

### Impact on Corporate Priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td>A. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact of saving on corporate priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal

**In principle stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Wards:</th>
<th>If individual Wards, please state:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Service Equalities Impact

**What is the expected impact on equalities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low/ Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Disability:</th>
<th>Religion/Belief:</th>
<th>Pregnancy/Maternity</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation:</th>
<th>Gender reassignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal.
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**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)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 - SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workforce Profile Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME:</td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Proposal

1.1 This saving will be achieved by ensuring the Council meets the care and support needs of eligible users 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.

1.2 The savings consists of a £2.4 m efficiency from all community care packages and £80K from the laundry service contract. Once the Meals on Wheels contract comes to an end, users will be offered alternative options for the provision of a meal, and a further £200K in savings will be achieved in 16/17.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Mayor agrees:

- The saving of £2.4m from community care packages
- The saving of £80k from laundry service contract
- That a further £200k be taken in 2016/17 by not renewing the Meals on Wheels contract and offering alternatives.

3. Context

3.1 At any point in the year approximately 3,400 working age and older adults are receiving community based packages of care.

3.2 Before any decision is made on the care and support needs of an individual, and before a care and support plan is prepared, consideration is given to an individual's particular circumstances, and a full assessment or review of the individual's needs is carried out.

3.3 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.

3.4 Access to support is through a professional assessment of need, guided by nationally set eligibility criteria. Local authorities can take resources into account when determining how those assessed needs should be met and may use the most cost effective solution. In some situations the assessment will be the only service that is provided directly by the Council, particularly when care and support needs do not reach the eligibility criteria or when needs can be met by opportunities available from within the community or from the persons network of support and own resources.

4. Activity to date

4.1 Following a review of practice, we have put in place a clearer more structured approach in relation to the provision of community support packages and residential placements, and a more consistent application of operational procedures, tools and financial controls to both provide more consistent, fairer decision making and, in advance of the new Care Act, training and development to support the required change in attitudes, behaviours and culture.

4.2 This shift in practice has resulted in the service moving from an approach which is predominantly service led, to one that considers the strengths and resources an individual can contribute to meet their needs. The programme of training and development mentioned above has focused on the assessment of need and how to support plan within a budget allocated that is determined by the assessment process.

4.3 An extended and more comprehensive resource allocation formula (RAS) has been tested throughout January and will go live in February. This will calculate how much money (personal budget) should be allocated to a person who is eligible for support from adult social care following their assessment. The size of the budget will reflect the scale and complexity of their care needs but also the availability of informal care from their families and friends. Opportunities for support from universal services and from within the community will also be considered. The work that has taken place to date to develop the market with opportunities for activities and alternatives to traditional care services has provided wider and more personalised options for people.

4.4 The care management and assessment teams have been aligned to GP practices within the borough. This multi disciplinary approach to work and support planning will ensure people remain living at home as independently as possible by providing low level support to keep people well and prevent them from needing more intensive (and expensive) care.

4.5 These services include information, advice and sign posting, Enablement (to aid recovery after illness), falls prevention, support to family carers, employment, assistive technology, equipment and by making use of existing universal services within the community and the development of targeted and a range of support developed from the community connections work aimed to tackle social isolation.
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4.6 By adopting this approach fewer people will need to access ongoing care and the costs of some existing packages of care can be reduced to achieve the mentioned savings. Monthly reports are provided to and monitored by the Departmental management team to ensure that the savings are being achieved. Attached to this report (appendix 1) are pen pictures of community care reviews that have taken place so far demonstrating how needs can be met in a more cost effective way.

4.7 The Laundry Service

The laundry service was originally commissioned by the health service to support people who have incontinence. It was subsequently transferred to the local authority and currently provides a service to 90 people. The contract expires at the end of January when formal arrangements with the provider will be put in place to extend the contract on a month by month basis as the service users needs are reviewed.

4.8 Partnership work across health and social care within the Neighbourhood teams will consider solutions for people who need support with incontinence, and alternative options to deal with laundry will be explored within the local market.

4.9 Meals on Wheels

The Meals on Wheels contract is a tri borough arrangement with LB Southwark and LB Lambeth which is due to come to an end in 2015. There are 250 people in receipt of a meal. For those people who need access to food as part of their assessed needs, alternative ways of providing meals are being explored as part of the review/assessment process.

4.10 The alternatives that are being offered and accepted are Wiltshire Farm Foods or supermarket ready meals. For those people who receive other care calls, assistance can be given to heat up a ready meal. Alternatively, MOW (hot meal plus pudding) can be purchased direct from Apetito for £ 6.50 per day. Support planners can assist with the information and securing this provision.

5. Equality Implications

5.1 The Council supported 1,860 users over the age of 65, 610 users with mental health issues, 460 users with a learning disability and 460 users with a physical disability. As at the 31st March 2014. There may be an impact for a number of users as the service that they have been receiving may change or be discontinued or alternative provision be offered. However, this will not necessarily be a negative impact as service users will have choice and control in the development of their support plans.

5.2 No change to any existing support plan will be made until a review with the user has taken place. The support plan will ensure that the eligible needs of users are still met.

6. Legal

6.1 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.
6.2 Although this is an absolute duty, 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.

6.3 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 comply with the new requirements of the Care Act 2014.

8. **Author and Contact Details**

Joan Hutton, Adult Assessment and Care Management. Tel: 0208 314 6304 or by email joan.hutton@lewisham.gov.uk
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Adult Social Care –
Assessment and Support Planning Services – Outcomes

JON

Adult with a learning disability, male age 24, high functioning, in care since a child, went into residential care placement on the South Coast as an adult, funded by Lewisham.

The 2011 review of care whilst in residential placement found that he was unhappy with his life in that environment.

After much work to remedy this situation by the team it was found JON wanted to live a more independent life.
Over a period of 18 months of working with the team JON secured a home in the private rented sector on the South Coast, he used housing benefit and his other state benefits to contribute toward setting up a new home and he had a small care package of carer visits daily.

After a further review at 2 years he decided that he wanted to live permanently in that South Coast borough, which has happened.

Care Package and Changes:-
2011 Residential weekly cost- £1200 per week
2013 Reduced to care package cost of 14 hours per week- £220
2014 Now nil cost as JON is now a resident of this South Coast borough

Outcomes for JON:-
Lives independently now with help from staff, alone in his own home, attends college, is volunteering in the Gaming shop his passion, and mixing on an everyday basis in his community.
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JM

JM, female aged 76, lives north of borough, with son as main carer, has significant cognitive impairment. Her son called the duty desk 6 months ago to say JM was getting fed up and becoming tearful, and that he as the carer was struggling to cope as it was getting him down. The team assessed both the client, and the son as carer and identified that some sort of day activity, and memory service help would be beneficial to give her a change, assess her mental health and to give the son a break.

At assessment it emerged that she was resistant to outside help but was able to self care with prompting from her son, had friends locally who she had not seen for a long time, and that she knew the Deptford area well. However she could not be left alone at all night or day as her dementia had deteriorated and her short term memory was poor. She was encouraged to consider going once a week to a free lunch club for 3 hours every week in the local community centre. To do this she needed help, both to get there, remain there and be safe, and to get back home. In consideration of this fact she was awarded a direct payment for 3 hours per week and would use her own resources to pay for lunch there. She was supported to identify a carer from the personal assistant bank and this is now working well.

Assistive technology was installed to keep her safe and monitor her movements if the carer popped out.

Care Package and Changes:-
2012 no services
2013 £35 per week for a personal assistant to support to attend lunch club locally- this was where her old friends were meeting too!

This care package avoids the need to attend a traditional day centre attendance, at a unit cost in the region of £100 per day.

Outcomes for JM:
Supported to remain in the community living with her son in a familiar environment and to pick up on her old friendship networks.
Carer gets a regular weekly break. JN becomes familiar with accepting outside help in case her care needs increase in the future.
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AN

Female aged 40, living with partner and autistic son in a Lewisham Home’s property. She had a road traffic accident about 3 years ago and was in hospital for a while. Although she could stand up and mobilise short distances, she needed help with all her activities of daily living because of significant nerve and muscle damage. She, and her family had significant support from occupational therapy services with moving to an adapted property, where there was a good range of aids and adaptations made available. On leaving hospital she had a care package of 21 hours a week of personal care, with some domestic support of 1 hour per week to help keep the home tidy and was supported to apply for additional disability related benefits to help the household finances now she could not work. Her partner carried out all other tasks. During this time she had a number of other therapeutic interventions to help increase her independence.

Through the ongoing process of annual review the care package continued to be reduced to remain relevant and appropriate to meet her needs. Today she has difficulties with some of her activities of daily living but she has recovered some of her former strength and ability.

Care Package and Changes
3 years ago on discharge from hospital 21 hours of personal care plus 1 hour domestic help, at a cost of £350 pw
2 years ago- reduced to 14 hours plus 1 hour domestic help at a cost of £200 pw
Now – reduced to 6 hours with domestic help of .5 hour at a cost of £100 pw

Outcomes for AN:-
Tailored package of care to suit improving ability to self care, increased confidence due to improved independence, greater ability to participate in family and community life. Now volunteering as a way to get back into the workplace.
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Mrs BW

Mrs BW, age 82 lives at home with her daughter, who is also her informal carer. Her daughter works full time and prepares/cooks main meal in the evening. Daughter also carries out all day to day activities like housework.

Mrs BW was admitted to University Hospital Lewisham (UHL) 2 years ago following a major stroke (left lacunar infarct), which resulted in cognitive impairment, confusion, reduced mobility, left sided weakness, left sided inattention, visual impairment, reduced self-help skills and double incontinence. Mrs BW had difficulty with swallowing and was at risk of choking so all her food needed to be soft.

Mrs BW was discharged home with a care package of 2 carers per visit – 4 calls a day 7 days a week. She was unable to weight bear or mobilise and needed assistance of two with all aspects of personal care and mobility.

**Action Plan identified at review to assist Mrs BW regain some of her former abilities-**
Referral to LATT (Lewisham’s physiotherapy team) for mobility programme. Encourage enablement self help outcomes within the care package i.e. Mrs BW to wash and cream top half of her body herself, for her to help with moving on the bed and for her to mobilise with walking frame over short distances

**Care Package and Changes**
Two years ago care package 4 visits daily and 2 carers each visit costing £500 per week. Today reduced to single person care visits at £250 per week

**Outcomes for Mrs BW**
Mrs BW completed a mobility programme with physiotherapist and her mobility has improved. She is able to transfer assisted by one person and is able to walk a few paces with her walking frame and with supervision. Mrs BW is independent to wash her face and hands now. Continues to live with her daughter in their home in the community.
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A – Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

Savings proposals A2 is presented here. It is:

A2 Learning disability care packages

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Healthier Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
3a A2 Proposal
3b A2 M&C report draft
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A2: Reduction in cost of Learning Disability provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction in costs of Learning Disability Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Carlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Wellbeing and Older People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthier Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings in the cost of care for people with a learning disability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget:</strong> £26,930.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,403.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,473.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,930.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Proposal 1**

This proposal is to save £900K through a negotiated reduction in placement costs. There are 300 plus service users with a learning disability who require 24 hour care either in residential care settings or in supported living accommodation. At present, this high level of care is costed on the basis of a significant level of 1:1 care. We have estimated that this proposal will affect the care costs of 70 people in this group.

(i) Some pilot work has demonstrated that the needs of some individuals do not need to be met on a 1:1 basis throughout the 24 hours. The pilot has shown that revised support plans can provide periods where staff support can be shared by increasing the number of group activities that service users can participate in.

(ii) In addition, some savings are also being identified through challenging the level of provider corporate overheads and fixed costs.

**Proposal 2**

This proposal is to save £500K by appropriately transferring the responsibility for some service users care management and funding responsibility to other health and social care systems. This transfer will save the whole of the current cost of service

(i) There are 15 service users who have been living in other geographical areas for a considerable length of time who are now settled with a tenancy, and have capacity to choose where they live. The costs of their care will therefore be appropriately transferred to the relevant host borough.

(ii) In addition, there are 6 people who officers believe are now eligible for fully health funded care. The costs of their care and case management will be transferred to the appropriate host Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

(iii) Officers are reviewing the needs of older adults with a learning disability to ensure that they are offered the...
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3. Description of service and proposal

opportunity to benefit from the development of the extra care housing the Council is investing in, and for the appropriate residential and nursing care services.

Proposal 3

This proposal is to generate income of £100K by extending the charging policy to users of the in borough supported living service. Historically, some of these services were funded through Health as part of the long stay hospital closure programme and were therefore outside of local authority charging policies. Local authorities are now responsible for this provision and therefore the Lewisham charging policy needs to be equitably applied. This will affect 150 people.

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:

Proposal 1

There will be a reduction in the level of 1:1 support for some individuals. However, there may also be an increase in the number and type of shared activities that people will have an opportunity to participate in.

Proposal 2

(i) Some families may be concerned about the transfer of care management and funding responsibility to another authority/ CCG
(ii) Some families may be concerned that extra care housing services may not fully meet the needs of their family member.

Proposal 3

Service users directly affected will potentially experience a reduction in the amount of disposable income that people have available to spend.

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

The level of savings in the learning disability service assumes that there are no unknown demands on the overall learning disability service. The majority of demand on the learning disability service comes through transition from children to adult services. Adult services are working with colleagues in the Children and Young People’s Directorate to understand these costs and proactively plan to meet the needs in the most cost effective way.

These proposals are based on some intensive assessment and reviews of individual care packages, managing the financial assessment process, and carrying out the financial negotiations with providers. Community services is looking with other Council colleagues, at configuring the capacity of the workforce to ensure that this can be managed.

Proposal 1 relates to direct negotiations with providers about service design and how needs will be met differently. An external organisation with in-depth knowledge of costs paid by other councils has been recruited to help sustain focus on fee negotiations with out of borough providers.

The authority will also work in collaboratively with providers to ensure that they do not threaten eviction as part of this saving. We already have a strong partnership with local providers who have signalled that they will be able to deliver the savings identified. As a Council we have responsibility for managing and developing the market, and in this role we will work with local provider, the majority of which are SMEs (small medium enterprises) to support their stability.

In the rare case where it is not possible for the service user to remain where they are, it may be necessary to identify alternative provision. We have a number of provider partners who will help us manage this with sensitivity and support the service user and their family to visit alternatives and offer support with the move itself.
4. Impact of proposal

Service users and their families may well feel concerned about the change in management responsibility in Proposal 2. We will work in partnership with them through the different parts of the process.

Proposal 3 will require formal consultation with those individuals affected by the extension of the charging policy. The authority will ensure that advocacy support is available for all affected individuals.

Each proposal carries its own specific risk as outlined above. There is, however, a potential for some service users to be affected by more than one of the savings proposals. This impact will need to be identified as part of the review of each service user’s care needs.

With a significant savings target that relates to direct service provision, there is always the potential for savings to be perceived as a reduction in service quality and choice. It is essential, therefore, that the care assessment and review process fully engages service users and their families to ensure that their concerns are addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Corporate Priorities:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Priority – Most Relevant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secondary Priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of saving on corporate priority</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact of saving on corporate priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level of Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Impact Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Because of the demographic nature of the group, there is a specific impact on older adults and also younger adults

People with complex learning and multiple other disabilities will feature as among some of the highest cost packages. The savings negotiations will ensure that complex needs are fully considered and that providers can evidence how service users needs can be met.

The pathway design for older people with a learning disability includes consideration of generic extra care housing as well as appropriate residential and nursing homes for older people. Responding to the needs of older people with a learning disability is an expanding and relatively new area of work. Their level of daily living skills can deteriorate earlier and faster than the general population and, therefore, this needs to be considered in the review of their care needs.

The local services into which young people in transition may move, if not handled well, could potentially result in a focus on their maintenance and safety needs, rather than a full focus on maximising their daily living and independence skills. Adult services are working in partnership with CYP to use the total resources available to deliver a more coherent approach to transition planning so that there is a careful balance between the quality of provision and the pricing of provision. This includes representation from families, through the SEND (Special Educational Needs) Implementation Board.

The young people in transition most likely to be affected by these savings proposals are young men from African and African-Caribbean backgrounds. Of the older adults likely to be affected by the savings, the majority are likely to be white British.

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,
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6. Legal
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 Proposal 3 relating to charging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is staff consultation required (Y/N)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Is public consultation required (Y/N)?</th>
<th>Yes for proposal 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME:</td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **The Saving**

1.1 This saving will be achieved by ensuring that the Council meets the needs of eligible service users who have a learning disability in the most cost effective way. The saving consists of £1.5m efficiency in the costs of meeting the needs of individuals who require 1:1 support, transferring care and funding responsibility to other health and social care authorities where appropriate, ensuring that older service users with a learning disability have access to care that most appropriately meets their needs and ensuring that the Council’s charging policy is applied equitably to all service users.

1.2 These savings are based on national best practice and areas where the council does not benchmark well against other similar authorities in terms of spend.

2. **Recommendations**

2.1 That the Mayor:

- Agrees the saving of £900k in the reduction in the cost of supported living provision;

- Agrees the saving of £500k in the transfer of funding responsibility local authorities of ordinary residence or to CCGs and ensuring that older adults access care that most appropriately meets their needs

- Notes that the £100k saving relating to the introduction of charging for supported accommodation has been delegated to officers and will be considered alongside all other proposals relating to charging in A5 (charging for Adult Social Care non-residential).

3. **Context**

3.1 As at 31st March 2014 the council was supporting 450 adults who have a learning disability. This support includes: residential and nursing care, supported living, community based packages of care and day opportunities.
3.2 A full assessment or review of an individual’s care needs is undertaken before any decision is made on how best to support an individual in meeting their needs. A care and support plan is developed which takes into account an individual’s particular circumstances and seeks to meet needs in the most cost effective way.

4. Detailed proposals

4.1 Saving 1

A saving of £900k will be achieved through a negotiated reduction in placement costs. There are currently approximately 300 service users who receive 24 hour care either in residential care settings or in supported living accommodation. At present this high level of care is costed on the basis of a significant level of 1:1 care. We have estimated that this proposal will affect the care costs of 70 people in this group.

Work undertaken to date has demonstrated that the needs of some individuals do not need to be met on a 1:1 basis throughout the 24 hours. The exercise has shown that revised support plans can provide periods where staff support can be shared by increasing the number of group activities that service users can participate in, therefore reducing the cost of 1:1 support.

In addition to reviewing how care is provided to individuals, commissioners will continue to challenge the level of corporate overheads and fixed costs which are part of the price of a placement seeking to secure reductions in cost and greater efficiency for the authority.

4.2 Saving 2

A saving of £500k will be achieved by appropriately transferring the responsibility for the funding and care management of some service users to other health and social care systems. This transfer of responsibility will save the whole of the current cost of the service.

There are currently 15 service users who have been living in other geographical areas for a considerable length of time. These individuals are now settled with their own tenancy and have capacity to choose where they live. The costs of their care will therefore be appropriately transferred to the host borough where they are now resident.

In addition there are currently 6 service users who officers consider are eligible for NHS fully funded health care. Following the completion of a Continuing Care Assessment, if eligible, the responsibility for the ongoing care and support for these individuals will be transferred to the host Clinical Commissioning Group.

Officers are currently reviewing the needs of older adults who have a learning disability to ensure that they are offered the opportunity to benefit from the development of the new extra care housing capacity that the council is investing in and ensuring that they have access to residential or nursing services which may be more appropriate in meeting their needs.

4.3 Saving 3
Income of £100k will be achieved by extending the council’s charging policy to users of the in borough supported living service. Historically some of these services were funded through health as part of the long stay hospital closure programme and were therefore outside the Local Authority charging policies. Local authorities are now responsible for this provision and therefore the Lewisham charging policy needs to apply equitably. A decision on this saving has been delegated to officers and will be considered alongside all proposed changes to charging set out in A5 (charging for Adult Social Care non-residential).

5. **Equality implications**

5.1 The savings relate to one specific group of people with disabilities, people with a learning disability. There are no specific mitigating steps on this point.

5.2 Because of the demographic nature of the group, there is a specific impact on older adults. Of the older adults likely to be affected by the savings, the majority are likely to be white British. Older people with a learning disability will have access to generic extra care housing as well as appropriate residential and nursing homes for older people. Responding to the needs of older people with a learning disability is an expanding and relatively new area of work. Their level of daily living skills can deteriorate earlier and faster than the general population and, therefore, this needs to be considered in the review of their care needs, and may require some additional ‘top up’ packages of care and training to provider staff so that they fully understand learning disability related conditions and how to best meet those care needs.

5.3 People with complex learning and multiple other disabilities will feature among the highest cost packages. The savings negotiations will ensure that complex needs are fully considered and that providers can evidence how service users needs can be met.

5.4 Young people in transition will be indirectly affected by these proposals over time. Officers are working through the SEND implementation process to ensure that there is a focus on maximising daily living and independence skills. Adult services are working in partnership with CYP to use the total resources available to deliver a more coherent approach to transition planning so that there is a careful balance between the quality of provision and the pricing of provision. The young people in transition most likely to be affected by these savings proposals are young men from African and African-Caribbean backgrounds.

6. **Legal**

6.1 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.

6.2 Although this is an absolute duty, 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.

6.3 However, on an individual basis, no service user may have their care package altered without a further assessment of need. Any assessment of needs will comply with the new requirements of the Care Act 2014.
6.4 The Council has in place an existing Framework Agreement for the delivery of local services for adults with a learning disability. Delivery of some of the in borough savings may require notice to be served on existing contracts. There is proviso for this action within the existing contracts.

7. Any other Information

7.1 The current Framework Agreement for services for adults with a learning disability is being reviewed and benchmarked against the Frameworks that have been put in place by other local authorities. The Council has a duty under the Care Act 2014 to ensure that the local market is sustainable and to avoid market failure. The review of the Framework is seeking to establish a Lewisham hourly rate for supported living services and is exploring the feasibility of ‘banding rates’ for people requiring residential care.

8. Conclusion

8.1 The Council will continue to support people with a learning disability who have eligible needs. The proposals will mean that service users will have access to a wider range of group and shared activities. No change to any support plan will take place until a review with the user and their family has taken place.

For more information contact Heather Hughes, Joint Commissioning Lead Complex Care & Learning Disability. Tel: 020 8698 8133
Email: heather.hughes@lewisham.gov.uk
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A – Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

Savings proposals A2 is presented here. It is:

A3 Reconfiguring sensory services provision

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Healthier Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
4a A3 Proposal
4b A3 M&C report
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A3: Changes to sensory services provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes to Sensory Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Financial information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget: £2,276.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure £000’s</th>
<th>Income £000’s</th>
<th>Net Budget £000’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**
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### 4. Impact of proposal

**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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>A. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact of saving on corporate priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Wards</th>
<th>If individual Wards, please state:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Service Equalities Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the expected impact on equalities?</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

---

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

** (covered by council employee)
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7. Human Resources

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female: 1</th>
<th>Male: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME: 1</td>
<td>White: X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known: N/K</td>
<td>Not Known: N/K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Proposal

1.1 The saving will be achieved by the adoption of a new staffing model for sensory services. The new model ensures that people who have a sensory impairment continue to have good access to information and advice, rehabilitation, the provision of equipment and access to an assessment. The saving will be achieved by a reduction in the staffing budget of £150K.

2. Recommendation

2.1 The Mayor is recommended to:

- Agree the saving of £150k from the sensory service budget (staffing)

3. Context

3.1 Sensory services are provided by the Council for people with Visual impairment, hearing impairment and dual sensory loss. Staffing within the current service model has been restructured. The new service model has moved away from providing support to people who have a sensory impairment from two discreet specialist teams - one for deaf and hearing impairment and the other for Visual and dual sensory impairment - to a model that ensures all the care management staff are familiar with how to support the needs of people with a sensory impairment.

3.2 The model ensures that specialist skills are retained and are used in a proportionate way. Staff will ensure there continues to be an emphasis placed on personalisation and the use of Direct payments for those people who have on-going needs that meet the criteria for support.

4. Activity to date

4.1 Consultation with staff affected by the restructure of sensory services has taken place throughout January. The new model will be in place from April with some staff moving to other assessment teams. There will be some staffing vacancies from April which will be set against the saving.
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4.2 Once the new model is established, engagement meetings will take place with established user groups for people who are Deaf and users of British sign language and people who are Deaf and Blind. The meetings will ensure that the groups are aware of the staffing changes and will provide information on how to continue to access advice, information and support within the new model and in accordance with the new Care Act requirements.

5. Equality Implications

5.1 The new model will not adversely affect the service offer to this client group although they may see a change in the personnel providing the support. The new model will continue to provide access to information and advice in a range of formats such as Braille, large print, electronically. Access in a range of communication formats that meet the needs of people who are Deaf, users of British sign language, Hard of hearing, Visually impaired or who have a dual sensory impairment and use hands on or visual frame communication will continue to be available.

6. Legal

6.1 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.

6.2 The introduction of the new model ensures that service provision continues to meet the Council’s statutory duty.

7. Author and Contact Details

Joan Hutton, Head of Adult Assessment and Care Management. Tel: 0208 314 6304 or by email joan.hutton@lewisham.gov.uk
APPENDIX 5 – Proforma proposals and update report for saving A4

A – Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

Saving proposal A4 is presented here.

It is:
A4 Remodelling building based day services

This appendix presents the individual saving proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Healthier Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
5a A4 Proposal

The M&C report for this saving is tabled for Mayor & Cabinet on the 11 February as a separate item
APPENDIX 5a – Proposal saving A4

A4: Remodelling building based day services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remodelling Building Based Day Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget</strong>: £4,328.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure £000’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,332.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

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.

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, Narborhood Centre, Ladywell and Mulberry.

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.

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.

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.

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.
### 3. Description of service and proposal

**Saving proposal description**

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>A. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
<td>Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>B. Young people’s achievement and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

In principle stage
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)
7. Human Resources

*(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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>35.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>covered by agency FTE: 40.59 HEADCOUNT: 44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Vacant post not covered by agency FTE: 1.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female: 34</th>
<th>Male: 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME: 19</td>
<td>White: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Where known: 15</td>
<td>Not Known: 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A – Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

Savings proposals A6 and A8 are presented here together.

They are:
A6  Public Health (part I)
A8  Public Health (part II)

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proformas as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Healthier Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
6a  A6 Proposal
6b  A8 Proposal
6c  A6 & A8 M&C report
A6: Public Health programme review (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Financial information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget:: 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

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.

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.

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.

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.

**Saving proposal description**

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.
### APPENDIX 6a – Proposal for saving A6

#### 3. Description of service and proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Area</th>
<th>Saving</th>
<th>Savings Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sexual Health**                 | £275,600     | 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     | 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      | 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      | 1. Decommissioning diabetes and cancer GP champion posts.                                                                                                                                           |
| **Obesity/Physical Activity**     | £92,400      | 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      | 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**   | £38,000      | 1. Decommission Health Promotion library service  
2. Reduce budget for health improvement training |
| **Health Inequalities**           | £266,500     | 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** |                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
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### 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 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.
4. Impact of proposal

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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual health</td>
<td>LGT reject decrease in funding and saving cannot be made.</td>
<td>Negotiations currently underway to assess financial risk to provider and commissioner. These will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>Schools chose not to fund physical activity programmes</td>
<td>DPH will work with schools to encourage engagement in the programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Inequalities</td>
<td>Access to advocacy and money advice is reduced for the most vulnerable in Lewisham</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### APPENDIX 6a – Proposal for saving A6

#### Impact on Corporate Priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Wards</th>
<th>If individual Wards, please state:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Service Equalities Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the expected impact on equalities?</th>
<th>Low/ neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Low/ Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 |
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### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is staff consultation required (Y/N)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Is public consultation required (Y/N)?</th>
<th>Yes with those organisations who work with communities to reduce health inequalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workforce Profile Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>BME:</th>
<th>White:</th>
<th>Other:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation:</th>
<th>Where known:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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A8: Public Health programme review (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Review (II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorates affected by proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short summary of proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,153.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,153.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?  
| DSG | HRA |
| No | 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

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 outlined in this proforma for further re-allocation will have a direct impact on service delivery of public health programmes. Any re-allocation in other areas of council spend must have an equally clear public health outcome..

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.

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.

Substance misuse services (which are funded from part of the ring fenced budget) have been reviewed separately.

Saving proposal description

Disinvestments identified here are in addition to the previously identified £1.5M. A further review of spend has identified a potential further £1.15M.
### 3. Description of service and proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Additional Disinvestments</th>
<th>Total Saving (including initial 1.5M)</th>
<th>Additional Disinvestments proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sexual Health                        | £7,158,727    | £46,000                    | £321,600                              | 1. Reduce sex and relationships funding by half (£20k)  
                                         |               |                            |                                       | 2. Stop funding chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening in GP practices (£26k) |
| NHS Healthchecks                     | £551,300      | £40,000                    | £157,800                              | 1. Reduction in funding available to support IT infrastructure for NHS healthchecks |
| Health Protection                    | £35,300       | £-                         | £12,500                               | No further savings proposed       |
| Public Health Advice to CCG          | £79,200       | £-                         | £19,200                               | No further saving proposed        |
| Obesity/physical activity            | £650,000      | £81,000                    | £173,400                              | 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                              | 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                              | 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                               | 1. Reduce capacity/funding for breast feeding peer support programme & breast feeding 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                     |               |                            | £547,000                              |                                   |
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3. Description of service and proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(uncommitted)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£14,995,000</td>
<td>£1,153,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Financial support for the delivery of sex and relationships education would be reduced by half. Previously identified Disinvestments include an efficiency saving which reduces the funding available to the Lewisham and Greenwich Trust to deliver sexual health services. A London wide sexual health transformation programme is being developed in partnership with 20 boroughs, which in the longer term is expected to deliver savings against sexual health services budgets. Any further savings committed before this programme is implemented are likely to jeopardise the delivery of the programme. For this reason further sexual health savings previously put forward have now been withdrawn.

Changes proposed here may 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. This situation will therefore require monitoring.

**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 but will be reorganised to improve its efficiency.

**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 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, there has been no spending
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4. Impact of proposal

commitments on Dental Public Health Promotion for the past two years. 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. PH will however continue to fund a dental health infection control function and a dental public health programme delivered by Lambeth and Southwark Public Health. 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 healthcheck 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 25% 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 work across the borough unless the reduction is accompanied by a service redesign. The LGHT who currently manage this programme have indicated a willingness to work collaboratively to redesign and position this service within the community. It is envisaged that this will lead to efficiencies and better coordination with other community based provision. Further Disinvestments would come from reducing warm homes funding and area based health improvement programmes (which have been shown locally to improve health outcomes). It will be essential therefore to ensure that the best elements of those programmes are not lost.

A number of organisations are funded to work with communities to reduce health inequalities. There is a risk that reducing funding to these organisations could 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 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
APPENDIX 6b – Proposal for saving A8

4. Impact of proposal

Breastfeeding mothers is likely to extend beyond the breastfeeding 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 without impacting the work of the child death review function 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 what 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.

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 embedded in other services which access similar populations, but with reduced funding available across the sector it is likely the impact will be felt in other parts of the system.

Any reinvestments identified must be spent in line with the requirements of the Public Health Allocation. Once the Health Premiums are developed an inability to deliver on public health outcomes may have an adverse effect on income which could be available to the borough.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Wards</th>
<th>If individual Wards, please state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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 |
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7. Human Resources

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

Within this savings proposal, 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female: 15</th>
<th>Male: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME: 7</td>
<td>White: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Detail of Savings Proposals**

1.1 The Public Health programmes which transferred to Lewisham Council in April 2013 have all been reviewed. This review identified an initial £1.5M of savings which could be delivered largely through efficiencies and using the uplift applied to the public health budget in 2014/15. A further disinvestment of £1.15M was also identified, although it was acknowledged that this was likely to have some negative impact unless the service delivery models were re-configured, subsequent savings identified in provider overheads and on costs, and there was a commitment from schools to both engage in health improvement programmes and contribute financially.

1.2 The savings proposals are presented in table 1 below.
Table 1 – Savings Public Health Savings Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sexual Health                | £7,158,727   | £321,600     | 3. Re-negotiation of costs for sexually transmitted infection testing with LGT in 2015/16, including application of a standard 1.5% deflator to the contract value as an efficiency saving, and inclusion of laboratory costs in the overall contract (£275.6k).
4. Reduce sex and relationships (SRE) funding and develop a health improvement package that schools can purchase that includes SRE co-ordinated and supported by school nursing (£20k)
5. Remove incentive funding for chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening in GP practices (£26k) | In the short to medium term the development of a neighbourhood model of sexual health provision will lead to improved services. In the longer term a London wide sexual health transformation programme is being developed in partnership with 20 boroughs, which is expected to deliver greater benefit at reduced costs. | The risk would be that LGT cannot deliver the same level of service within reduced funding, and GPs disengage with sexual health. Mitigation includes work with primary care to deliver sexual health services in pharmacy & GP practices, and free training given to GPs and practice nurses. The risk is that SRE is not delivered in schools. Mitigation includes |
### APPENDIX 6c – Report for savings A6 & A8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHS Health checks</td>
<td>£551,300</td>
<td>£157,800</td>
<td>2. Removing Health checks facilitator post 3. Pre-diabetes intervention will not be rolled out 4. Reduced budget for blood tests due to lower take up for health checks than previously assumed 5. Reducing GP advisor time to the programme 6. Reduction in funding available to support IT infrastructure for NHS health checks</td>
<td>An essential component of the NHS Healthchecks programme is delivered through the Community Health Improvement Service. See proposed re-commissioning and service re-design under</td>
<td>developing a health improvement package that schools can purchase that includes SRE, and work with school nursing to support schools to provide quality SRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Programme Area</td>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>Total Saving</td>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>Service re-design where applicable</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Protection</td>
<td>£35,300</td>
<td>£12,500</td>
<td>Stop sending the recall letter for childhood immunisations (as this is already done via GPs)</td>
<td>‘health inequalities’ below.</td>
<td>commissioning of NHS Health Checks with Neighbourhoods will help to optimise the efficiency and effectiveness of resources and may identify more people at risk earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Advice to CCG</td>
<td>£79,200</td>
<td>£19,200</td>
<td>Decommissioning diabetes and cancer GP champion posts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>These posts will be commissioned by the CCG in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Decommission Hoops4health (£27,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a risk of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Programme Area</td>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>Total Saving</td>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>Service re-design where applicable</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| physical activity           | £650,000     | £173,400     | 7. Changing delivery of Let’s Get Moving GP & Community physical activity training (£5,000) 
8. Decommissioning Physical Activity in Primary Schools (£50,000) 
9. Reduce funding for community development nutritionist (£30k) 
10. Remove funding for obesity/ healthy eating resources (£10K) 
11. Withdraw of funding for clinical support to Downham Nutritional Project (£9k) 
12. Efficiency savings from child weight management programmes. (£12k) 
13. Reduce physical activity for health checks programme (£20k) | reduction of physical activity in schools. Mitigation includes Schools being encouraged to use their physical activity premium to continue programmes selected from a recommended menu of evidence based activities. The risk is a reduction in support to voluntary sector healthy eating and nutrition programmes. Mitigation includes |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dental public health</strong></td>
<td>£64,500</td>
<td>£44,500</td>
<td>Release funding from dental public health programmes</td>
<td>Dental public health services commissioned by NHS England</td>
<td>organisations being encouraged to build delivery into their mainstream funding programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Mental Health**           | £93,400      | £59,200      | 1. Withdraw funding for clinical input to Sydenham Gardens  
2. Reduce funding available for mental health promotion and wellbeing initiatives (including training) | | The risk is that Sydenham Gardens is unable to sustain clinical input from grant funding, but it is agreed to direct them to alternative funding sources. The risk is a reduction in mental |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£88,000</td>
<td>£58,000</td>
<td>3. Decommission Health Promotion library service 4. Limit health improvement training offer to those areas which support mandatory public health services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>health awareness training across the borough. Mitigation includes pooling resources with neighbouring boroughs for delivery of training and work closely with voluntary sector and SLAM to deliver mental health awareness training and campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Programme Area</td>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>Total Saving</td>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>Service re-design where applicable</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Health inequalities         | £1,460,019   | £581,500     | 6. Reconfiguring LRMN Health Access services to deliver efficiencies (£21,500)  
7. Remove separate public health funding stream to VAL (£28,000)  
8. Decommissioning FORVIL Vietnamese Health Project (£29,000)  
9. Reducing funding for Area Based Programmes (£40,000)  
10. Decommissioning CAB Money Advice in 12 GP surgeries (£148,000)  
11. Reduce the contract value for community health improvement service with LGT by limiting service to support mandatory Public health programmes such as NHS Health Checks only and reduce other health inequalities activity. (£270k) | It is proposed to integrate a number of community based health improvement programmes, including those funded by the GLA (e.g. Bellingham Well London) with the health and social care activities currently being developed in these neighbourhoods by | The risk is reduced capacity across the system to tackle health inequalities, and a reduction in service for the most vulnerable., Mitigation includes working with the Adult integrated Care Programme to deliver a neighbourhood model for health outcomes. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Further reduce funding for area based public health initiatives which are focused on geographical areas of poor health with in the borough. (£20k)</td>
<td>the Community Connections team, District Nurses, Community Health Improvement Service, Social Workers and GPs. There is also a plan to develop a stronger partnership working with Registered Social Landlords as well as any local regeneration projects in each of these neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>inequalities work, and develop local capacity. It is anticipated that basing these services directly in the community and with greater integration will accommodate the funding reduction. Voluntary organisations will have an opportunity to continue some of this work in a different way through the grant aid programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Reduce funding for ‘warm homes’ (£25K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reduce contract value for stop smoking</td>
<td>There are</td>
<td>There is a risk of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smoking and</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reduce contract value for stop smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tobacco Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tobacco Control             | £860,300     | £348,500     | 5. Stop most schools and young people’s tobacco awareness programmes  
                           |              |              | 6. Decommission work to stop illegal sales | proposals to re-configure the stop smoking service as part of the neighbourhood developments described under ‘health inequalities’ above. | reduction in number of people able to access stop smoking support and an increase in young people starting smoking if services are not reconfigured appropriately.  
                           |              |              | service at LGT by £250k (30%) | Mitigation includes optimising efficiencies in the delivery of the SSS and reducing the length of time smokers are supported from 12 to 6 weeks to release capacity. Schools will be able to fund some of the peer |
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## Public Health Programme Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education non-smoking programmes as part of the menu of programmes. The restructuring of enforcement services is likely to allow tackling illegal sales of tobacco in a more integrated way with the same outcomes and prevent young people having access to illegal tobacco.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be less opportunity to learn from and improve services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maternal and child health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£187,677</td>
<td>£68,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Reducing sessional funding commitment for Designated Consultant for Child Death Review
4. Reduce capacity for child death review process by reducing sessional commitment of child death liaison nurse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Removal of budget for school nursing input into TNG</td>
<td></td>
<td>for families which have been bereaved, but this is not the purpose of the panel and there will be no impact on prevention of child deaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Reduce capacity/funding for breast feeding peer support programme &amp; breast feeding cafes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The school nursing service received grant funding of £250k in 2014/15 which has not been reduced, and the service will be able to accommodate input into TNG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a risk that women will be less well supported to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public Health Programme Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>breast feed and Lewisham may not achieve UNICEF/WHO Baby Friendly status in 2015. Mitigation will include re-negotiating support through the maternity services contract, although this may not be achievable in time for 2015 contracts. Baby café licences may be re-negotiated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department efficiencies</td>
<td>£262,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be identified through a staff restructure in 2015. At this point public health staff terms and conditions and pay scales are to be harmonised with council staff terms and conditions and pay scales.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>£547,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Programme Area</td>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>Total Saving</td>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>Service re-design where applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplift (uncommitted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£14,995,000</td>
<td>£2653,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6c – Report for savings A6 and A8

2. **Recommendation/s**

   Mayor and Cabinet is recommended to:

   2.1.1 Note the response to the consultation process by Lewisham CCG, note the commentary by the Director of Public Health, and agree the budget accordingly.

3. **Background**

3.1 The public health budget is ring fenced until at least the end of 2015/2016. 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.

3.2 Where savings have been identified from the current public health budget these will be used to support public health outcomes in other areas of the Council. The guiding principle for the re-investment will be to support areas where reductions in council spend will have an adverse impact on public health outcomes. The approach to identifying savings has been:

   1) To identify any duplication with aspects of other council roles which can therefore be combined or streamlined.

   2) To identify any service which should more appropriately be carried out by other health partners.

   3) To stop providing service level agreements or incentive payments to individual GP practices and develop those services more efficiently and equitably across the four GP neighbourhood clusters where appropriate.

   4) To gain greater efficiency through contract pricing where applicable.

   5) To integrate public health grants to the voluntary sector into the Council's mainstream grant aid programme.

3.3 The savings achieved would then be re-invested into other areas of council spend which impact on public health outcomes. Any re-allocation in other areas of council spend must have an equal or greater public health impact. These areas have not yet been identified.

3.4 The programmes where savings 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
3.5 Substance misuse services (which are funded from part of the ring fenced grant) have been reviewed separately and are accounted for in the crime reduction proposed savings.

3.6 It is proposed that the London Borough of Lewisham, as the commissioner of these services, will work closely with the provider of services on planned service re-configuration, in order to mitigate the impact of any service changes, maximise the efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery and to optimise value for money.

4. Consultation Undertaken and Results

4.1 The consultation was undertaken with Lewisham CCG and was not a public consultation.

4.2 The savings proposals have been considered by: The Children & Young People’s Select Committee, The Healthier Communities Select Committee, and the Public Accounts Committee during a pre-consultation phase in autumn 2014.

4.3 The savings proposals have also been discussed at partnership meetings with the CCG and Lewisham and Greenwich Trust.

4.4 The CCG received the consultation document by email and was given 2 weeks to respond on the Public Health savings proposals.

4.5 The responses to the consultation were reported to the Healthier Communities Select Committee which oversaw the consultation process, and to the Health & Wellbeing Board.

4.6 Lewisham CCG responded to the consultation on the Public Health savings proposals on 29th December 2014 (see Appendix 1). In doing so, the CCG considered the impact of the proposals on its own plans and against a number of overarching criteria:

- Commissioning that is population-based
- Equitable access
- Tackling health inequalities
- The aims or goals of our joint commissioning intentions
- Stronger communities for adult integrated care and for children and young people

4.7 The CCG highlighted a number of general issues and then commented specifically on each public health programme in relation to the savings proposals. Both the general and specific responses are reported below, with a commentary by the Director of Public Health on each response.

a. Highlighted Issues

i. The CCG responded - “Given the importance of health improvement and prevention, and its prominence in our local Health and Wellbeing Strategy and nationally in the NHS ‘Five Year Forward View’, we are concerned that money is being taken away from the current public health budget priorities without a comprehensive assessment of the implications on health outcomes and inequalities.”
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ii. DPH commentary – the proposed disinvestments in current public health initiatives were prioritised for disinvestment on the basis that these initiatives would result in the least loss of public health benefit per pound spent when compared across all current public health investments. In this way the likelihood that re-investment in other areas of current council spend will result in equal or greater public health outcome and reduction in inequalities is maximised; however, it is acknowledged that a full and comprehensive assessment of the implications of this re-allocation of funds cannot be undertaken until the areas for investment have been identified.

iii. The CCG responded – “In reviewing the proposals our response on their impact is necessarily restricted by the absence of details from the council of how monies will be reinvested.”

iv. DPH commentary – this is covered in the above DPH response.

v. The CCG responded – “Overall we would expect that the savings proposals are accompanied by redesign of services so that they will achieve positive health impacts, and that any changes are monitored accordingly to ensure that the expected benefits are realised“.

vi. DPH commentary – Much of the mitigation of potential negative impacts on public health outcomes arising from the proposed savings is predicated on successful re-design and re-configuration of commissioned services. The council public health department intends to monitor closely the changes and fully expects to be asked to provide regular update reports to the relevant scrutiny committees and the Health & Wellbeing Board.

vii. The CCG responded – “The need for voluntary organisations that previously accessed public health grants to be supported to access the council’s mainstream grant programme.”

viii. DPH commentary – the council has already ensured that those voluntary organisations that previously accessed public health grants can now access the council’s mainstream grant programme.

ix. The CCG responded – “The criteria that you will use to identify substantial development or variation in service should be made available as soon as possible.”

x. DPH commentary – the council agrees with this response.

xi. The CCG responded – “Assessments of equalities implications should be carried out and made available at the outset of the savings programme.”

xii. DPH commentary – the council has already undertaken an initial equalities assessment and these are described in the savings proposal; however, as has been acknowledged above a comprehensive assessment can only be carried out once the re-investment plans and the impact of service re-configurations are known.

xiii. The CCG responded – “The areas of greatest concern are proposals that have negative impacts on smoking reduction and health inequalities.”

xiv. DPH commentary – the DPH shares these concerns. Smoking is still the single largest cause of health inequalities within Lewisham and between Lewisham and the England
average for premature mortality. The proposals as they stand look to re-configure how smoking services are organised. They will essentially be integrated into the neighbourhood model of working which should give a more comprehensive use of staff resources and reduce the current level of overhead costs. If however, these proposals were not successfully implemented then consideration would need to be given to re-instating this level of funding. The DPH will be monitoring the progress of these proposals and will be able to provide a further progress report. The illegal tobacco sales work has been supported by public health funding and consideration will need to be given by the new enforcement service as to how this work should be continued. Smoking cessation will continue to be a priority for public health and new funding sources will be pursued to test new initiatives.

xv. Lewisham’s Community Outreach NHS Checks team, commissioned from the Lewisham & Greenwich Trust Community Health Improvement Service, won the Heart UK Team of the Year award in 2014. It is envisaged that these services will be reconfigured with less overheads as part of the neighbourhood working but again this needs to be monitored.

xvi. Area based health improvement programmes have been shown locally to improve health outcomes and have been identified as an example of best practice by the GLA Well London Programme. The council has successfully leveraged extra resources, including from the GLA, to extend the work that has been shown to be effective in Bellingham and North Lewisham to Lewisham Central and Downham.

b. Service specific responses

i. Sexual Health: the CCG responded – “As the lead commissioner the CCG will advise the council as its agent in the proposed contract renegotiation with LGT. Public Health will be fully involved in the appropriate contracting forum. Further detail is required about how sexual health services will be delivered through a neighbourhood model. The CCG would seek assurance that the health improvement package will be taken up by schools if the SRE funding is reduced. Where some services have been provided on a limited pilot basis we support the move to enable a wider population coverage. Where incentive funding is withdrawn from GP practices we need to take into account the total impact from all the proposed changes. The CCG Medicines Management team can provide professional advice in the further development of pharmacy needs assessment.”

ii. DPH commentary – the council acknowledges and appreciates the CCG’s role as lead commissioner with LGT, and its desire to involve public health fully in the contracting process. The CCG will be kept fully appraised of sexual health service re-configuration within the neighbourhood model as plans emerge. The council would welcome the CCG’s help and support to influence and persuade schools of the benefits of taking up the health improvement packages, in particular SRE. The council would also welcome the CCG’s support in jointly assessing the impact of any funding withdrawal from GP practices, and the continued support of the Medicines Management Team in the pharmacy needs assessment.

iii. NHS Health Checks: the CCG responded – “We agree with the highlighted risks concerning the pre-diabetes intervention. This may have an impact on the CCG’s plans for long-term conditions, for risk stratification and around variation in primary care. The removal of the Health Checks facilitator post and reduction of GP advisor time may mean that the focus is on maintenance rather than the continuing
development of the programme. We support the continuing integration of the pharmacy into the neighbourhood resources to deliver the health checks programme. Further detail is required about how health checks will be delivered through a neighbourhood model to achieve efficiency and effectiveness."

iv. DPH commentary – the council would welcome the CCG’s financial support to invest in diabetes prevention alongside public health investment in the NHS Health Checks programme in line with NHS England’s recently published five year forward view operational plan for 2015-16. The CCG will be kept fully appraised of the NHS Health Checks service re-configuration within the neighbourhood model as plans emerge.

v. Health Protection: the CCG responded – “We acknowledge that this service has not been proven to be a cost effective intervention. “

vi. DPH commentary – the council welcomes the CCG’s acknowledgement.

vii. Public Health Advice to CCG: the CCG responded – “We will adopt responsibility for the Diabetes and cancer GP champion posts from April 2015.”

viii. DPH commentary – the council welcomes the CCG’s adoption of this responsibility.

ix. Obesity / Physical Activity: the CCG responded – “This area is a Health & Wellbeing Board priority. As with the reduced SRE funding, we would seek assurance that the health improvement package will be taken up by schools, and where some services have been provided on a limited pilot basis we support the move to enable a wider population coverage. The reduction in funding for the community nutritionist and withdrawal of clinical support may mean that the focus is on maintenance rather than the continuing development of the programme. This is an area that should be part of a whole programme approach to neighbourhood development. “

x. DPH commentary – please see 6.3.6 and 6.4.2 above.

xi. Dental Public Health: the CCG responded – “This may represent a missed developmental opportunity to improve dental health particularly for children and young people.”

xii. DPH commentary – the DPH shares this concern, but the reality is that this budget has not been spent for several years prior to the transfer of public health to the local authority, and there has been no expenditure in 2013-14 or 2014-15. The number of decayed, missing and filled teeth at the age of five is one of the few measures of children’s health on which Lewisham has done consistently well. The council will continue to monitor this performance indicator which is based on a national survey.

xiii. Mental Health: the CCG responded – “We recognise the potential benefits of pooling resources with other neighbourhoods but need to highlight the potential difficulties inherent in working across multiple organisations and sectors that may make this difficult to achieve.”

xiv. DPH commentary – the council also recognises the potential difficulties and challenges of working with other boroughs and organisations but also recognises the need to overcome these challenges.
xv. Health Improvement Training: the CCG responded – “This area has a potential impact on achievement of the ‘Every Contact Counts’ strategy. This will need to be mitigated further through additional development via HESL resourcing, development of neighbourhood teams, and SEL Workforce Supporting Strategy.”

xvi. DPH commentary – the council welcomes these suggestions for further mitigation of potential impact on achieving ‘Every Contact Counts’ and would welcome the CCG’s support in leveraging resources from HESL and from the SEL workforce supporting strategy.

xvii. Health Inequalities: the CCG responded – “We support the neighbourhood model as an integral part of the integration programme. But investment and implementation requirements should be defined that support the development of the four hub approach, in particular how they will address health inequalities where services are decommissioned, such as the money advice service which can be an important enabling factor in supporting health improvement. We support changes to a whole neighbourhood approach away from specific groups, and building community capacity to tackle inequalities; again, this may require further resources to ensure continuing support to vulnerable population groups. Where there are proposed changes to the LGT contract these must be assessed for their impact and likely success for linking to the neighbourhood model. We recognise the mitigation in respect of the ‘warm homes’ funding but seek assurance that this will be strong enough.”

xviii. DPH commentary – please see 6.3.6, 6.3.8, 6.3.15, and 6.3.16 above.

xix. Smoking & Tobacco Control: the CCG responded – “Both the local and SEL JSNAs identify the impact of smoking on mortality rates, inequalities and QALYs. The CCG has identified smoking quitters as one of its local quality premium outcomes. This is therefore an area of considerable importance for local population health and the CCG. As with other aspects of the LGT contract, the CCG will advise the council as its lead commissioner in the proposed contract renegotiation. Public Health will be fully involved in the appropriate contracting forum. Further detail is required about how efficiencies in the stop smoking service will be achieved without reducing its effectiveness.”

xx. DPH commentary – please see 6.3.14 above.

xxi. Maternal & Child Health: the CCG responded – “Recognising that change to the sessional commitments of the child death liaison nurse will not prevent its delivery of the main purpose of the role, there may be an impact on support for bereaved families which may need to be provided or commissioned differently. We have significant concerns about the reduction in support to breastfeeding cafés and peer support and the possible impact on our UNICEF status. This is an identified priority for the CCG and for SEL. While the peer support proposal is actually a reduction in the supporting infrastructure so should not have an impact, the support for the cafés could. But if this can be maintained for a further 6 months and alternative can be put in place this may avoid a negative impact.”

xxii. DPH commentary – the council welcomes the CCG’s view that support for bereaved families may need to be provided or commissioned differently. The DPH also shares the CCG’s concerns that disinvestment in breastfeeding peer support and breastfeeding cafes may jeopardise Lewisham’s final stage submission to achieve the highly prestigious UNICEF baby friendly status, after successfully completing stages one and
two. The council may wish to consider extending funding for these initiatives for at least 6 months, but this would mean that the level of anticipated savings would not be achieved in 2015-16.

xxiii. Department Efficiencies: the CCG responded – “We would seek assurance that any revised structures or functions can deliver our agreed memorandum of understanding (MOU) of PH support to the CCG, for instance by freeing up time for PH consultants and intelligence support, and working with us around the commissioning cycle. A clear, agreed work plan will be essential to realise delivery of this service. “

xxiv. DPH commentary – the council can provide reassurance that any revised structures or functions will be designed to deliver the council’s mandatory responsibilities to provide public health support to CCG commissioning. The council has already advertised for a public health intelligence officer at a higher grade and salary than the equivalent NHS grade and salary of the previous post holder. A clear work plan will be agreed with the CCG for 2015-16.

5. Financial implications

5.1 Failure to meet the health and wellbeing strategic objectives, particularly in relation to child health and wellbeing, obesity in adults and children, and maintaining the health and independence of older people, could result in additional financial burdens being placed upon health and social care services in the short, medium and long term.

6. Legal implications

6.1 The Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group was consulted on these proposals. Their response is included in this paper, together with proposed mitigating actions.

6.2 The Public Health budget is ring fenced. Local authorities have a high level of discretion regarding allocation of resources against the key public health outcomes, subject to consultation.

7. Equalities Implications

7.1 Sexual health
Possible impact: The removal of the GP incentive scheme may decrease access to the chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening programme for young people 15-24 years old through GP practices. An online screening service is available and clinics will continue to provide this service, minimising the impact of this saving. Most screening currently takes place in clinics.

The savings are not expected to have impact on other protected characteristics, as access to clinics which particularly meet the needs of LGBT groups, young people and those with learning disability will be maintained. The needs of specific BME groups in relation to sexual health are being addressed through the wider Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham Sexual Health strategy.

7.2 NHS Health Checks
No impact: This programme has been successful in reaching the high risk African and African-Caribbean population, however, the proposed disinvestment is based on
efficiency savings and therefore unlikely to affect access to services and have an impact on equalities.

7.3 **Health protection**
No impact: the funded letter was not an effective way to improve uptake of immunisations and will have no impact.

7.4 **Public Health Advice to CCG**
No impact: The diabetes and cancer GP champion posts will be funded by the CCG.

7.5 **Dental Public Health**
No impact: most of the resource in this area relates to children and young people and infection control from communicable diseases, however the proposed disinvestment is unlikely to impact on these groups as they are largely derived from efficiency savings.

7.6 **Health Inequalities**
Possible impact: A number of organisations are funded to work with communities to reduce health inequalities and there may be an impact on the populations they serve, some of whom face poorer health outcomes than the rest of the population.

Mitigating actions include: working with the Adult integrated Care Programme to deliver a neighbourhood model for health inequalities work, and develop local capacity. It is anticipated that basing these services directly in the community and with greater integration will accommodate the funding reduction; Voluntary organisations will have an opportunity to continue some of this work in a different way through the grant aid programme, the North Lewisham Participatory budgeting programme and through the Well London Programme, where there is opportunity for drawing in external resources that will support community based health improvement hubs in the north and south of the borough.

7.7 **Mental Health (adults and children)**
No impact: neither of the service disinvestments relate to service provision. Disinvestment in clinical support to the Sydenham Gardens project will not impact on front line activity. Training of front line staff in mental health awareness will be re-provided in conjunction with neighbouring boroughs.

7.8 **Maternal and Child Health**
Possible impact: There is scope for a reduction of the funding of the Designated Consultant for Child Death Review by one third without impacting the work of the child death review function, however a reduction in the sessional commitment of the child death liaison nurse, will reduce capacity regarding what can be done to improve support for bereaved parents in the borough and this will be monitored carefully.

The reduction in support to breastfeeding cafés and peer support and the possible impact on our UNICEF status is likely to impact on young people and people with lower socio-economic status as they have lower rates of breast feeding than the general population. However the service is committed to continuing to retain the UNICEF status.

7.9 **Obesity/Physical Activity**
Possible impact: There is an association between obesity and deprivation, therefore people on low incomes could potentially be more affected by the disinvestment, however there are a number of proposed mitigating actions including re-configuring
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community initiatives on physical activity and healthy eating; securing funding from schools and encouraging capacity through area based initiatives small grants programmes (see 7.6).

7.10 **Smoking and Tobacco Control**
Possible impact: Smoking prevalence is higher among people on low incomes, LGBT groups and people with mental health problems, therefore any disinvestment in this area is likely to have an impact on equalities.

Mitigating actions include securing funding from schools for the peer education programme; working with SE London boroughs on illegal sales of tobacco; and redesigning some Stop Smoking Services to be aligned with the Neighbourhood/hub model.

7.11 **Training and Education.**
No impact: The library was intended to support staff with health promotion role in Lewisham. Key staff now have access through their employing organisations electronically and this service is no longer required. Health Improvement Training to support mandatory and other public health functions, will continue within the constraints of the reduced budget.

If there are any queries on this report please contact Dr Danny Ruta, Director of Public Health, 020 8314 ext 49094.
A – Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

Savings proposals A9 is presented here. It is:

A9 Review of services to support people to live at home

This appendix presents the individual saving proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Healthier Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
7a A9 Proposal
7b A9 M&C report
**APPENDIX 7a – Proforma for saving A9**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review of services to support people to live at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Financial information

#### 2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure £000’s</th>
<th>Income £000’s</th>
<th>Net Budget £000’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,610.8</td>
<td>(770.2)</td>
<td>1840.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Total 2015/16-2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Proforma covers four services (Linkline, Special Duty, Enablement Care and Sheltered Floating Support Services). These teams provide services that help people live independently in their own homes.

---

**a) The Sheltered Housing Floating Support Team supports vulnerable adults to live independently. The support includes assistance with budgeting, claiming benefits and ensuring people are safe and secure in their properties for example identifying trip hazards. This does not include personal care.**

---

**b) The Enablement Care Team work with people being discharged from hospital or people who are at high risk of being admitted to hospital. Enablement is about helping people to become more independent and improve their quality of life. Enablement is different from traditional homecare, the focus is on helping people to learn or relearn skills to maintain independence. For example, when people have acquired a disability, it helps them rebuild confidence in making a meal or hot drink, getting out of bed, moving about and doing it yourself especially after spell in hospital. The main benefit is that it encourages people to become more independent and can reduce the need for more intensive higher cost care or residential services.**

---

**c) The Special Duty Team provide a rapid response so that older or more vulnerable services users can be discharged from hospital safely. The Team ensures that properties are cleaned, de-cluttered habitable and safe to occupy so that care can take place in the home.**

---

**d) The Linkline service is a community alarm service that monitors people at home who are vulnerable and at risk of falls. Sensors and pull cords are installed in the service user’s home, and are monitored 24/7. The service is split into staff who monitor the alarm system and staff who go to the person’s home if an urgent response is needed.**
3. Description of service and proposal

Saving proposal description

This following proposal seeks to make better use of existing staffing resources and supports the further integration of services. These services focus on keeping people independent and in their own homes, minimising hospital stays, wrapping services around the person and employing the right skills, in the right place at the right time.

**Sheltered Floating Support Service.** Sheltered Housing and Extra Care Housing provision has been reviewed in recent years. This review has resulted in the development of new Extra Care Housing Services in the borough and the current consultation on existing Extra Care schemes. With Housing colleagues, we are assessing the long term housing and support needs for older people and developing options for future delivery. This work will take into account existing external housing and support providers and look at developing different models of delivery. Possible models include aligning this service to similar housing support services that are provided externally. Discussions are currently taking place with other RSL providers to continue developing this proposal.

**Linkline (Community Alarm Service).** The proposal is to separate out the alarm monitoring function from the response function. The call monitoring function (answering the telephone calls) can be delivered through alternative providers/mechanisms.

It is intended to integrate the Linkline Response Service and the Special Duty Team into the Reablement Care Team. This will create a home response service that will wrap the most appropriate support around the person in their home. It allows the flexibility for rapid response 24 hour / 365 days a year.

The savings will be delivered through:

1. An alternative delivery model for floating support and Linkline, which will include consideration of the use of external providers.
2. Introducing a charging model for floating support linked to rents.
4. Reduction in management and monitoring staff.

The enablement care team has recently been reorganised and goes live on 3rd November 2014. The posts that are currently being covered by agency staff are now being advertised and permanent recruitment is underway.

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 proposal will impact on staff within all four service areas and will require full staff consultation.

As service users will continue to receive these services, the impact will be neutral except where there is a proposal to introduce a charge. Changes to charging policies are subject to full consultation.

However, the intention is to make access to services easier, and align services that support the prevention and early intervention programme. It is expected that this would have a positive effect on service users.

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

There are no anticipated risks to services users as the services will still be provided. Any charging implications will be consulted on as part of the fairer charging policy, that will takes peoples personal circumstances into account.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:
### Impact on Corporate Priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>B. Young people’s achievement and involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact of saving on corporate priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

#### 5. Service Equalities Impact

- What is the expected impact on equalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Low/ Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/ Belief</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/ Maternity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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)

*(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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female: 55</th>
<th>Male: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME: 34</td>
<td>White: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation:</th>
<th>Where known:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Proposal

1.1 The savings proposals initially outlined last year focused on restructuring staffing arrangements and realigning back office and management functions within the Council. As discussions on the further integration of services between the Adult Social Care, Housing, health and other providers have taken place it has become clear that further consideration is required to determine the new model of service delivery.

1.2 It is proposed that this saving be achieved by establishing a new model of revenue funding for support that ties in with new investment in sheltered accommodation and which also ensures consistency in the delivery of integrated health and social care support to older people in different housing settings.

2. Recommendation

2.1 The Mayor is asked to note that the work to develop and agree a new whole system model that will require services across health and social care to integrate further is still underway. It is therefore likely that any proposed model will also require formal consultation with service users and implementation of any new model is unlikely to be agreed until later in the next financial year 15/16. The detail on the proposed model will be presented to the Mayor for decision during 15/16. In the meantime, we will look to cover the slippage of the full saving within existing resources.

3. Background

3.1 The approach to the review of housing and care for older people has focused on:

- the quality and appropriateness of sheltered accommodation; the quality of specialist housing for those older people who require it; the investment in the Council’s Sheltered Housing accommodation and exploring different models of revenue funding for sheltered accommodation. This proposal will aim to deliver a model of revenue funding for support that ties in with new investment in sheltered accommodation whilst ensuring support is aimed at the most vulnerable.
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- As part of our work to integrate services across health and social care we are reviewing the current services which include Linkline, Enablement, Special Duty and Sheltered Floating Support Services.

3.2 The aim of these services are to support people to remain in their own home and Partnership work is in progress with Lewisham Greenwich hospital trust (LGHT) and the CCG to develop an approach that further integrates services across health and social care within the community. The proposal seeks to minimise hospital stays and prevent admissions to hospital by wrapping services around the person and employing the right skills, in the right place at the right time.

4. EAA and other Equals Implications

4.1 A full EAA will be completed when the details of the model have been finalised.

5. Legal

5.1 There are no specific legal implications at this time.

6. Author and Contact Details

Joan Hutton, Head of Adult Assessment and Care Management. Tel: 0208 314 6304 or by email joan.hutton@lewisham.gov.uk
APPENDIX 8 – Proposal and report for saving B1

B – Supporting People

Savings proposals B1 is presented here. It is:

B1 Reduction and remodelling of Supporting People housing and floating support

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Healthier Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
8a B1 Proposal
8b B1 M&C report
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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** | The savings across supported housing and floating support services 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 review of mental health services across the board lends itself to changes in what is currently commissioned via the SP programme. |
| | This will involve a range of decommissioning/ re-commissioning/ closing units and identifying different provision. |
| | • 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 respond to low level needs for older people, those with learning disabilities, single adults and young people. |

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget: 12,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Inclusion: 8,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Learning Disabilities: 3,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure£000’s</th>
<th>Income£000’s</th>
<th>Net Budget£000’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,792</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>12,792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

This paper covers the review of all housing related support activities

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.

In Lewisham, housing-related support is delivered by a number of service providers to clients with a range of needs.
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### 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
4. Impact of proposal

accommodation based services. This removal of service will be targeted to ensure that those with most needs will still remove 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Households becoming homeless | *Any losses to the floating support service will carry increased risk of more households becoming homeless*

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.

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.

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.

| 2. Impact on statutory services/temporary accommodation/residential care | *Loss of hostel bed spaces will inevitably lead to pressure elsewhere within council resources.*

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.

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
4. Impact of proposal

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.

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 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.

3. Increased risk of safeguarding cases and services failure

Further reductions in funding my impact on staff quality and morale to such an extent that service users are put at risk

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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.

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
### 4. Impact of proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. A rise in rough sleeping</th>
<th>Numbers of people living on the streets in Lewisham will rise significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is likely if reduced floating support services to help maintain tenancies 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. A rise in Anti Social Behaviour on the streets</th>
<th>Anti social behaviour on the streets in Lewisham may rise significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many of the individuals supported by housing related support services have a history of anti-social behaviour including begging, street-drinking and petty theft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Financial Viability</th>
<th>Remaining services become financially unsustainable for providers and they withdraw from provision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Priority – Most Relevant</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Priority</td>
<td>Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Wards</th>
<th>If individual Wards, please state:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x – for individual reductions rather than overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is staff consultation required (Y/N)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Is public consultation required (Y/N)?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Human Resources

#### Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME:</td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations

1.1 The Mayor and Cabinet are recommended to:

- approve the approach to realise savings of £2,523,000 from area B1 – Supporting People Services based on activity highlighted in tables 1 and 2

- agree that £1,349,000 will be delivered in 2015/16 and a further £1,174,000 in 2016/17

### Overview

2.1 In Lewisham, housing-related support is delivered by a number of service providers to clients with a range of needs. 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 older people, people with mental health problems, drug and alcohol users, women experiencing violence and exploitation, offenders and rough sleepers.

2.2 The savings proposals are to reduce funding to these services by a further £2,523,000 (20% of the budget) over the next two years through a combination of:

- Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity¹
- Reductions in service capacity
- Service closures

---

¹ It is important to note that all staff engaged in service delivery will be paid the London living Wage as a absolute minimum
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2.3 The majority of the savings will be taken from ‘floating support’ services that visit people in their own homes. Currently these services support over 800 people at any one time with up to 1600 supported each year.

2.4 The savings will be delivered through a reduction in individual contract values in the first instance but ultimately through a major reconfiguration exercise to create one large service across the borough rather than the current arrangement of several services each supporting a particular client group.

2.5 It is inevitable that funding reductions of this level will lead to reduced service provision and some people who currently receive support will no longer be supported.

2.6 However, officers believe that through effective consultation and planning with providers, service users and other stakeholders the impact can be kept to a minimum and given the overall financial pressure on the council these are achievable savings.

2.7 The original funding proposals highlighted a series of risks relating to these reductions.

2.8 However, officers are working hard across departments to ensure that the impacts of these reductions are kept to a minimum. Due to these actions officers are confident that the savings can be delivered with the minimum of disruption to services and service users.

2.9 This paper sets out the mitigating actions for these risks (Table 1) as well as for each of the individual reductions (Table 2). Equalities Implications and Impacts are considered individually for each of the planned reductions in Table 2.

3. Feedback from Scrutiny Committee

3.1 These proposals were considered by The Healthier Communities Scrutiny Committee on Wednesday 14 January 2015.

3.2 Members of the committee asked for clarification regarding the role of one of the services listed for a funding reduction but no objections were raised to any of the proposals.

Table 1 – Overarching mitigating actions and principles applied across this area of funding reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. People becoming homeless</td>
<td>The impact of this will be mitigated by targeting the remaining services at those most in need. The majority of the reductions to floating support services will be from 1 April 2016. During 2015/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation actions

- Officers will undertake a full review of the provision and consult on the most appropriate access and referral criteria. This is will be undertaken in partnership with colleagues in housing and other frontline services to identify need.

- The new floating support service(s) to run from 1 April 2016 will have a contract value(s) of c£750,000 per annum which is considered sufficient to provide a service to prevent single people in the borough experiencing homelessness.

- There is also an opportunity to integrate this funding with other areas of council spend to create more efficient and joined up services e.g. within sheltered housing. This will also be explored during 2015/16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9. Impact on statutory services/temporary accommodation/residential care  
*Loss of hostel bed spaces will inevitably lead to pressure elsewhere within council resources.* | Officers considered this risk carefully when drafting proposals and the saving are designed to ensure that there are very few hostel or supported housing spaces closed due to the funding reductions.  
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 order to stabilise their physical health and chaotic behaviour preparing them for a more independent lifestyle.  
In addition to this officers are undertaking a full review of the accommodation support provided to people with Mental Health problems to ensure that this resource is effectively targeted and the most vulnerable individual in the borough have easy and rapid access to in to prevent admissions to hospital or residential care. |
| 10. Increased risk of safeguarding cases and services failure  
*Further reductions in funding my impact on staff quality and morale to such an extent that service users are put at risk* | In order to protect against reduction in the quality of the workforce, decreased morale and increased staff turn-over officers have rejected wholesale ‘salami-slicing’ contracts and looking for continued savings while delivering similar services. |
### APPENDIX 8b – Report for saving B1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instead a range of services which are considered low risk will simply</td>
<td>be ended and fundamental reviews of floating support and MH services will be undertaken to redesign services and procure new contracts against revised outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Increased use of existing hostels by high needs out of borough</td>
<td>As highlighted above the savings proposals have been designed to ensure that very few units of accommodation are lost to the borough. This also ensures that other boroughs do not begin to place high need clients within Lewisham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The loss of buildings currently used as hostel accommodation is in</td>
<td>significant one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A rise in rough sleeping Numbers of people living on the streets</td>
<td>All services are being remodelled to target those most likely to end up sleeping rough or requiring high support services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Lewisham will rise significantly</td>
<td>This includes ensuring that floating support services have effective referrals mechanisms to get to those in need before they lose their accommodation, protecting high support hostels for those that needs them and ensuring there is a ‘Pathway’ of support so services work more effectively and efficiently to move people into independent accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti social behaviour on the streets in Lewisham may rise significantly</td>
<td>Officers also continue to work closely with a range of service in the borough funded through other sources including the ‘No Second Night Out’ Hub and the Bench and Deptford Reach outreach services to ensure that all rough sleepers are housing in accommodation as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A rise in Anti Social Behaviour on the streets Anti social</td>
<td>Again, the reduction of high support services that often contribute to this type of behaviour have been protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour on the streets in Lewisham may rise significantly</td>
<td>Officers are working closely with all providers to ensure that they are financially viable. There are currently a number of mergers taking place across the sector that will mitigate risk for individual providers and officers will continue to undertake market management activity to ensure that individual cuts do not have a cumulative impact on providers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 – Individual consultation/mitigating actions to each individual reduction in this area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Support</td>
<td>Older Person’s Floating Support</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>See table on page 9</td>
<td>This is a 14% reduction in the current contract value and officers are confident that the provider will be able to limit the impact on existing service users through efficiency savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Officers have spoken to senior management at One Support who have indicated that the vast majority of this reduction can be absorbed through efficiency savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>However the reduction may mean that the threshold for the service increases slightly and officers will be undertaking a consultation with stakeholders and affected service users to ensure that any ongoing and future needs are met and the impact of this change is minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further reductions in 2016/17 will be part of a major reconfiguration exercise for floating support services across the borough. There are a number of options for these services which will be subject to a wide ranging consultation with stakeholders and service users during 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full details are of contracts covered under this reconfiguration are listed at table 3 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Support</td>
<td>Mental Health Floating Support</td>
<td>£117,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>This saving involves the merging of this contract with a larger MH accommodation based contract. This makes sense as the majority (60 out of 85) of the current clients live within designated housing units which are essentially longer term supported housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people with mental ill health in their own homes to provide support in a range of areas including rent arrears, budgeting, social isolation, housing issues, anti-social behaviour, medicine compliance etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The merger of these contracts will allow the provider to make significant savings in management and accommodation costs with only a smaller reduction in overall service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookahead</td>
<td>Adults with Learning Disabilities Floating Support</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
<td>See table on page 9</td>
<td>Officers have spoken to senior management at One Support who have indicated that they feel these reductions are achievable with only minimal disruption to the current service provision. Will we consult with the provider and colleagues within the council to ensure that the impact of this change is minimised. All current service users will have their needs assessed and those who are able to move on from the service will be supported to do so. Those with continuing needs will be referred to other services for ongoing support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames Reach</td>
<td><strong>Vulnerable Adults Floating Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>who are able to move on from the service will be supported to do so. Those with ongoing needs will be referred to other services but the overall threshold for services will increase and some may not receive ongoing support. Further reductions in 2016/17 will be part of a major reconfiguration exercise for floating support services across the borough. There are a number of options for these services which will be subject to a wide ranging consultation with stakeholders and service users during 2015/16. Full details are of contracts covered under this reconfiguration are listed at table 3 below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This service is open to all adults across borough in their own homes to provide support in a range of areas including rent arrears, budgeting, social isolation, drug and alcohol misuse, £100,000 (See table on page 9) This is a 14% reduction in the current contract value but the provider has indicated that the vast majority of this saving can be delivered without impact on service capacity due to a recent organisational restructure designed to reduce the costs of their services across London. Officers are conscious that restructures of this type have the potential to impact on service quality due to reduced investment in front line staff, training etc. As such will we consult with the provider and colleagues within the council to ensure that the impact of this change
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames Reach</td>
<td>Generic Supported Housing</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>As above the provider has indicated that the vast majority of this saving can be delivered without impact on service capacity due to a recent organisational restructure designed to reduce the costs of their services across London. Officers are conscious that restructuring of this type have the potential to impact on service quality due to reduced investment in front line staff, training etc. As such will we consult with the provider and colleagues within the council to ensure that the impact of this change is minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further reductions in 2016/17 will be part of a major reconfiguration exercise for floating support services across the borough. There are a number of options for these services which will be subject to a wide ranging consultation with stakeholders and service users during 2015/16.

Full details are of contracts covered under this reconfiguration are listed at table 3 below.

- housing issues, independent living skills, accessing other services etc
- ther issues including drug and/or alcohol misuse, lack of budgeting skills, history of mental health problems etc

is minimised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames Reach</td>
<td>Generic Supported Housing</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>As above the provider has indicated that the vast majority of this saving can be delivered without impact on service capacity due to a recent organisational restructure designed to reduce the costs of their services across London. Officers are conscious that restructuring of this type have the potential to impact on service quality due to reduced investment in front line staff, training etc. As such will we consult with the provider and colleagues within the council to ensure that the impact of this change is minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further reductions in 2016/17 will be part of a major reconfiguration exercise for floating support services across the borough. There are a number of options for these services which will be subject to a wide ranging consultation with stakeholders and service users during 2015/16.

Full details are of contracts covered under this reconfiguration are listed at table 3 below.

- housing issues, independent living skills, accessing other services etc
- ther issues including drug and/or alcohol misuse, lack of budgeting skills, history of mental health problems etc

is minimised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames Reach</td>
<td>Generic Supported Housing</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>As above the provider has indicated that the vast majority of this saving can be delivered without impact on service capacity due to a recent organisational restructure designed to reduce the costs of their services across London. Officers are conscious that restructuring of this type have the potential to impact on service quality due to reduced investment in front line staff, training etc. As such will we consult with the provider and colleagues within the council to ensure that the impact of this change is minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further reductions in 2016/17 will be part of a major reconfiguration exercise for floating support services across the borough. There are a number of options for these services which will be subject to a wide ranging consultation with stakeholders and service users during 2015/16.

Full details are of contracts covered under this reconfiguration are listed at table 3 below.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames Reach</td>
<td>Hostel Diversion Pilot</td>
<td>£37,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The ending of this pilot may lead to people having to enter hostels or supporting housing while they wait for independent accommodation. However, the introduction of the Pathway approach means that any time spent in such accommodation will be kept to a minimum and officers are working with a range of stakeholders to ensure that there is an effective supply of independent ‘move-on’ accommodation available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hestia</td>
<td>Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) Floating Support</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£82,300</td>
<td>This reduction will lead to the closure of the MAPPA floating - clients are low need but high risk and we will need to undertake a full consultation with Police and Probation colleagues to fully understand the impact of this and confirm the proposal for 2016/17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrepoint</td>
<td>Young People’s Assessment Centre</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>This reduction will end a ‘payment by results’ element to the service designed to support more individuals into independent living. While the saving may reduce the capacity within the service it is expected that the overall impact will be limited. Will we consult with the provider and colleagues within the council to ensure that the impact of this change is minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Homeless Project (SHP)</td>
<td>Young People’s Floating Support</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>See table on page 9</td>
<td>This reduction will be part of a major reconfiguration exercise for floating support services across the borough. There are a number of options for these services which will be subject to a wide ranging consultation with stakeholders and service users during 2015/16. Full details are of contracts covered under this reconfiguration are listed at table 3 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Lewisham</td>
<td>Very Sheltered Accommodation) - Extra Care</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>This 2016/17 proposal will be subject to wide consultation. A number of Extra care are planned for closure but this reduction will limit the funds available for re-provision and the impact of this needs to be considered carefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of providers</td>
<td>Mental Health Supported Housing</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£270,814</td>
<td>This is a 12% reduction in the overall contract value and officers are confident that the provider could absorb this cost through limited reductions in service. However, this saving is not scheduled until 2016/17 and remains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The service provides support to young people who have recently approached the council as homeless. The support is delivered in their own homes and includes a range of areas such as rent arrears, social isolation, drug and alcohol misuse, housing issues, independent living skills, and accessing other services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB Lewisham</td>
<td>supported housing units across the borough. The service prepares individuals for independent living by addressing their individual support needs which may relate to a range of issues including drug and/or alcohol misuse, lack of budgeting skills, history of non compliance with medication etc</td>
<td>indicative at this stage as officers are currently undertaking a full review of all housing provision for people with MH problems and all final proposals will be subject to consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reduced</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Lewisham</td>
<td><strong>Sheltered Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>£100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£0</strong></td>
<td>An element of the current service covers basic cleaning and maintenance tasks which are eligible for funding through housing benefit. As such it is proposed that costs of the service are met by Lewisham Homes through its rental income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will be subject to a full consultation as part of the rent setting exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The overall approach to support for Older People in the borough will be examined in detail as part of the review of floating support in 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Telecare</td>
<td><strong>Alarm system</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>£0</strong></td>
<td>Peabody, as a large registered landlord, have agreed to absorb this cost into its wider housing management provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbeyfield Deptford</td>
<td>Older Persons support service</td>
<td>£1,085</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>The impact of this small funding withdrawal will be minimal. Officers have spoken to Abbeyfield and they have agreed to absorb the cost of this reduction. We will consult with Abbeyfield regarding the overall approach to support for Older People in the borough as part of the review of floating support in 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Tony Law House - Alarm</td>
<td>£2,486</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Anchor, as a large registered landlord, have agreed to absorb this cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>2016/17 Reduction</th>
<th>Consultation/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cost into its wider housing management provision. We will consult with Anchor regarding the overall approach to support for Older People in the borough as part of the review of floating support in 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm only service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Trust</td>
<td>Knights Court - Alarm system</td>
<td>£9,674</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Anchor, as a large registered landlord, have agreed to absorb this cost into its wider housing management provision. We will consult with Anchor regarding the overall approach to support for Older People in the borough as part of the review of floating support in 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service includes contribution towards Alarm system and office based support (9am to 4pm weekdays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Providers</td>
<td>Various service for Adults with Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>£430,000</td>
<td>£104,000</td>
<td>The Year 1 savings have been achieved through a range of actions undertaken by colleagues in Adult Social Care. Further savings from 2016/17 will be subject to wide consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinardos</td>
<td>Fairway Lodge</td>
<td>£271,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>This reduction has previous been agreed and took effect from October 2014. So far there has been no impact from this reduction as the provider has continued to deliver the service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 2015/16 there will be a major reconfiguration of floating support services in the borough to move from a client group based approach to an outcomes based approach i.e. the provider will be required to work with a range of different people to achieve the same outcomes such as reduced rent arrears, reduced drug and alcohol use, increasing independent living skills etc.
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### Table 3 – Services in scope for the review of Floating Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Services included</th>
<th>Contract values (2015/16)</th>
<th>Overall saving across the 4 contracts</th>
<th>Impact/Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Support</td>
<td>Older Persons Floating Support</td>
<td>£305,210</td>
<td>£525,000</td>
<td>This proposal will lead to one overall service with a contract value of approximately £730,000 per annum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookahead</td>
<td>Adults with Learning Disabilities Floating Support</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>This will be subject to full consultation with providers, service users and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Reach</td>
<td>Vulnerable Adults Floating Support</td>
<td>£485,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHP</td>
<td>Young Person Floating Support</td>
<td>£268,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Legal implications

4.1. The services listed in this report are non-statutory and the council is not required to provide them by law. However, for users who are currently in receipt of support services which they may lose, individual assessment of their needs should be undertaken to ensure that they are able to manage without the support or to arrange access to any alternative support which may be available.

4.2. As is set out in the table, many of the Providers have agreed to absorb the savings through efficiencies. In relation to the Floating Services for Adults with Learning Disabilities such as Look Ahead, these contracts provide for variations enabling the Council to omit services upon six months notice.

4.3. 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.

4.4. 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.

4.5. 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.

4.6. 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/

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

- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
- Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
- Engagement and the equality duty
- Equality objectives and the equality duty
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- Equality information and the equality duty

4.8. 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/

5. Financial implications

5.1. The reduction of £2,523,000 from across all services outlined above is required as part of the overall budget saving proposals for the Council. The proposal is developed to achieve these reductions recognising that this also will mean a reduction in overall services.

6. Crime and disorder implications
6.1. The London Borough of Lewisham has a statutory responsibility under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to work with partners to reduce crime and disorder.

6.2. Provision of suitable supported accommodation links directly to the delivery of S17 of the Crime and Disorder Act. Section 17 of the Act recognises that there are key stakeholder groups who have responsibility for the provision of a wide and varied range of support services to and within the community. In carrying out these functions, section 17 places a duty on partners to do all they can to reasonably prevent crime and disorder in their area.

6.3. The purpose of section 17 is simple: the level of crime and its impact is influenced by the decisions and activities taken in the day-to-day of local bodies and organisations. The responsible authorities are required to provide a range of services in their community. Section 17 is aimed at giving the vital work of crime and disorder reduction a focus across the wide range of local services and putting it at the heart of local decision-making.

6.4. Research by the Home Office has shown that stable housing is a significant factor in reducing the likelihood of people re-offending so accommodation based services have been protected in order to reduce offending rates.

7. Human Rights Act implications

7.1. There are no specific implications arising

8. Equal opportunities

8.1. The attached equalities analysis report details this – See below.

9. Environmental implications

9.1. There are no direct environmental implications to this report.
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For further information on this report please contact James Lee, Prevention and Inclusion Manager

james.lee@lewisham.gov.uk  020 8314 6548.
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Equalities Analysis Assessment for 2015/16 savings
Proposals B1 - Reduction & remodelling of supporting people services

Background

1.1 In Lewisham, housing-related support is delivered by a number of service providers to clients with a range of needs. 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 older people, people with mental health problems, drug and alcohol users, women experiencing violence and exploitation, offenders and rough sleepers.

1.2 The savings proposals are to reduce funding to these services by £2,523,000 (20% of the budget) over the next two years through a combination of:
   • Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity
   • Reductions in service capacity
   • Service closures

1.3 The savings will be delivered through a reduction in individual contract values in 2015/16 and through a major reconfiguration exercises across Mental Health and Floating Support services in 2015/16.

1.4 It is inevitable that funding reductions of this level will lead to reduced service provision and some people who currently receive support will no longer be supported.

1.5 However, officers believe that through effective consultation and planning with providers, service users and other stakeholders the impact can be keep to a minimum and given the overall financial pressure on the council these are achievable savings.

1.6 In order to ensure that we are fully assessing the impact of these changes on different groups and meeting the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty the individual reductions have been considered individually – see table 1 below.

1.7 This is because a single overarching EEA would fail to capture the different impacts across the protected characteristics as the services deal with different client groups.

1.8 The considerations apply to the 2015/16 reductions only as the 2016/17 changes are still to be fully developed and will be subject to consultation and further equalities assessments.

2 It is important to note that all staff engaged in service delivery will be paid the London living Wage as a absolute minimum.
### Table 1 – equalities considerations for the savings plans for 2015/16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 Reduction</th>
<th>Equalities considerations/Mitigating Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Support</td>
<td><em>Older Person’s Floating Support</em></td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>This is a 14% reduction in the current contract value and officers are confident that the provider will be able to limit the impact on existing service users through efficiency savings. Officers have spoken to senior management at One Support who have indicated that the vast majority of this reduction can be absorbed through efficiency savings. However the reduction may mean that the threshold for the service increases slightly and officers will be undertaking a consultation with stakeholders and affected service users to ensue that any ongoing and future needs are met and the impact of this change is minimised. As a specialist service all of the current service users are older people so obviously this will have a direct impact on them. However, across all of the savings older people are generally affected very little so the reduction in this service is proportionate at worst. Generally the service users of the service reflect the overall demographics for Lewisham for this age group so there will be not be a disproportionate impact on any particular group. The provider will provide details to the commissioning team of all the cases that they are due to close and this will be reviewed against protected characteristics and the overall caseload to ensure that no group is being affected more than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Support</td>
<td><em>Mental Health Floating Support</em></td>
<td>£117,000</td>
<td>This saving involves the merging of this contract with a larger MH accommodation based contract. This</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This service is delivered to people with mental ill health in their own homes to provide support in a range of areas including rent arrears, budgeting, social isolation, housing issues, anti-social behaviour, medicine compliance etc

makes sense as the majority (60 out of 85) of the current clients live within designated housing units which are essentially longer term supported housing.

The merger of these contracts will allow the provider to make significant savings in management and accommodation costs with only a smaller reduction in overall service.

Officers have spoken to senior management at One Support who have indicated that they feel these reductions are achievable with only minimal disruption to the current service provision.

However, approximately 25 current service users who are able to move on from the service will be supported to do so. Those with continuing needs will be referred to other services for ongoing support.

It is widely acknowledged that BME communities are disproportionately represented in mental health services so officers will work with the provider to ensure that the reductions in service do not fall even more disproportionately on this group.

In addition to this the access and referral routes for the service and the nature of the ongoing offer will be reviewed to ensure that it appropriate for the profile of clients needs the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lookahead</th>
<th>Adults with Learning Disabilities Floating Support</th>
<th>£80,000</th>
<th>This is a 28% reduction in the current contract value.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This service is delivered to adults with learning disabilities in their own homes to provide support in a range of areas including rent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Officers have spoken to the provider of this service and while a degree of the saving will be absorbed through efficiency savings it will inevitably lead to an overall loss of capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This means that the current service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thames Reach</th>
<th>Vulnerable Adults Floating Support</th>
<th>£100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This service is open to all adults across borough in their own homes to provide support in a range of areas including rent arrears, budgeting, social isolation, drug and alcohol misuse, housing issues, independent living skills, accessing other services etc</td>
<td>This is a 17% reduction in the current contract value but the provider has indicated that the vast majority of this saving can be delivered with minimal impact on service capacity due to a recent organisational restructure designed to reduce the costs of their services across London. Officers are conscious that restructures of this type have the potential to impact on service quality due to reduced investment in front line staff, training etc. As such will we consult with the provider and colleagues within the council to ensure that the impact of this change is minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Thames Reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Supported Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>£150,000</strong></td>
<td>As above the provider has indicated that the vast majority of this saving can be delivered without impact on service capacity due to a recent organisational restructure designed to reduce the costs of their services across London. As no units of support are being lost as part of this reduction there are no equalities impacts although the commissioning team will continue to monitor usage of the service and access and referral routes against protected characteristics to ensure equality of access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This service is delivered to individuals living within supported housing units across the borough. The service prepares individuals for independent living by addressing their individual support needs which may relate to a range of issues including drug and/or alcohol misuse, lack of budgeting skills, history of mental health problems etc.

### Thames Reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hostel Diversion Pilot</strong></td>
<td><strong>£37,000</strong></td>
<td>The ending of this pilot may lead to people having to enter hostels or supporting housing while they wait for independent accommodation. However, the introduction of the Pathway approach means that any time spent in such accommodation will be kept to a minimum and officers are working with a range of stakeholders to ensure that there is an effective supply of independent ‘move-on’ accommodation available. This should reduce an impact of the changes but the overall use of the Pathway is subject to an annual review including an assessment of use against protected characteristics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An accommodation based service that assesses the housing and support needs of vulnerable young people.

### Centrepoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young People’s Assessment Centre</strong></td>
<td><strong>£50,000</strong></td>
<td>This reduction will end a ‘payment by results’ element to the service designed to support more individuals into independent living. While the saving may reduce the capacity within the service it is expected that the overall impact will be limited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An accommodation based service that assesses the housing and support needs of vulnerable young people.
who have recently approached the council as homeless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>Sheltered Housing</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>This funding is for a Floating Support service which provides support for people living in the boroughs Sheltered schemes (managed by Lewisham Homes). Support includes help with rent arrears, budgeting, social isolation, housing issues etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>Alarm system</td>
<td>£5,757</td>
<td>This funding is for an alarm service for a Peabody Sheltered scheme. When the One Support Older Persons Floating Support service was commissioned, Peabody requested that they were able to continue with their existing alarm service. The service provides out of office cover through use of alarms and pendants etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbeyfield Deptford</td>
<td>Older Persons support service</td>
<td>£1,085</td>
<td>The impact of this small funding withdrawal will be minimal. Officers have spoken to Abbeyfield and they...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This service is a small shared house supported by a local organisation affiliated to the National umbrella organisation Abbeyfield. Support provided is at a very low level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Trust</td>
<td><strong>Tony Law House - Alarm system</strong>&lt;br&gt;Alarm only service</td>
<td>£2,486</td>
<td>Anchor, as a large registered landlord, have agreed to absorb this cost into its wider housing management provision. As this saving to the council will be picked up by Anchor without loss of service there will be no equalities impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Trust</td>
<td><strong>Knights Court - Alarm system</strong>&lt;br&gt;Service includes contribution towards Alarm system and office based support (9am to 4pm weekdays)</td>
<td>£9,674</td>
<td>Anchor, as a large registered landlord, have agreed to absorb this cost into its wider housing management provision. As this saving to the council will be picked up by Anchor without loss of service there will be no equalities impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Providers</td>
<td><strong>Various service for Adults with Learning Disabilities</strong></td>
<td>£430,000</td>
<td>The Year 1 savings have been achieved through a range of actions undertaken by colleagues in Adult Social Care. These savings were achieved as part of a recommissioning process and the Equalities Implications were addressed during that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinardos</td>
<td><strong>Fairway Lodge</strong></td>
<td>£271,000</td>
<td>This reduction has previous been agreed and took effect from October 2014. So far there has been no impact from this reduction as the provider has continued to deliver the service. As such there are no equalities implications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E – Asset Rationalisation

Saving proposal E1 is presented here.

It is:
E1  Reorganisation of the Regeneration and Asset Management Division

This appendix presents the individual saving proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Sustainable Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
9a   E1 Proposal
9b   E1 M&C report
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- 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’.

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.

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.
4. Impact of proposal

Furthermore the new structure and ways of working will involve closer working with other divisions, including 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>A. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
<td>Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>B. Young people’s achievement and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>C. Clean, green and liveable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>D. Safety, security and a visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Strengthening the local economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Wards :</td>
<td>If individual Wards, please state:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Service Equalities Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the expected impact on equalities?</th>
<th>Low/ neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Low/ Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

(人力资源顾问服务将为您提供您所需数据，如果它可用)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Band</th>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Female: 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>17 yes, 101 no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation:</th>
<th>Where known:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose:

1.1 A Regeneration & Asset Management Review is one of the 19 projects included within the Lewisham Futures Programme which aims to identify £95m of savings over the next three years. The division is tasked to deliver £9m as part of the programme through a number of strands, including a structural re-organisation of the division.

1.2 The proposals contained in this report set out the approach being taken to structurally re-organise the Regeneration and Asset Management Division in order to realign resources in an effective way to assist with the delivery of savings as part of the Lewisham Future Programme.

1.3 The proposed structure is designed to be flexible whilst retaining core skills and management information. It seeks to retain key knowledge and provide the structure for staff to share systems and processes across the division where possible and support the delivery of corporate priorities.

1.4 Initial proposals were considered by Mayor and Cabinet as part of the Revenue Budget Savings Report for 2015/16 on 12th November 2014. The outline proposals were agreed subject to further work and consultation with staff and final approval by Mayor and Cabinet. This report seeks to secure approval from Mayor and Cabinet for the proposals, provide an update on progress to date as well as provide a timeline for delivery.

2. Recommendations:

It is recommended that Mayor and Cabinet:

2.1 Note the savings gap of £150k highlighted in paragraph 4.2 of this report and the requirement to identify further cost saving measures within the Regeneration and Asset Management Division.

2.2 Agree to the implementation of the restructuring of the Regeneration & Asset Management Division as set out in this paper.

3. Policy Context:

3.1 The Council’s vision is to work together to ‘make Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn’. This vision is set out in Shaping our future, Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-20. The contents of this report are...
consistent with the Council’s policy framework. It supports the achievement of Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy priority outcome(s)

- **Empowered and responsible** – where people can be actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities
- **Dynamic and prosperous** – where people are part of vibrant localities and town centres well-connected to London and beyond

3.2 Lewisham’s core values are to:
- Put service to the public first
- Respect all people and all communities
- Invest in employees
- Be open, honest and fair in all we do.

3.3 Lewisham has ten enduring corporate priorities which outline the Council’s distinctive contribution to the delivery of *Shaping Our Future* – Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy. These include: Community leadership and empowerment; Clean, green and liveable; and Strengthening the local economy.

3.4 The proposed restructure will optimise service delivery within the available resources. It will create a knowledgeable division that will continue to support internal and external stakeholders to deliver the borough’s regeneration objectives. The new division will remain outcome driven and will seek out opportunities to deliver change in a sustainable and enduring way. It will also focus on realising new commercial opportunities that will generate revenues to support LBL objectives in the long term.

4. **Background:**

4.1 The Lewisham Future Programme is the Council’s approach to making the transformational changes necessary to deliver services for the future, while living within the financial resources at its disposal. This is guided by the Council’s enduring values and principles agreed in 2010 aimed at delivering significant savings and promoting greater efficiencies in the delivery of priorities across the authority.

4.2 As noted above, a review of Regeneration & Asset Management is one of the 19 projects included within the Lewisham Futures Programme, which aims to identify £95m of savings (or net new income) over the next three years. As part of the £9m net savings which Regeneration & Asset Management Division has been asked to identify, £600k has been earmarked to come from a reduction in staff costs. This is in addition to a further saving of £250k identified within the 2014/15 savings targets, which has been delayed pending this restructure. These proposals identify £700k of that £850k target, leaving £150k to be found from further proposals yet to be identified.

4.3 In seeking to make the division sustainable and fit-for-purpose for the future, a root and branch re-structure of the service areas is proposed. This will ensure that the service can respond to the internal and external influences and opportunities associated with delivering regeneration and investment programmes and managing property and highway assets within the borough.

4.5 The proposed structure seeks to retain a core resource base from which services can be delivered and outcomes managed. It also proposes the creation of a Commercial
and Investment Delivery team incorporating a Commercial Management Office to drive transparency and performance across the Division.

4.6 It seeks to minimise the impact of changes in services by streamlining management arrangements, identifying synergies between the services, and prioritising those aspects of the services which are service critical or have the most impact on borough wide priorities. The model will use a core team that, in the main, commissions, monitors and manages services. It will focus on the strategic management of regeneration objectives and effective management of assets across the built environment.

4.7 The main strands of the approach are set out below together with the two key stages and a timeline for implementation.

5. Proposals:

5.1 The proposed structure has four core groups. These new groupings will enable staff to focus on providing a service which will deliver the best outcomes for residents and users of the borough’s built environment including the highways network & public realm. It has been designed to support the longer term growth, transformation and regeneration of Lewisham.

5.2 The following section provides a brief description of each group, key roles and the interrelationships with each other.

5.2.1 Asset Strategy & Technical Support

This group will lead on Asset strategy/planning and liaison across the authority to align the use of and where appropriate drive value from assets. It will also act as the technical expert for the division. They will;

i. Monitor the external and internal influences on the management and use of our assets and property portfolio.

ii. Monitor opportunities to fund and, in conjunction with colleagues in the Capital Delivery Team, deliver capital and investment projects. Ensuring at all times that the use of assets is optimised across the authority from a strategic perspective.

iii. Provide the Council with professional and technical advice on corporate strategies and policies for the built environment.

iv. Ensure that national and corporate sustainability objectives and targets are embedded within the thinking and actions of the division.

v. Oversee the Regeneration Strategy, transport policy and strategy and Asset Management Plans across the division.

vi. Oversee the Building Control function.

5.2.1 Commercial & Investment Delivery (incl. a Commercial Office function (CMO))
This group will provide strategic and professional leadership on commercial management and investment strategies for the division. Working with colleagues in corporate finance they will drive financial and operational performance transparency into the division. They will be responsible to ensure that:

i. Resources are properly allocated and accounted for

ii. Operational performance is reported diligently and accurately

iii. Projects, programmes and investments are established and delivered on sound commercial terms.

In addition, this team provides and manages a CMO, which will ensure transparency, consistency and efficient and effective use of systems across the division. They will be responsible for ensuring that statutory compliance requirements are met across the division.

5.2.2  **Capital Programme Delivery**

i. This team will lead on the approach and delivery of capital projects for the division as a whole and, as appropriate, for other areas within the authority. They will work in tandem with colleagues in Customer, CYP and Community Services to assist with the creation of a corporate approach to delivery of projects in support of corporate priorities.

ii. They will establish, monitor and deliver all stages of the project lifecycle in tandem with colleagues elsewhere in the division and with consultants / delivery partners as necessary.

iii. Working with colleagues in the Commercial team they will be responsible for the establishment of reporting procedures, measures and indicators to ensure the regular, diligent and transparent reporting of projects and programmes for the division.

5.2.3  **Operational Asset Management (day to day delivery)**

This group will have responsibility for day to day operations across the highway and property asset base.

i. They will take primary responsibility for the planned and reactive maintenance of our property and highway assets and ensure that the day to day statutory obligations are met across all asset classes.

ii. The team will manage the process of managing assets from routine inspections through the commissioning of design solutions and upkeep and maintenance of a diverse asset base. This will include the management of the authorities;
   - School PFI contracts
   - Corporate FM contracts
   - Term maintenance contract for highways
   - Planned maintenance contract for highways
   - Ad-hoc commissioning of repairs and maintenance contracts
• Corporate energy contracts

iii. In addition, (supported by colleagues across the division) this group will manage the physical aspects of the entire property portfolio that is the current responsibility of this division. That includes the corporate (operational) estate, the commercial estate and the ‘grey estate’ (those assets such as strips of land, parks, property assets in parks and aerial sites for example)

iv. They will be responsible for ensuring that there is a transparent commercial position in all leases, tenancies, licences, rents and obligations across the estate and for keeping up to date records for the division’s entire portfolio.

v. They will be responsible for the delivery of the statutory Network Management functions for borough roads.

vi. In summary the Operations team will be responsible for on-going day to day business delivery.

5.3 The proposed restructure is being delivered in two stages.

5.3.1 Stage 1:

This stage involved a realignment of the following service areas in the division: Transport (Highways), Corporate Asset Services and Programme Management into one cohesive and efficient unit under the Director of Regeneration and Asset Management. Additionally, responsibility for Building Control was integrated from Customer Services Directorate to the division. The outcome was the creation of four new Service Group Manager (SGM) roles with responsibility for leading, managing and providing clear direction to the teams within their respective groups. These are SGM Operational Asset Management; SGM Commercial & Investment Delivery; SGM Capital Programme Delivery; SGM Asset Strategy & Technical Support.

It also involved a transfer of the Catford Complex receptionists, civic support services and post room services staff to the Public Services team in the Customer Services Directorate, pending the conclusion of the wider corporate business support review.

5.3.2 Stage 2:

The second stage of the process involves the creation of teams to support the four SGM roles developed as part of the first stage. It requires the deletion of a number of roles across the current structure and creation of new roles where necessary to provide the key services.

There are a total 128 staff in the current structure (excluding the Director and the 4 SMG roles in phase 1) and 100.6 proposed for the new structure – a reduction of 27.4 staff. New teams and team profiles have been created as part of the new structure and the associated job descriptions and person specifications have been agreed in accordance with HR protocols and procedures.
Formal consultation

5.4 Consultation ran from the issuing of a formal consultation paper on 18th December 2014. This included two ‘open house’ consultation meetings between staff and management, which took place on the 6th and the 7th of January 2015. It also included a meeting with representatives from the Property System’s Team and other one to one meetings as requested. The consultation paper was circulated to staff and trade union representatives. During the consultation meetings, points and queries raised were responded to where possible in order to assist colleagues to come to a timely understanding of the proposals being made. A short extension to the consultation period was agreed to allow all responses and consultation ended on 14th January.

5.5 At all of the consultation meetings staff were advised to submit their queries in writing as part of the consultation process in order that they could be properly considered within the formal management response.

5.6 A number of queries and comments were received by the consultation deadline from individual staff affected, teams and unions. A formal management response was issued on the 23rd January providing clarification on the issues raised. In some cases issues were highlighted which led to minor changes being made to the proposed structure. Subsequently, where duties needed to be clarified or reallocated, those job descriptions have been reviewed and where necessary regraded to reflect postholder responsibilities.

5.7 A timetable for delivering the proposed structure is set out below and it is expected that the new structure will be fully implemented by 1st June 2015 subject to Mayor and Cabinet approval on 11th February 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reorganisation Timetable:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation begins Papers issued to staff and Trade Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation feedback from staff and unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development Select Committee Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC meeting if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJC meeting if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Mayor &amp; Cabinet for final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If agreed by Mayor and cabinet, Staff invited to apply for new posts JDs and PSs available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for receipt of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short listing and selection process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation begins Papers issued to staff and Trade Unions</td>
<td>18th Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation feedback from staff and unions</td>
<td>14th Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management response</td>
<td>23rd Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development Select Committee Review</td>
<td>20th Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC meeting if required</td>
<td>w/c 26th Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJC meeting if required</td>
<td>w/c 2nd Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Mayor &amp; Cabinet for final decision</td>
<td>11th Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If agreed by Mayor and cabinet, Staff invited to apply for new posts JDs and PSs available</td>
<td>13th Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for receipt of applications</td>
<td>20th Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short listing and selection process</td>
<td>23rd Feb – 6th Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Issue notices of redundancy and offers for posts in new structure | w/b 9th Mar 2015 |
| Redundancy appeals if applicable | TBA |
| Commence further stages of recruitment/selection as necessary | 16th Mar 2015 |
| Proposed implementation date for new structure | 1st June 2015 |

6. **Financial Implications:**

6.1 The proposals have been designed to deliver a total saving of £700k including a pre-existing savings commitment of £250k for 2014/15. The potential redundancy costs have been agreed through ER/VR panel. To achieve the full £850k saving a further £150k will need to be found from alternative proposals yet to be developed.

7. **Legal Implications:**

7.1 There are none directly arising out of this report

8. **Human Resource Implications:**

8.1 The proposals as set out in the restructure programme and approach has significant human resource implications and these are being addressed through the council's reorganisation protocols and processes.

9. **Environmental Implications:**

9.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising out of this report.

10. **Equalities Implications:**

10.1 An equalities impact assessment will be carried out as part of the proposals.

11. **Crime and Disorder:**

11.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

**List of Background documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title Of Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Future Programme 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
<td>David Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you would like further information on this report please contact Rob Holmans, Director of Regeneration and Asset Management on ext 47908
APPENDIX 10 – Proforma proposal for saving G1 (re blue badge) and consultation

G – Income Generation

Saving proposal G1 part c is presented here.

It is:
G1c  Charging a fee for administering Blue Badges

This appendix presents the individual saving proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the related consultation paper. The November Mayor & Cabinet decision was to hold off consulting on this proposal but resubmit it in the savings report to accompany the budget report for a final decision.

The appendix references are:
10a  extract of G1 Proposal – elements relating to Blue Badge proposal
10b  consultation paper
APPENDIX 10a – Proforma for G1 Blue Badge proposal

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing Income from Blue Badge Administration Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure £000’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income £000’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Budget £000’s</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

**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.

**Saving proposal description**

**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:**

**Blue Badge Administration Fee**
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4. Impact of proposal

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:

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

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

All Wards : None

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:| Medium       |
| Religion/Belief: | Low/ Neutral |
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Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Low/ Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Band</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 6 - SO2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO1 – PO5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO6 – PO8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMG1 – SMG3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 7. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME:</td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation:</th>
<th>Where known:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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?
H – Enforcement and Regulation

Saving proposal H1 is presented here.

It is:
H1  Restructuring of Enforcement and Regulatory Services

This appendix presents the individual saving proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the related consultation paper.

The appendix references are:
11a  H1 Proposal
11b  H1 M&C Report
H1: Restructuring of enforcement & regulatory services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restructuring of Enforcement and Regulatory Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure £000’s</th>
<th>Income £000’s</th>
<th>Net Budget £000’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,987.4</td>
<td>(982.0)</td>
<td>3,005.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including approx £180k for business support (which is being reviewed under a separate review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total 2015/16-2017/18:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.

The model has identified the following groupings of services:

- 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.
3. Description of service and proposal

Following this model a restructure of services within the Community and Health protection hub is proposed.

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:

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

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

All Wards: If individual Wards, please state:
### Ward/Geographical implications
State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal in principle stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards/Geographical implications</th>
<th>State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal in principle stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Service Equalities Impact
What is the expected impact on equalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the expected impact on equalities?</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristics</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is staff consultation required (Y/N)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is public consultation required (Y/N)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Human Resources

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

Within this savings proposal, 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)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 – 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 – 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 – SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female: 36</th>
<th>Male: 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME: 17</td>
<td>White: 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known: 28</td>
<td>Not Known: 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Recommendations

1.1 The Mayor and Cabinet are recommended to:

- approve the approach to realise savings of £800,000 from area H1 – based on information outlined below

Background

1.2 The Mayor & Cabinet meeting of 12 November 2014 asked that savings proposal H1 be resubmitted on 11 February 2015 for final decision updating on consultation and having been further considered by the relevant Select Committees.

1.3 At the 30 October 2014 meeting of The Sustainable Development Select Committee (SDSC) and the 3 November 2014 meeting of the Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committee (SSCSC), further details were requested in relation to saving proposal H1 including any matters arising from staff consultation. Update reports were presented to these Select Committees on 20 January 2015 (SDSC) and 3 February 2015 (SSCSC).

1.4 This report includes the additional information presented to Sustainable Communities Select Committees and their further comments. at the time of completing and dispatch of this report the Safer Stronger Select Committee had not taken place. A verbal update can be provided to Mayor and Cabinet if requested.

1.5 the information below includes further deatails that were requested at the Select committees in Nov 14.
2. **What would be different against each separate service area in the proposed model?**

2.1 The following table attempts to capture some of these; however there will be some things that might not be apparent at this stage. The proposed new model is intended to equip the remaining officers with the ability to undertake a wider range of activity after appropriate training and to ensure that statutory responsibilities can continue to be addressed. We are adopting problem solving and intelligence actions but we still aim to tackle the main problems although invariably with less staff; it is proposed that a reduction in overall staff numbers will be mitigated by increased flexibility.

2.2 Problem solving has become a tested model of working in tackling anti-social behaviour. In partnership with the Police this approach has allowed us to work with less staff – but in a more targeted and responsive way. The intention is to develop this way of working across the different service areas that have been brought together and an intelligence based method of working is already being piloted in Trading Standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service area</th>
<th>What will be different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Anti-Social Behaviour | Reduced preventative offer – i.e. safety advice sessions/delivery of ASB, knife crime, cyber bullying and hate crime in schools and youth clubs.  
                             Reduced crime prevention roadshows  
                             Maintain surgeries in locations where problem solving profiles/geographical issues are being dealt with under the risk matrix – this will mean other areas may not get a regular surgery.  
                             Cease delivering youth shoplifting awareness course  
                             Reduce work in relation to things like property marking/helping people log phones/electronic items etc. |
| Licensing          | No dedicated officer to deal with licensing matters but a wider pool of trained staff to do this. A wider range of issues can be addressed during a single visit. 
                             More available staff to attend and support the Licensing Committee. A licensing ‘lead’ officer will be nominated to ensure consistency & co-ordination is maintained.  
                             Routine premise visits will be replaced by more targeted visits – visits will be predicated on risk/Intel/issues of non compliance |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service area</th>
<th>What will be different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public health and Noise Nuisance</td>
<td>Noise nuisance complaints will be assessed &amp; responses prioritised. Officers will be deployed to visit out of hours noise ‘hotspots’ when required on a programmed intelligence basis. Greater use of information &amp; evidence from partner agencies to support action will be made where possible along with increased use of pre-emptive noise abatement measures. Drainage &amp; matters relating to filthy &amp; verminous conditions at private premises will be addressed with support from Food &amp; Safety team as necessary. A vigorous system of prioritising case work will be applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Standards</td>
<td>There will be reduced service delivery and services will be provided by reference to a newly developed service risk/intelligence matrix. This may mean that individual consumer complaints will not be investigated and that where appropriate, greater use of advisory measures will be made in cases relating to counterfeit goods and product safety. Whilst we will seek to maintain some level of support to residents vulnerable to doorstep rogue traders &amp; mass marketing scams it is likely that preventative work will be scaled down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety and Hygiene</td>
<td>Still meeting the requirements of the FSA as most practicable. Priority will continue to be given to meeting the Food Standards Agency prescribed requirements relating to the inspection of food premises. We will seek to ensure that infectious disease etc notifications are responded to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service area</td>
<td>What will be different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Significant health &amp; safety incidents will continue to be investigated. This team will also undertake duties relating to special treatments licensing as many requirements are health &amp; safety related. In addition to undertaking duties relating filthy &amp; verminous conditions at commercial premises, this team will also support Public Health &amp; Nuisance team with such matters at residential premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Whilst there will be fewer staff, lead officers for each of noise, contaminated land &amp; air quality will be identified in order that statutory strategic requirements can continue to be addressed. This service will continue to provide specialist comment &amp; advice on large scale planning developments but detailed input to medium and smaller scale developments will be reduced with greater reference being made to planning policy documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **What is the data in relation to noise call outs / officer availability/ peak periods/ cost of current noise service/ what consideration has been given to the impact and the service needs to be more resident focused.**

3.1 For clarity, the new proposed model is not to lose any specific function, but to realign the functions and enable officers to be multi-facetted and work across a number of enforcement agendas. The noise service as it exists currently is only available until Midnight Mon- Thurs and until 3am Friday–Sundays therefore the service is not able to tackle issues that rise outside of these hours. If a call comes in outside of these hours, the switchboard would take details and pass the information on.

3.2 The service is also restricted by the number of officers it has and their ability to cover all shifts/ rotas. Police support may also be required on occasion but may not always be readily available. Officers are required to attend in pairs for safety and evidential reasons and in some instances require the police to accompany them dependent on the issue. Although instances of the service having to be suspended due to sickness and other issues are rare, service capacity means it is not always possible to provide the prompt response assumed & arguably not all matters require immediate attention.

3.3 The current cost of the bespoke service that deals with noise nuisance including overtime is up to £510K per annum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Env Enforcement 2014 - 2015</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Required</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No. of noise nuisance complaints received</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of complaints receiving a visit</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of <em>noise</em> notices issued</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of <em>noise</em> prosecutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data accurate to September 2014: Public Health and Nuisance Team

When plotted, the demand appears as follows:
3.5 It is to be noted that there are questions about the reliability of this data due to data entry issues.

3.6 The real issue is not the number of demands for service at night – or “out of hours” – but rather whether the staff deployed could perform an effective out-of-hours action as a result of the call and whether its nature justifies an immediate response visit.

3.7 Anti-Social Behaviour

3.7.1 Hub Solutions, the IT performance tracking system that supports the Neighbourhood Community Safety Service has been having problems so a full dataset was not available in time for this report.

3.7.2 There had been 20 major long-term “Problem Solving Profile” (PSP) pieces of work. The Service gets between 150-250 calls + emails a week from residents seeking advice and action in relation to ASB or Crime problem. Some of these become cases, while others are people who ring us to progress other issues as the service has been advertised widely. The number of ASB cases in 13/14 was 369.

3.7.3 It is noteworthy, that where there is alarm, harassment or distress being caused by Noise the Police can and will respond.

4. **How can other agencies / RSLs be involved?**

4.1 We are certainly exploring how RSLs and Lewisham homes can support the work in all aspects of ASB/ noise and housing. It is important to highlight that we have worked with these bodies over the years and have developed services jointly in relation to CCTV, housing enforcement in relation to adding in requirements to tenancies’ that assist in tackling crime, ASB, dogs
etc. we will build on already strong working relationships to further develop services in this area.

5. **What is the current level of fines and usage?**

5.1 The level of fines used in the services impacted by these reductions is minimal – there are a range of enforcement tactics that we can employ and we use those that are most proportionate and appropriate for the issues at hand. We use a significant amount of mediation and neighbour dispute resolution techniques, as well as lower level compliance encouragement tools such as Acceptable Behaviour Contracts.

5.2 Where formal enforcement and legal action is taken these result in some successful outcomes in relation to seizures of large amounts of illegal tobacco for example – however often the courts do not give the Council any compensation just costs. We will be working to develop better processes for us to be able to recover POCA – Proceeds Against Crime Act money – which upon a successful operation and seizure the Council can receive a proportion of the value of the items seized. It should be noted that a significant number of matters are resolved informally e.g. Trading Standards seizures of small quantities of illicit tobacco & alcohol are normally dealt with by voluntary surrender and written warning & subsequent monitoring of the premises at which they were discovered with a view to stronger action if a repeat breach occurs.

5.3 The Committee asked specifically in relation to fines and enforcement for business waste specifically. The committee were advised that this service area was not currently within the scope of the proposals being discussed. Officers in these service areas work closely with officers in the service areas within this proposal where appropriate to jointly tackle issues and concerns related to trade waste/ non-compliance.

6. **Further Information**

6.1 In addition to the referral responses above, officers would like to present a range of additional information.

6.2 This further information outlines the proposed revised principles and structure covering the following current areas of work:

- Crime reduction service
- Environmental protection
- Food safety
- Health and Safety
- Public Health & Nuisance
- Licensing
- Trading standards

It does NOT include:

- Building control and planning
- Housing enforcement e.g. Rogue Landlords
7. **Rationale for the proposed changes**

7.1 The Council is committed to “making Lewisham the best place to live, work and learn”, and to providing a cohesive, efficient and effective front line service that enables residents to feel safe with low levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. The Council does however have to reduce its expenditure by approximately £95 million over the next three years. Service areas listed above have been asked to identify £800K reduction in spend.

7.2 In identifying these proposals, consideration has been given to the Council’s well established principle of achieving greater accountability and efficiency through flatter managerial structures and intelligent resource allocation of staff.

7.2.1 The options considered have also taken regard of what is currently delivered and what impact changes would have on residents, and clarifying what the current offer is and what it is not.

8. **Background**

8.1 There are a number of statutory requirements which the Council must meet within these areas; however the Level / Frequency/ Amount that needs to be delivered for most areas are dependent on local need and policy. The primary exception is that of food hygiene & standards. The following examples are intended to broadly illustrate the position. It should be noted that the table below is indicative only and it is accepted that other examples of statutory activity exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Area of Activity</th>
<th>Duty of Local Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weights &amp; Measures</td>
<td>Appoint chief inspector and enforce legislation. No level of activity specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Trading &amp; Product Safety</td>
<td>Enforce legislation and consider certain types of fair trading complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Investigate complaints and serve abatement notice if considered a statutory nuisance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Hygiene &amp; Standards</td>
<td>To inspect premises at prescribed frequencies based on risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>Periodically review and assess the air quality within their area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime and Offender management</th>
<th>Statutory responsibilities to reduce reoffending. S17 to prevent crime and disorder.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>New duty to develop a Community Trigger protocol for ASB, advertise and implement. ASB &amp; Policing Act 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Duty to implement a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) following any domestic homicide. Includes duty to appoint independent DHR Chair and report back to Home Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 There are some areas which require a specific qualified officer to deliver/enforce including Food Safety and Weights and Measures. There are a number of synergies within identified service areas, as well as many ways to join up/cluster services – however, in order to meet the absolute minimum requirements and attain the savings required, significant changes in roles and service activity is proposed.

9. The Proposal
9.1 What is currently undertaken?

The following is an illustration of the kinds of work the services undertake:

| Inspections of all premises serving/selling food (e.g. restaurants, retailers) for hygiene and food standards requirements |
| - frequency is specified by FSA |
| - Food notices / closures |
| Anti-social behaviour |
| - manage and implement reduction strategies |
| - Investigate and lead partnership activity |
| - Take action |
| A range of legal powers: community triggers, crack house closures, injunctions etc. |
| Administration and enforcement |
| - all applications and compliance checks |
| - I.e. alcohol / late night / Committee requirements |
### Health and safety
- obligation to enforce
- High risk premises / proactive response
- Sports grounds
  - Investigation of workplace accidents

### Age restricted goods –
Sale of alcohol, fireworks, tobacco, butane lighter fuel to persons under 18
Control of illicit tobacco & alcohol, tobacco display

### Statutory nuisances. PESTS (identify but not remove), drains, alarms, amplified noise.

### Air quality (dust, pollutants)
- review and assess
- 4 air quality monitoring stations

### Unauthorised encampments - travellers
- undertake the initial welfare assessment
- Work with police
- Agree legal action if Council land
  - Advise others if not council land

### Trading standards
Dealing with rogue traders such as letting agents & doorstep sellers, consumer, product safety, counterfeit goods.

9.2 Many of these services have reduced over the years in relation to staffing and capacity. Therefore some services may be perceived to be delivering a level of service which they do not.

9.3 Noise nuisance is an example of this:
The noise service as it exists currently is only available until Midnight Mon-Thurs and until 3am Friday – Sundays therefore the service is not able to tackle issues that arise outside of these hours. If a call comes in outside of these hours, the switchboard would take details and pass the information on.

9.4 The service is also restricted by the number of officers it has and their ability to cover all shifts/rotas. Police support may also be required on occasion but may not always be readily available. Officers are required to attend in pairs for safety and evidential reasons and in some instances require the police to accompany them dependent on the issue. Although instances of the service having to be suspended due to sickness and other issues are rare, service capacity means it is not always possible to provide the prompt response assumed & arguably not all matters require immediate attention.
9.5 Officers often go to a call and if they do not hear anything make no contact. Where they do hear noise they will seek to enter the premises of the Complainant to gather evidence. If officers do consider that a statutory noise nuisance has occurred, contact will also then be made with the alleged perpetrator if it is considered safe and practical to do so. A letter is sent the following day to the perpetrator of the noise whether heard or not.

10. **It is proposed that the Principles to be adopted include:**
- Paying regard to the actual statutory requirements of delivering the function & being realistic about the amount of activity actually required
- Risk and intelligence based approach
- Establish a minimum acceptable level of routine operations
- Use intelligence and risk assessment to determine necessary ‘surge’ capacity and capabilities in the main, whilst giving due consideration being given to a reasonable base level of service.
- Limited prevention / proactive service
- A flexible multi skilled team able to provide current and future requirements of an enforcement service
- Focus on harm / harmful premises/ harmful goods and premises across all areas specialist and non specialist : a focus on hazards
- A single point of contact for businesses / public – not have multiple visitors / officers dealing with single issue matters. This is consistent with the government’s “better regulation” agenda as it should lead to better co-ordination of action.
- Ensure that officers use a wide range of powers and enforcement tactics to tackle and get resolution to an issue.

11. **What will be different:**
- Officers will need to be skilled in a wider range of areas – more multi-faceted staff dealing with more issues – breadth of specialism that does not require specialist qualifications. Roles that require a specialist qualification will be maintained at a reasonable minimum level but with regard to local need.
- Focus and target resources – i.e. changes in night time noise response matching the service to real need more closely than currently – discussions with partner agencies about out of hours response where alarm, distress or harassment is being caused.
- Change in enforcement policy to focus on an intelligence led and risk based model – with consideration given to randomised checking at medium/ low risk for test purposes where considered justifiable, in identified problem areas or as a part of a wider Partnership operation
- A reactive service that is less focused on pro-active routine inspections, unless intelligence suggests otherwise

1. A reduction in the number of staff delivering these functions
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12. Possible models - FUNCTIONS not PEOPLE or POSTS:

**Option 1**
Maintain the current set up – requiring reductions in each area.

- Trading Standards and Environmental Protection
- Licensing
- Crime Reduction
- CCTV
- Prevent
- Serious Violence Team
- Violence Against Women and Girls
- Out of scope
- Neighbourhood community safety
- Food Safety
- Environmental Protection
- Enforcement
- Trading standards
Option 2

Cluster business regulatory services together and multi skilled enforcement services, for example as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food safety</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Community Safety</th>
<th>Environmental Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>Trading standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public health and Nuisance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 3

Cluster specialist Environmental Protection provision and multi skilled public realm enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food safety</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Community Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Trading Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise Nuisance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Nuisance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are options to organise service delivery by geographical clusters’ – i.e. North, Central, South, but retaining flexibility to deploy staff wherever required.
13. **Options considered:**

13.1 Option 1 would merely mean silo reductions and trying to maintain distinct services areas with significantly reduced staff – in already small teams. The reality of being able to deliver services with the smaller numbers in some areas would be impossible.

13.2 Option 2 would merge services into a business hub, multi skilled enforcement hub and an environmental protection hub. This will result in a reduction in staff but would not address senior management posts.

13.3 Option 3 would develop a dedicated service around Environmental Health / protection provisions in the main and a Flexible multi skilled public realm enforcement service with the ability to deploy a range of enforcement activity in relation to public nuisance and other unlawful or dangerous public and business behaviour.

13.4 Activity levels will follow a risk based/ intelligence led model with “routine” checking curtailed to problem areas or joint operations. There will need to be some checks and balances of medium and low risk areas on a ‘sampling’ basis to ensure compliance – but focus will be the high risk/ greatest harm areas/ premises.

13.5 A change in the night time service primarily for noise and licensing will mean a reduced regular ‘routine’ service – but flexibility to deliver an ‘out of hours’ service is required where risk and intelligence identifies a need.

13.6 A criteria and agreement around what cases will progress to legal enforcement will be developed for clarity in identifying tools/ powers and options and costs. A dedicated budget will need to be identified for this along with a case prioritisation system.

13.7 Maintaining posts that require specialist qualifications in food safety are prioritised. Other qualification posts will be maintained at reasonable minimum levels with regard to local need, seeking to purchase in the service if required.

13.8 All posts in the multi skilled public realm enforcement service will receive delegated powers across the whole remit of the service area where legally possible and it is hoped to retain a core of specialist knowledge to underpin this new approach. Lead officers will be identified for Trading Standards, Licensing, Community Safety & Public Health & Nuisance respectively.

13.9 Work will be undertaken to ensure that any first response to residents/ businesses is reassuring, supportive and enabling further action to be taken if required.

14. **Outcomes being sought to achieve include:**

- Improving outcomes and finding resolution for residents and the community.
- improved use of officer time and ability to deliver across a range of enforcement and regulatory services
- improved public health outcomes in relation to food & other product safety and in the quality of the environment
- focus on high risk / persistent problems/ issues/ areas
- maintaining service input to the redevelopment process to influence air quality and address contaminated land and strategic noise issues.
15. **Phase 2** – to further explore options around outsourcing / buying in aspects of the provisions/ joint delivery with other Boroughs

16. **Issues Raised from staff consultation**

16.1 Staff consultation Began on the 18 November 2014 with written responses being completed by the 9th January 2015. The following are an illustration of the issues being raised:

- It is not possible to deliver what is being expected within the new roles and structure - concerns about the wide breadth of knowledge required.
- There has not been sufficient consideration about the requirements and staffing capacity and skills and knowledge within Food Safety, Environmental Protection, Licensing and Trading Standards teams.
- Concerns about the grading of posts and the process for application / eligibility for new posts under the management of change policy.
- Concerns about the impact, the ability and capacity to deliver statutory services
- Concerns about how licensing committee and specific responsibilities around this area will be delivered
- Concerns about capacity and expectations on the service.

16.2 Full detailed responses will be made to all issues raised. Whilst the above concerns have been noted It is assessed that these issues are not insurmountable nor sufficient to reconsider the delivery model and its fundamental principle of increased service flexibility and adaptability. There has been agreement to amend some of the job descriptions in line with the comments raised by staff during the consultation process. A significant training programme has already been started for all staff in the current services and more will be in place post restructure. The new service will be reviewed regularly and formally at 6 months after implementation.

17. **Feedback from key partners and stakeholders.**

17.1 The proposals have been discussed with a number of key senior stakeholders and partners particularly in respect of the Crime, Enforcement and Regulation aspects with the Community Safety Partnership (Safer Lewisham Partnership), a statutory board as prescribed in legislation.

17.2 The general feedback from partners was that the reductions in service were accepted based on the financial position. Police specifically noted concerns about the reductions as a strong partnership and delivery model has been developed over the past years which has led to significant reductions in crime and anti social behaviour.

17.3 They could see the merits in the proposed model, they supported the changes to out of hours noise nuisance with the note that the police service themselves would be reduced significantly over the coming 3 years. They were keen to develop further joint ways of working and welcomed the proactive geographical action model, as this would enable police to allocate resources to support activity.

17.4 Discussions have also been had with senior officers within the Council where services affected by this reorganisation interface or interact, such as with public health and planning.
17.5 All officers recognise the reductions and changes in the staffing and model will impact on their areas and outcomes, but are keen for further discussions to try and find a joint solution to enabling delivery as best as is possible in the current climate.

17.6 These senior officers are supportive of the model recognising that greater joined up working and ongoing regular monitoring of the new delivery model will be required to ensure services are meeting statutory requirements.

17.7 There is no requirement to consult with the public nor more widely with government, but it was deemed prudent to discuss the proposals with those mentioned above to ascertain any local issues or impact.

19. Comment From The Sustainable Development Select Committee (SDSC) of 20 January 2015

The committee welcomed the additional information that had been provided in response to their request and made the further additional points namely:-

- Noting that there would not be an immediate response noise service but that a response would be provided on an intelligence lead and prioritising basis.

- Out of hours immediate response would be provided by police if alarm harassment or distress was being caused.

- Lewisham officers would however be deployed at whatever time necessary if advance intel indicated that a nuisance problem was likely at a particular date and time.

- It should be ensured that residents were made fully aware of what service was available in the new structure and when it was available using as wide a means as possible, including Lewisham Life.

- That consideration be given to other regulatory services being incorporated in the proposed model at the appropriate time. The Committee was advised that such consideration could be given once lessons had been learned from the model. Those currently incorporated are those which are felt to have the most commonality.

- That SDSC requests a report back on how the model is working once it has been operating for a while. The Committee was advised that a continual review would be undertaken with a full review after 6 months and that this could be reported back to SDSC.

20. Comment From The Safer & Stronger Communities Select Committee (SSCSC) of 03 February 2015

This will be verbally reported to Mayor & Cabinet together with an addendum to this report.

1) Legal implications

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

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

c) Confirmation within the body of the report provides that there will be no loss of any specific statutory function; accordingly, the broad statutory obligations pursuant to the provisions of the said Crime & Disorder Act 1998 will continue to be complied with. So too, will the other levant statutory enforcement obligations continue to be complied with by the council consequent upon the specific proposals specified within this report. Namely, section 6 Food Safety Act 1990, so as to carry out all necessary food enforcement inspections as a statutory ‘food authority’, Ss. 18 & 19 of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act so as to enforce the necessary health and safety provisions as a statutory ‘enforcement authority’, S. 69 and Part VI of the Weights and Measures Act 1985, S. 3 Licensing Act 2003, as a Licensing Authority for the purposes of all Licensing Act functions and S. 2 Gambling Act 2005 when acting as a Licensing Authority for the purposes of all Gambling Act functions.

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

e) 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.

f) 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.

g) 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

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

i) The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
   - Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
   - Engagement and the equality duty
   - Equality objectives and the equality duty
   - Equality information and the equality duty

j) 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/

22. Financial implications
   The reduction of £800k from across all services outlined above is required as part of the overall budget saving proposals for the Council. The proposal is developed to achieve these reductions recognising that this also will mean a reduction in overall services / changes in delivery model.

23. Crime and disorder implications
   A significant element of the proposals have a direct impact in crime and disorder. With reduction in service capacity there are likely to be elements of current provision which will not continue such as proactive crime prevention work. The proposed model of enabling staff to be multi faceted in terms of enforcement gives the potential for officers to directly resolve issues using a wider range of provisions and powers that is currently the case.

24. Human Rights Act implications
   There are no specific implications arising

25. Equal opportunities
   The attached equalities analysis assessment (EAA) outlines the information on staffing as the current structures exist. A further EAA will be undertaken post reorganisation.

26. Environmental implications
   There are implications in respect of environmental protection services and some aspects of public health and nuisance provision. Changes in the way these services will be delivered may have an impact on the environment. Close work with relevant local and national bodies in respect of these impacts will be required to ensure Lewisham's compliance and likely impact on residents into the future.
Appendix - Savings Proposal H1 Enforcement and Regulatory Services

Restructure first stage equalities analysis assessment

1 This document sets out the first stage for the equalities analysis assessment of the proposed restructure of Enforcement and Regulatory Services. The proposal is subject to consultation with staff and trades unions and so it will only be possible to complete the EAA once that process has completed, and when the proposed recruitment process to the new roles is complete. Until that point it will not be possible to measure the impact of the new structure on particular protected characteristics.

2 However, this initial assessment suggests that the equalities impact may be low.

3 Subject to the views of affected staff and the trades unions, the proposed restructure will see 64.3 FTE deleted and 39 FTE new posts will be created in the proposed structure. Of the 64.3 FTE’s in the current structure, 8 FTE posts are vacant, one of which is filled temporarily. The number of FTE therefore which are proposed to be deleted are 25.3 FTE’s (of which eight are vacant). and to create six new roles which will be subject to a selection exercise, ring-fenced to affected staff in the first instance. The Council’s HR policies will apply to that selection process, ensuring that this is fair and transparent.

4 Of the 57 posts that are affected by the proposed restructure (excluding the vacant posts), the breakdown by grade is as follows
   • 5 posts (9%) are for staff graded from PO6 and above
   • 49 posts (86%) are for staff graded from P01 – P05
   • 3 posts (5%) are for staff graded SO1 and below.

5 The current composition of the workforce in posts that are proposed to be affected by the restructure is as follows.

6 By age:
   • 2% are aged 21-25
   • 9% are aged 26-30
   • 16% are aged 31 – 35
   • 18% are aged 36-40
   • 12% are aged 41-45
   • 12% are aged 46-50
   • 19% are aged 51 – 55
   • 12% are aged 55 +

7 By gender:
   • 47% are women
   • 53% are men

8 By ethnicity (where staff have chosen to provide this information)
   • 26% are BME
   • 69% are White.
9 By disability (where staff have chosen to declare their status)
   • 9% are disabled
   • 89% are not disabled.

10 By sexual orientation:
   • 68% either chose not to declare this information or the information is unknown
   • 4% are Gay/lesbian
   • 28% are straight/heterosexual

11 As previously, the Council’s HR policies will ensure fair and equitable recruitment to the new posts for staff who choose to apply. As such, there are no reasons for assuming that these classifications will vary significantly as a result of the reorganisation. The initial EAA suggests that there will be low/nil impact as a result of the restructure across gender, ethnicity, age and disability.
APPENDIX 12 – Proposal and report for saving K2

K – Crime Reduction

Saving proposal K2 is presented here.

It is:
K2 Young Offending Service reorganisation, changes in intervention and reduction in contracts

This appendix presents the individual saving proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Safer Stronger Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
12a K2 Proposal
12b K2 saving M&C report
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**    | Lewisham YOS will be making the following savings: |
|                                  | • Reduction in general overhead costs |
|                                  | • Reduction in reparation projects |
|                                  | • Reduction in externally funded programmes |
|                                  | • Deletion of staff post         |

1. **Financial information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure £000’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income £000’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Budget £000’s</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

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.

Lewisham YOS is responsible for a range of services to the public and a wide range of stakeholders including:

- 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.
### 3. Description of service and proposal

- 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

#### 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 1\(^{st}\) 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
4. Impact of proposal

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 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:** |
| D. Impact of saving on corporate priority | B. Impact of saving on corporate priority | A. Community Leadership and empowerment |
| Negative | Negative | B. Young people’s achievement and involvement |
| Level of Impact | Level of Impact | C. Clean, green and liveable |
| Medium | Medium | 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?

Medium

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:
APPENDIX 12a – Proposal for saving K2

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Medium Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Medium Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Medium Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Medium Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 – 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 – 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### 7. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workforce Profile Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female: 27</th>
<th>Male: 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>BME: 20</td>
<td>White: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Where known: 6</td>
<td>Not Known: 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Summary

1.1. This report provides an update on the proposed savings to the Youth Offending Service’s (YOS) budget for 2015 – 2018. The savings proposals are to reduce funding to this service by £200,000 (12.5% of the total budget) over the next year through a combination of:

- Efficiency savings through reduced contract values
- Reductions in service capacity

1.2. This report will be going to Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee on 3rd February and a verbal update will be given for Mayor and Cabinet if requested.

2. Purpose

2.1. The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the readiness and proposals to implement the YOS budget reductions.

- The reduction in YOS general overheads (£16k)
- The reduction in YOS externally funded reparation programmes (£40k)
- The reduction in YOS externally funded programmes and contracts (£101k)
- The deletion of a vacant post in the YOS (£43k)

3. Recommendation

3.1. The Mayor and Cabinet are recommended to:

- approve the approach to realise savings of £200,000 from area K2 as outlined below.

4. Background

4.1. Following the 2015/16 savings proposals being considered by Select Committees and the Mayor during October and November 2014, updates on the proposals returned to Safer Stronger, and Children and Young People Select Committees prior to their consideration at February’s Mayor and Cabinet. As these select committees
have not met at the time of dispatch for this report, a verbal update can be provided if requested for the Mayor and Cabinet Meeting in Feb 15.

4.2. In England and Wales a Youth Offending Team (YOT), also known as a Youth Offending Service (YOS) is a multi-agency team that is coordinated by a local authority, which is overseen by the Youth Justice Board. It deals with young offenders, sets up community services and reparation plans, and attempts to prevent youth recidivism and incarceration. YOTs were set up following the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act with the intention of reducing the risk of young people offending and re-offending, and to provide counsel and rehabilitation to those who do offend.

4.3. Youth Offending Teams engage in a wide variety of work with young offenders (those under 18) in order to achieve their aims. YOTs supervise young people who have been ordered by the court to serve sentences in the community or in the secure estate. Sometimes, teams organise meetings between offenders and victims to encourage apologies and reparation. Youth Offending Teams also arrange for Appropriate Adults to accompany under 18s after their arrest in order to advise and support the young person, and observe that they are treated fairly.

4.4. In Lewisham, youth offending interventions are provided by the Youth Offending Service and a range of small sub contracts. The YOS is a team within the Community Services Directorate.

4.5. In considering these budgets cuts Officers have consulted with other departments of the Council. In particular they have discussed the proposed cuts with the Youth Service. The Youth Service have not yet finalised their proposed budget reductions to commissioned services. Officers will continue to liaise with the Youth Service regarding the organisations that the budget cuts will affect in order to assess the wider impact of the cuts. There are likely to be two organisations affected by the likely cuts.

5. Reparation Consultation

5.1. The YOS has a statutory obligation to deliver reparation activities. The lists below show what Officers will cease to commission and what Officers will be delivering. The Reparation budget will reduce from £50,000 to £10,000.

5.2. Officers consulted with TCV regarding the reduction in funding. Officers will no longer be funding The Conservation Volunteers (TCV) for the delivery of the Firhill Road allotment programme. However TCV have confirmed that they have secured funding to continue the delivery of the programme for a two year period 2015 – 2017. The reparation activity will be expanded as part of this to accommodate the delivery of Unpaid Work.

5.3. Officers have consulted with Surrey Docks Farm regarding the £2,000 reduction in funding to £4,000. This had previously been discussed with them and they have accommodated the reduction into their budget planning. This is a provision based in Southwark and they do not receive any other core grant funding.
5.4. Officers have consulted with the Young Lewisham Project (YLP) regarding the reduction in funding for the bike restoration programme. This was a pilot programme for 2014/15 and funding for future programmes had not been confirmed. Officers have reviewed the programme and the outputs that Officers wish to achieve for 2015/16 and believe that this can be delivered within the proposed budget. YLP are facing budget cuts from other Council sources such as the Youth Service. YLP has previously received main grant funding in the region of £90,200 towards salaries and running costs, and additional funding from Lewisham Youth Service of £20,254. The organisation was previously successful to secure one-off funding to develop the new Garden Project from Environmental Green Scene LBL. However this is not sustainable funding. YLP are at risk due to overall funding reductions however this is not as a direct result of the planned YOS budget cut.

5.5. Proposals will not affect the Community Panel Member Training, Supporting the Food Banks, Youth Engagement Programme or the Anti Social Behaviour Programme. No consultation has taken place with these providers.

5.6. Agency staff have been used in the current year to allow the new Youth Support Officers time to train across the service, with a particular focus on Triage and the new out of court disposals. This will no longer be necessary in 2015/16. There will be a reduction of £10,000 in staffing however this will not result in any redundancies as these posts are agency posts who are due to leave in December 2014. Consultation has not taken place as this was a planned and temporary piece of work.

5.7. Below is a summary of the forecast reduction in expenditure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2014/15 Funding</th>
<th>2015/16 Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCV</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Maintenance</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Engagement Group</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Docks Farm</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training CPMs</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB Programme</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (costs for materials etc for YOS delivered programmes)</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessional Staffing</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£50,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Programmes and Interventions Consultation

6.1. Officers have met with Elevating Success who will no longer be commissioned to deliver holiday programmes to young people on Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS) or high risk young people. They have confirmed that they are seeking alternative funding to deliver the programme and that this reduction in funding will not affect the viability of the organisations.
6.2. PYE will not be commissioned to deliver Double Edge Knife Crime Programme. PYE will not be commissioned to deliver MVP Offender Behaviour Programme. PYE are not funded by other areas of the Council. Officers have consulted with them.

6.3. Kinetic Youth will only deliver resettlement programmes at one custodial estate based on need. They have received an increasing in funding from other sources and so services to young people will not be affected.

6.4. Some discussions have taken place with providers about their viability as an organisation and the impact that these budget changes will have on their work. Elevating Success and Kinetic Youth have both confirmed that this will not impact on their organisation and their ability to deliver work.

7. Arts Programmes

7.1. Lewisham YOS have delivered the Summer Arts College (SAC) for six years in partnership with Occupy My Time and Unitas. SAC is delivered by Occupy my Time and funded through Unitas. The YOS has been in a fortunate position to provide additional funding to enhance the programme.

7.2. The following table shows what has been spent this year, split by Unitas and L B Lewisham’s contribution. Next year’s budget is not yet known. The figure from this table has been incorporated into the main table at the end of this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Arts College</th>
<th>2013/14 Unitas contribution</th>
<th>2013/14 Lewisham additional contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discover and Explore</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Award</td>
<td>£5,400</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£10,400</td>
<td>£7,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3. Officers have consulted with the current provider and with other providers who are based in other London Boroughs. They have all confirmed that they could deliver for the fixed amount of funding that Unitas are likely to allocate to Lewisham.

8. Appropriate Adults

8.1. Lewisham YOS has a statutory obligation to provide Appropriate Adults to young people who are arrested and have no adult available to support them while they are at the Police station. Negotiations have taken place with the provider Catch 22 and the service can be delivered for £30,000 securing a saving of £10,000. This is based on them having secured contracts from other London Boroughs which will allow economies of scale. A Single Action Tender process will take place in line with the Local Authority procurement guidelines.
9. Staffing

9.1. One vacant YOS Officer post will be deleted. This post has been covered by an agency worker during the current year in order to meet demand. Caseloads will be realigned in order for the case and workload to be manageable. This will allow a saving of £44,358. A consultation process is underway with staff regarding the deletion of the post. Staff have been made aware of the deletion and a meeting is taking place on Tuesday 20\textsuperscript{th} January. The consultation will be finalised on Friday 30\textsuperscript{th} January with implementation from 1\textsuperscript{st} April 2015.

9.2. Lewisham has now been notified of our Youth Justice Board Grant allocation for 2015/16. The delay to the process has been due to this announcement. Had the amount been less than anticipated the Council may have had to make greater cuts to the staff team.

10. General Overheads

10.1. The reduction in overheads has commenced and the office is moving to a paper free office. There has already been a reduction in the level of paper ordered and a shift from all young people known to the service having paper files created, with everything being scanned and held online. This will be further implemented by April 2015 with the reduction of Court paperwork.

10.2. Discussions are currently taking place with the Court to implement the reductions further by reducing the paperwork that the YOS are required to prepare for Magistrates and District Judges.

11. Legal Implications

11.1. Section 39 (1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires the co-operation of the named statutory partners to form a YOT. Section 38 (1, 2) identifies the statutory partners and places upon them a duty to co-operate in order to secure youth justice services appropriate to their area. These statutory partners are the local authority, police, the probation service and health.

11.2. To support the YOT, additional partners may also be recruited to the joint strategic effort to prevent offending by children and young people. The Act does not prescribe how services are delivered, but sets out two principal statutory functions assigned to each YOT in Section 39 (7):

- to co-ordinate the provision of youth justice services for all those in the authority’s area who need them
- to carry out such functions assigned in the youth justice plan formulated by the local authority.

11.3. In addition, by providing the youth justice services outlined at Section 38 (4) of the Act, the local authority also addresses its duty, under paragraph 7(b) of Schedule 2 of the Children Act 1989, to take reasonable steps designed to encourage children and young people within the area not to commit offences.
11.4. The budget reductions outlined in this report will have no impact on the YOS’s ability to meet its legal requirements and so there are no legal implications at this stage.

12. Financial Implications

12.1. There are financial implications as a result of the proposals outlined in this report. They are to reduce the YOS budget by £200,000. The impact will be seen on both internal departments and external partners.

12.2. Officers have looked at wider cuts across the Council and there are no cumulative effects on organisations as far as it is able to assess at this stage.

13. Crime and Disorder Implications

13.1. As outlined in 10.1, the YOS was created under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and has responsibilities outlined in the Act. However the recommendations made in this Act should not have any adverse impact on the Service’s ability to meet the legislative requirements.

14. Human Rights Act Implications

14.1. There are no specific implications arising.

15. Equal Opportunities Implications

15.1. The Youth Offending Service delivers interventions to young people who have offended. There are a disproportionate number of young people in the youth justice system who are male and from a black and minority ethnic background. As most services will continue to be delivered, albeit via a different delivery route, it is envisaged that there will be no specific implications arising.

15.2. The YOS vacancy that is being delivered is currently vacant and so there are no equal opportunities arising as a result.

15.3. EAA attached below

16. Environmental Implications

16.1. There are no specific implications arising.

17. Conclusion

17.1. The majority of organisations who will experience a reduction of funding from Lewisham YOS in 2015 will not be adversely affected by a reduction in funding from other Council departments. Officers have looked at wider cuts across the Council and there are no cumulative effects on organisations as far as can be assessed at this stage. Several organisations have already identified funding sources in order to continue services to Lewisham YOS young people. Several agencies are awaiting confirmation of funding from charities and private providers. Lewisham YOS will continue to work with these agencies to secure funding and resources.
18. Contact Details

18.1. For further information please contact Tanya Edwards, Strategic YOS Manager 020 8314 9884.
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Lewisham Youth Offending Service (YOS)
Equality Impact Assessment – Budget reductions 2015

Background

Public bodies such as local authorities are legally required to consider the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty (set out in the Equality Act 2010) and document their thinking as part of any decision-making processes.

The Act sets out that public bodies must have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share that characteristic
- foster good relationships between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share that characteristic.

The following equalities characteristics are ‘protected’ from unlawful discrimination in service provision under the Equality Act 2010:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion and belief
- Gender
- Sexual orientation.

This document considers how the planned budget reductions to the YOS will impact on each of these protected characteristics.

Age

The main service users of the YOS are young people aged between 10 – 17 but predominantly ages 15 – 17. The reduction in budget is unlikely to have a negative impact on this cohort of young people at this stage as alternative provision is being put in place.

The reduction of the YOS Officer post will not impact on the overall diversity of the staff delivering the service and will not negatively impact on this protected characteristic.

Disability

Following consultation with staff and service users, there are no concerns about the impact that the budget reductions will have on this protected characteristic. A number of YOS young people suffer from a learning or special additional need such as ADHD or learning difficulties, however the service has recently developed a range of programmes at no cost to support this particular target group. This will give an enhanced service to this cohort.

The reduction of the YOS Officer post will not impact on the overall diversity of the staff delivering the service and will not negatively impact on this protected characteristic.
Pregnancy and maternity

Following consultation with staff and service users, there are no concerns about the impact that the budget reductions will have on this protected characteristic.

Race

Following consultation with staff and service users, there are no concerns about the impact that the budget reductions will have on this protected characteristic. The number of young people from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups supervised in the community is broadly representative of the wider population. This cohort will not be adversely affected. The number of young people in custody who are from a BME background is disproportionate to the wider population, with an over representation of black males. However there are no planned cuts to this service and there are other programmes of work in place working with this cohort at present.

The reduction of the YOS Officer post will not impact on the overall diversity of the staff delivering the service and will not negatively impact on this protected characteristic.

Religion and belief

Following consultation with staff and service users, there are no concerns about the impact that the budget reductions will have on this protected characteristic.

The reduction of the YOS Officer post will not impact on the overall diversity of the staff delivering the service and will not negatively impact on this protected characteristic.

Gender

Young men are over represented in the youth justice system with 85% of the YOS cohort comprised of young men. The reduction in budget is unlikely to have a negative impact on this cohort of young people at this stage as alternative provision is being put in place. Several new programmes will be delivered at no cost to the service, which focus on young men, especially around relationships and healthy living.

The reduction of the YOS Officer post will not impact on the overall diversity of the staff delivering the service and will not negatively impact on this protected characteristic.

Sexual orientation

Following consultation with staff and service users, there are no concerns about the impact that the budget reductions will have on this protected characteristic.

The reduction of the YOS Officer post will not impact on the overall diversity of the staff delivering the service and will not negatively impact on this protected characteristic.

Gender reassignment

Following consultation with staff and service users, there are no concerns about the impact that the budget reductions will have on this protected characteristic.
The reduction of the YOS Officer post will not impact on the overall diversity of the staff delivering the service and will not negatively impact on this protected characteristic.

Conclusion

As a result of the consultation and engagement activities and analysis of the key issues and findings from the budget reduction process, it is concluded that at present there are no adverse implications for the protected characteristics listed above. However, due to the wider budget cuts taking place across the Council and partner agencies, this will need to be monitored to ensure that agencies who previously supported our young people are able to continue to provide a service or that we are able to identify similar local provision. This will remain a particular challenge when considering age, gender and race.

Further information

Tanya Edwards, Strategic YOS Manager 020 8314 9884 tanya.edwards@lewisham.gov.uk
L – Culture and Community Services

Savings proposals A2 is presented here. It is:

L1 Review of main voluntary and community service grants programme

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Safer Stronger Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
13a L1 Proposal
13b L1 M&C report
L1: Review of main voluntary & community service grants programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead officer</th>
<th>Liz Dart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directorates affected by proposal</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Third Sector and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee</td>
<td>Safer Stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference no.</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short summary of proposal</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget: 5889.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,955.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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.

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.

Saving proposal description

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:

- The level of need locally
- The contribution the third sector can make to meeting the priority
- The availability of other sources of funding locally

The proposed programme themes are:

18. Strong and Cohesive Communities
19. Communities that Care
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3. Description of service and proposal

20. Access to Advice  
21. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legal challenge – risk of JR’s from VCS organisations losing funding.</th>
<th>Careful design of process, appropriate consultation, consideration of equalities impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slippage – ensuring that information presented to members at each stage of process is complete enough to enable decisions to be taken.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Capacity – open process could bring large volumes of applications</td>
<td>Not possible to extend assessment period without further delays to saving implementation so extra capacity may need to be identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>I.</td>
<td>A. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
<td>Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Young people’s achievement and involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Clean, green and liveable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Safety, security and a visible presence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Strengthening the local economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Decent Homes for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Protection of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact on Corporate Priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G. Caring for adults and the older people</th>
<th>H. Active, health citizens</th>
<th>I. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Wards:</th>
<th>If individual Wards, please state:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Service Equalities Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the expected impact on equalities?</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Low/Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is staff consultation required (Y/N)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Is public consultation required (Y/N)?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender: Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: BME:</td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: Where known:</td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**  
1.1 This report seeks to provide an update to saving proposal L1 reduction to main grants programme budget of £1.5million.

2. **Recommendation**  
2.1 That Mayor and Cabinet note the outcome of the additional consultation detailed in section 4 of this report.

2.2 That Mayor and Cabinet agree in principal the proposed reduction to the main grants budget of £1.5million subject to individual grant recommendations being agreed by Mayor and Cabinet at their meeting in May 2015.

3. **Background**  
3.1 The Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 16th July 2014 approved a 3 month consultation period on proposed new criteria and application process for the main grants programme. This consultation took place from the end of July to end of October 2014 and the outcome was reported to Mayor and Cabinet contracts on 12th November 2014. Mayor and Cabinet contracts approved the proposed new grants criteria and for the application process to commence. The meeting requested that in the meantime some additional consultation on the proposed budget reduction be undertaken and reported back to Mayor and Cabinet in February 2015.

4. **Results of additional consultation**  
4.1 All the current main grant funded organisations and all organisations that had participated in the 3 month consultation on the main grants criteria were written to and asked whether they had any suggestions about alternative ways that we could achieve a £1.5million saving other than the proposed reduction to the main grants budget.

4.2 There were only two responses to the additional consultation. The low level of responses is likely to be due to the high participation rates in the initial 3 month consultation which has already been reported to Mayor and Cabinet in November 2014. The two responses were from Downham Community Association and Teach Sport. Downham Community Association suggested that the council could make better use of some of its assets and asset transfer to reduce our repairs and maintenance costs and increase organisation’s long term viability with long leases that would enable them to attract other funding. This is something that the council already considers in certain instances where a careful assessment of the asset suggests that
it is a viable option and will provide the right level of community benefits. Teach Sport endorsed the need to reduce the grant aid budget and made a strong argument that with reduced resources it was important to fund less organisations rather than spread the funding too thinly. They suggested only funding one or two organisations per strand and for organisations to work closely with the council and each other to meet needs. The view that the council should fund less organisations rather than spreading the funding too thinly was widely endorsed during the initial consultation. The viability of each funding award will be taken into consideration during the assessment process.

5. Update on application process
5.1 The application process for 2015-18 grant period opened in early December. To assist organisations to submit quality applications there have been four networking events and officers have been providing one to one Application Surgeries (either via phone or face to face) throughout December and January. Both the Networking events and the Application Surgeries have proved extremely popular, with both current and new organisations booking slots.

5.2 The application deadline for the programme is 4 February 2015. Applications will then be assessed through a three stage assessment process and draft recommendations provided to organisations by 30th March 2015. Organisations will then be able to prepare an appeal that will be presented alongside the officer recommendations to the Mayor and Cabinet contracts meeting on 13th May 2015 for a final decision. The new grants will commence on 1st July 2015. The officer’s draft recommendations will be available for scrutiny by Safer Stronger Select Committee at their meeting on 15th April 2015.

6. Equalities Implications
6.1 The equalities implications of the new grants criteria were reported to Mayor and Cabinet contracts in November 2014 to inform the decision to approve the criteria and open the programme to applications. Individual equalities assessments will be made of each grant application and reported to Mayor and Cabinet Contracts in May 2015 with the grant recommendations for decision.

7. Legal Implications
7.1 Under S1 of the Localism Act 2011 the Council has a general power of competence to do anything which an individual may do unless it is expressly prohibited. The giving of grants to voluntary organisations is a discretionary power which must be exercised reasonably taking into account all relevant considerations and ignoring irrelevant considerations. In relation to any consultation exercise sufficient reasons must be given for any proposal, adequate time must be given for consideration and response and the outcome of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account by the decision maker.

If you would like more information on this report please contact Liz Dart, Community Services Directorate on 020 8314 6115
L1 Equalities Implications

EAAs will be undertaken on individual applications.

However the following Equalities Implications were noted in the November M&C Contracts Report

Equality Implications

1. An Equality Analysis Assessment of the proposed changes to the main grants programme has been undertaken. This indicated a potential negative impact in relation to age with the removal of the dedicated Children and Young People strand. In relation to children and young people although there is not a dedicated theme there are opportunities to apply for funding to support work with children and young people across other strands. In relation to youth activity the focus within the main grants programme is on cultural provision through Theme 4 as it is felt that the Youth Service through both its direct and commissioned services provides for generic youth work. The importance of very grass roots responses to youth activity is recognised through the inclusion of youth activity within the Neighbourhood Community Development Strand.

2. There is the potential for a negative impact across other protected characteristics due to the proposed reduction to the grant aid budget. The exact detail of this will not be known until applications have been received and assessed. A further EAA will be undertaken at that stage to inform the decisions of Mayor and Cabinet Contracts.

3. All organisations will be asked to demonstrate their commitment to equalities as part of their applications as well as providing information about the proposed impact of their work on different equalities strands.

4. The Council recognises that within reduced resources and with an increasingly diverse community it will be extremely hard to fund dedicated services for all the different communities within the borough. It will be important for the Council to demonstrate fairness in the allocation of resources not favouring any one specific community. The Council however recognises that many people face disadvantage and have difficulty accessing services and will continue to seek to fund organisations that can work with a range of disadvantaged communities to address this.
APPENDIX 14 – Proposal for saving L3 (NEW)

L – Culture and Community

Savings proposals L3 is presented here. It is:

L3 Culture and Community Development

This appendix presents the savings proforma for this new proposal.

The appendix references are:
14a L3 Proposal
### L3: Cultural and Community Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural and Community Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no. (to be provided by finance)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal (to be included in overall report)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget: £</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Total 2015/16-2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DSG</strong></th>
<th><strong>HRA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

A number of additional savings are being proposed from across the Cultural and Community Development Service. The Cultural and Community Development Service manage Local Assemblies, grants, arts, events, sports development, Leisure and community premises.

**Saving proposal description**

The saving is proposed to be achieved through reducing a number of development budgets, an increase in income and the deletion of two vacant posts as follows:

- Arts Development budget reduced by £40k. This funding is currently unallocated and would have been used for development projects. The service will retain the Festival Fund and funding for Black History Month.
- Sports Development budget reduced by £40k. This funding is currently unallocated and would have been used for development projects. The service will retain the Sports Grants budget and funding for London Youth Games and Mini Marathon.
- Glass Mill car park income – £35k new income target for the Glass Mill Car Park which is now operational.
- Leisure management budget - £20k reduction to the contract management budget which has been underspent in 2014/15.
- Reduction to salaries budget - £85k reduction to the service salary budget which will be achieved by
3. Description of service and proposal

not filling two posts that are currently vacant.

- £20k – reductions to miscellaneous team overheads budgets that have been underspent in 2014/15

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:

Two vacant posts will not be recruited to which will require some reallocation and reprioritisation of workloads across the remaining staff team. The proposed reductions are to budgets that have not been spent in 2014/15 and therefore the impact on service users and VCS is expected to be neutral.

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

There is always some risk with income generation but the Glass Mill car park income is a negotiated fee with the contractor and is therefore considered achievable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Priority – Most Relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Impact of saving on corporate priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

All Wards: If individual Wards, please state:

None

5. Service Equalities Impact

What is the expected impact: Low/ neutral
### 5. Service Equalities Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)
## Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>BME:</th>
<th>White:</th>
<th>Other:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation:</th>
<th>Where known:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 15 – Proposal for saving L4 (NEW)

L – Culture and Community

Savings proposals L4 is presented here. It is:

L4 Broadway theatre

This appendix presents the savings proforma for this new proposal.

The appendix references are:
15a L4 Proposal
APPENDIX 15a – Proposal for saving L4 (NEW)

L4: Broadway Theatre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadway Theatre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorates affected by proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference no. (to be provided by finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short summary of proposal (to be included in overall report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget: £284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Broadway Theatre has an 800 seat auditorium and small studio theatre space offering a year round programme of music, comedy, community events and theatre with a staff team of six and a large number of agency staff. The theatre is a Grade II listed building that was not designed with the requirements of a modern performance venue in mind. It is recognised that the building requires substantial capital investment to bring it up to the standard expected by production companies and audiences in the competitive London venue market. It is anticipated that this investment could be secured as part of Catford regeneration but this will not be for several years.

Saving proposal description

The proposal is to significantly reduce the operating period within the theatre. This is driven partly by the need to deliver savings but also by concerns over the ability to safely manage the scale of operations currently provided at the theatre given the building's limitations.

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 a staff reorganisation to reduce the fulltime salaried staffing structure. The theatre will operate for two focussed programmes during the year rather than a year round provision. This will enable the theatre to continue operating with a focus on community programming such as pensioner events, local showcases etc. whilst the longer term solution for the building is developed as part of the Catford Regeneration.

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

The key risk is being able to design a focussed programme that can be safely delivered within the current building constraints and with the reduced staff resource. The mitigating action will be a much reduced programme that will be carefully planned to ensure that the staff and building capacity are not overstretched.
# APPENDIX 15a – Proposal for saving L4 (NEW)

## Impact on Corporate Priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Young people’s achievement and involvement</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Clean, green and liveable</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Safety, security and a visible presence</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Strengthening the local economy</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Decent Homes for all</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA. Protection of children</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB. Caring for adults and the older people</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC. Active, health citizens</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

All Wards: If individual Wards, please state:

The Broadway Theatre is in Rushey Green Ward.

## 5. Service Equalities Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the expected impact on equalities?</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low/ neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristics</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 15a – Proposal for saving L4 (NEW)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacant*

Vacant**

Vacant***

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>BME:</th>
<th>White:</th>
<th>Other:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Disability: | 0 disabled, 6 not disabled |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation:</th>
<th>Where known:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N – Environmental Services

Savings proposals N1 is presented here. It is:

N1 Reduction in maintenance of some small parts, highways and reduced management

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers submitted to Sustainable Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
16a N1 Proposal
16b Update reported to Sustainable Select Committee in January 2015
N1: Reduction in maintenance of some small parks, 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**   | Green scene                     |
|                                 | 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. 2) Reduce management and management support costs/ posts |

1. **Financial information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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)

2. Reduce management and management support costs/ posts (3 posts) £188k

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:

- 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

Reduced management structures
4. Impact of proposal

- 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:

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

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low/ neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Low/ Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief:</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 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:

x

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is staff consultation required (Y/N)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is public consultation required (Y/N)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female: 14</th>
<th>Male: 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME: 4</td>
<td>White: 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known: 18</td>
<td>Not Known: 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor and Cabinet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Budget Savings Proposal N1: Reorganise environmental services reduction in maintenance of some small parks, highways &amp; reduced management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key decision</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors</th>
<th>Executive Director of Customer Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>11th February 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Report Purpose & Summary
1.1. Following the 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings report on 12th November last year the Mayor asked for reports back on a number of proposals for budget reductions including item N1: Reorganise environmental services reduction in maintenance of some small parks, highways & reduced management. He asked for further work including consultation with affected staff and service users, and that full report be included in the February Budget report.

2. Policy Context
2.1. Shaping our Future – the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy includes the following priority outcomes:

- Empowered and responsible - where people are actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities
  - Empower citizens to be involved in their local area and responsive to the needs of those who live there.
  - Champion diversity and the contribution everyone makes to the borough’s quality of life

- Clean, green and liveable – where people live in high quality housing and care for and enjoy their environment
  - Protect and enhance our parks, open spaces and local biodiversity

- Healthy, active and enjoyable – where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being
  - Improving the well-being of our citizens by increasing participation in healthy and active lifestyles.

2.2. The Council has outlined ten corporate priorities which enables the delivery of the Sustainable Community strategy. Priority number 1 Community Leadership and Empowerment – recommends the developing opportunities for active participation and engagement of people in the life of the community with residents involved in the life of their communities. Priority number 3 Clean, green and liveable prioritises a protected and managed environment setting out to work in partnership with Glendale Grounds management to increase public involvement in parks and raise levels of public satisfaction.
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2.3 The Council’s Cultural Strategy sets out the following key themes:

- Placemaking – develop high quality leisure, heritage and cultural facilities that contribute to the borough’s physical character and sense of place
- Community – Build vibrant and cohesive communities by encouraging participation in cultural and leisure activities
- Health – Build healthy communities through culture, sport and leisure

3. Recommendations
That Mayor and Cabinet approve

3.1 The measures set out in the report in order to achieve the savings to the environmental services revenue budget for Parks and Open Spaces 2015/16.

4. Background
4.1 The Mayor and Cabinet Lewisham Future Programme 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings report 12th November 2014 recommended, under appendix N1, the reduction in Green Scene Management Costs £188k; and the Exploration of the possibility of reducing direct costs by increasing community engagement and involvement in the management of open spaces £153k.

3. Measures to achieve the proposed savings
5.1 Reduction in Green Scene Management Costs £188k

The Group Manager Green Scene (November 2014) and the Green Space Regeneration Manager (March 2015) have both agreed flexible retirement with the Council, a saving of £58k. Consultation on the deletion of 1 management support post has already been completed and, subject to the approval of M&C in February, the post will be deleted on 27th March 2015, a saving of £50k. The balance of £80k has not been formally identified but will be partially offset from increased event income and further efficiencies in the management of the contract.

5.2 Community Management of Open Spaces £153k
At the meeting with the Lewisham Parks Forum on 17th January, which followed up on discussions held at the Lewisham Parks Summit in October 2014, it was broadly agreed that 3 groups will be formed. These will be made up of interested user group members, Councillors and a lead Council officer.

Consultation with service users

5.3 Following an initial consultation meeting with the Chairs of our Park User Groups on the 24th October 2014, officers met with members of the Lewisham Parks Forum (LPF), a group set up by the chairs of the user groups, on 17th January 2015 to discuss the establishment of working groups to investigate the following opportunities to increasing community involvement to help reduce costs. Local Ward Councillors are invited to attend LPF meetings and a number were in attendance at the January meeting.
• Group 1 will look at how the current contract works and what opportunities there are to reduce costs. This group is to be established in early February. This is the best option to deliver savings for 2015/16 as it will look at potential changes to maintenance regimes for example further changes to planting & grass cutting regimes and possible changes to litter collection regimes.

• Group 2 will look at opportunities to secure external funding including fundraising from commercial events. This will obviously take more time to deliver results but is probably the best option for securing long term cost reductions e.g. via income generation from events/festivals

• Group 3 will look at alternative management options, for example Trusts and Social Enterprises, with a view to taking over the management of parks, either individual or multiple sites. The Client team will be supported by the Community Services directorate in order to explore the potential for alternative options.

4. Sustainable Development Select Committee
6.1 At the meeting of the 20\textsuperscript{th} January 2015 members expressed a concern that future proposals discussed by the 3 Working Groups be aired at a wider forum and not just by the Lewisham Parks Forum. They recommended that proposals be discussed at the Area Assembly Forums and discussed at the Environmental Sustainability Committee.

5. Financial implications
7.1 The proposals set out in section 5 will require further measures in order to achieve the whole year savings targets.

7.2 Officers will work closely with Glendale Grounds management to ensure that, where possible, any future cuts affecting the contract specification do not impact of Glendale’s ability to deliver the contract, i.e its viability, whilst ensuring the core service standards are continued to be met.

7.3 Should further measures be required that affect the contract specification, the costs of any Contract Variation will need to be considered when those proposals are considered.

7.4 Options considered and rejected:

• To close and cease to maintain seven small parks £77k. Rejected due to the likelihood to cause public dissatisfaction.

• To cease to maintain 15 fenced highways enclosures - £27k. Rejected due to the likelihood to cause public dissatisfaction.

• To cease to maintain all 5 closed churchyards - £49k – Rejected due to possible legal challenge from the affected Parochial Church Council’s and the Diocese of Southwark.

8. Legal and human rights implications
8.1 Detailed legal implications will be provided as the community management proposals are brought forward and legal services will need to be involved at an early stage in the formulation of those proposals. It is likely that there will be a range of different proposals that come forward which will each have different legal and financial implications. As part of this process, the implications for the Glendales Contract will need to be kept under review, as well as the financial implications of any proposals for Glendales and the Council.

8.2 Handing over responsibility for individual or multiple sites to particular groups will require appropriate legal arrangements to be put in place to ensure that the sites are properly managed and that the Council’s position is protected and its objectives met. The insurance and liability aspects will be particularly key as well as ensuring continued compliance with all relevant statutory provisions and health and safety legislation. It will be essential for appropriate monitoring mechanisms to be put in place and maintained by the Council as there are clear risks to the public that could arise in these circumstances.

8.3 Any use of volunteers in parks has particular insurance and liability issues which must be considered as part of any proposal that comes forward.

8.4 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.

8.5 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.

8.6 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.

8.7 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/
8.8 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

8.9 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/

9. Human Resource Implications
9.1 The Group Manager Green Scene (November 2014) and the Green Space Regeneration Manager (March 2015) have both agreed flexible retirement with the Council. Consultation on the deletion of 1 management support post has already been completed and, subject to the approval of M&C in February, the post will be deleted on 27th March 2015.

10. Crime and disorder implications
10.1 Officers will work with Glendale Grounds management to seek to ensure that core service standards are met. The crime and disorder implications of any proposal that comes forward for approval will be considered in detail at that point.

11. Equalities implications

Shaping our future, Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy for 2008-2020, sets out a vision for Lewisham:-

“Together we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live work and learn.”

This is underpinned by hard-edged principles for:

- **reducing inequality** – narrowing the gap in outcomes for citizens
- **delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably** - ensuring that all citizens have appropriate access to and choice of high quality local service.

11.2 Lewisham’s Comprehensive Equalities Scheme (CES) 2012-16 describes the Council’s commitment to equality for citizens, service users and employees. It
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provides an overarching framework and focus for the Council’s work on equalities and helps ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010. The CES is underpinned by a set of high level strategic objectives which incorporate the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty, these include:-

To improve access to services
11.3 Take reasonable steps to ensure that services are inclusive; responsive to risk; physically accessible and provided through the most efficient and effective channels available.

To close the gap in outcomes for citizens
11.4 Take reasonable steps to improve life chances for citizens by reducing outcome gaps that may exist within the borough as well as those that may exist between the borough and elsewhere.

To increase understanding and mutual respect between communities
11.5 Take reasonable steps to build stronger communities and promote good relations - both within and between communities.

To increase participation and engagement
11.6 Take reasonable steps to remove barriers that may exist to engagement and help residents (especially those who are under-represented) to participate in local decision making and influence local decisions.

11.7 Options developed as a result of the establishment of working groups will be subject to an initial equality analysis assessment (EAA) scoping exercise. This will enable the service to assess the possible implications on the whole community (including staff) where changes to service delivery are proposed. This will help ensure that certain protected characteristics, groups, individuals or staff, are not excluded from services or practices and ensures that the whole community benefits from services which the Council delivers.

12. Environmental implications
12.1 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 proper exercise of those functions to the purpose of conserving biodiversity”. No such implications have been identified in this report.

13. Conclusion
13.1 The report sets of measures officers will take in order to achieve the savings requirements for the 2015/16 parks revenue budget. The report recommends the establishment of 3 Working Groups which will report back to Area Forum and the Environment Sustainability Committee.

14. Background documents and originator
14.1 The background documents, including notes of meetings are attached as Appendix 1
If you require any further information about this report please contact Martin Hyde on 020 8314 2034.
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N – Environmental Services

Savings proposals N1 is presented here. It is:

N2  Reduction in street cleansing frequency and management costs

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional paper submitted to Sustainable Select Committee in January 2015, updating members on the approach taken and work completed to date.

The appendix references are:
17a  N2 Proposal
17b  Update reported to Sustainable Select Committee in January 2015
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N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequency & management costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction in Street Cleansing Frequencies and Cleansing Management Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Unswept 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.
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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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Priority – Most Relevant</th>
<th>Secondary Priority</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. Community Leadership and empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of saving on corporate priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Equalities Impact

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

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

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

(Env Ad SR will provide you with data where this is available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Band</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Vacant*</th>
<th>Vacant**</th>
<th>Vacant***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1 - 2</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3 - 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 6 - SO2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO1 – PO5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO6 – PO8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMG1 – SMG3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>BME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known:</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Report Purpose & Summary
1.1. Following the 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings report on 12th November last year the Mayor asked for reports back on a number of proposals for budget reductions including item N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs.

2. Policy Context
2.1. Shaping our Future – the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy includes the following priority outcome:
   - Clean, green and liveable – where people live in high quality housing and care for and enjoy their environment

2.2. The Council is obliged to comply with cleansing standards defined within the Environmental Protection Act 1990. 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.

3. Recommendations
That Mayor and Cabinet approve

3.1. The measures set out in the report in order to achieve the savings to the environmental services revenue budget for Street Management (Cleansing) 2015/16.

4. Background
4.1. As part of the Council’s 2015/16 budget saving process the Cleansing Service was required to identify further savings of £394k for financial year 2015/16 Measures to achieve the proposed savings.

   Residential Sweepers
4.2. In 2012 there were 112 residential street sweepers, this was reduced to 92 when 20 sweeper posts were deleted that year. (18% reduction)

4.3. The current proposal would delete 14 sweeper posts (92 down to 78, a reduction in sweeper post since 2012 of 30%).

Supervision
In 2011/12 there were 15 supervisors within Cleansing, this was reduced to 12 (a 20% reduction).

In 2012/13 another supervisory post was deleted.

In March 2015 two more supervisory posts are to be deleted. (40% reduction since 2011)

**Reduction in Cleansing Costs £394k**

14 Street Sweepers posts are to be deleted and management will look at the allocation of work to all beats across the borough. This will ultimately result in changes being made to the way we deliver Cleansing services to the residents of Lewisham.

These savings will be achieved by the loss of 14 agency staff.

To help to mitigate the loss of these posts it is proposed that the mobile sweeping staff within the 4 Cleansing mobile teams (not drivers) are to taken off their current teams and the 4 mobile teams will be reduced to 2 Drivers per team.

Frequencies of sweeping to residential roads within the borough will have to be reduced in certain areas.

A number of sweepers beat sizes will have to be increased.

A further management post will also be deleted and a large percentage of this work will have to be re-distributed.

**Sustainable Development Select Committee**

At the meeting of the 30th October 2014 the Committee highlighted its concerns around this proposal and the potential negative impacts it will have on the borough, including a more negative perception of and loss confidence in the Council and its ability to look after the borough amongst residents, as well as a decrease in feeling of community safety.

**Financial implications**

The financial implications of this savings proposal are set out in the body of the report. Namely a reduction in the revenue budget for this service of £400,000.

**Legal implications**

Under Section 89(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, the Council is under a statutory duty to ensure that open land under its direct control and to which the public have access is, so far as practicable, kept clear of litter and refuse. Under Section 89(2), the Council is also under a statutory duty, so far as is practicable, to ensure that public highways within its area are kept clean. In deciding what standard is required, the Council must have regard to the character and use of the land or highway, as well as the measures which are practicable in the circumstances.

Under Section 89(10), the Council is also required to have regard to the code of practice published by the Secretary of State from time to time. In particular, the code requires the Council to allocate its land into different types or "zones" which must be publicised. The code then sets out cleanliness standards for the different types of land and maximum response times for cleaning an area which has been littered. The
duty applies seven days a week. Members of the public may complain to the Magistrates Court where they consider that there is a breach of Section 89. The code of practice is admissible in evidence and the court may take into account any relevant provision in the code of practice. If the complaint is successful, a litter abatement order will be made, failure to comply with which is an offence. The court may also award costs if it is satisfied that there were reasonable grounds for bring the complaint, even if by the time the complaint is heard, the litter has been cleared away or the lack of cleanliness rectified. In considering any savings proposals in relation to these matters, the Mayor must therefore be satisfied that the Council will still be able to comply with its duties under Section 89 and the requirements contained in the code of practice.

6.3. 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.

6.4. 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.

6.5. 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.

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

6.7. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
- Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
- Engagement and the equality duty
- Equality objectives and the equality duty
- Equality information and the equality duty
6.8. 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/](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/)

7. **Human Resource Implications**

7.1. Staff consultation has taken place. Redundancy has been approved for the management post affected by the post deletion. Sweeper post reductions will be delivered by terminating agency-worker contracts.

8. **Crime and disorder implications**

8.1. Reduced cleansing standards may have a negative impact on resident perception of safety in public areas.

9. **Equalities implications**


9.2. *Shaping our future*, Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy for 2008-2020, sets out a vision for Lewisham:

> “Together we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live work and learn.”

This is underpinned by hard-edged principles for:

- **reducing inequality** – narrowing the gap in outcomes for citizens

- **delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably** - ensuring that all citizens have appropriate access to and choice of high quality local services

9.3. Lewisham’s Comprehensive Equalities Scheme (CES) 2012-16 describes the Council's commitment to equality for citizens, service users and employees. The CES is underpinned by a set of high level strategic objectives which incorporate the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty;

- Tackle victimisation, harassment and discrimination
- To improve access to services
- To close the gap in outcomes for citizens
- To increase understanding and mutual respect between communities
- To increase participation and engagement

9.4. An equalities analysis at Appendix A concludes that the reduction in street cleansing and cleansing management costs may have a negative impact on people’s sense of community safety and community well-being across all protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and this may disproportionately impact older and disabled people.
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9.5 As part of their operational business processes, the service managers will need to monitor the impact of reductions in service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.

9.6 As this proposal will have an impact on staffing levels, it has been subject to consultation as stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies, and the service will be required to undertake an analysis of its workforce profile as part of its restructuring process.

9.5 As part of their operational business processes, the service will need to monitor the impact of any staffing implications on service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.

10. Environmental implications

10.1 This will threaten our capacity to maintain standards within the Environmental Protection Act.

12. Background documents and originator

12.2 If you require any further information about this report please contact Nigel Tyrell nigel.tyrell@lewisham.gov.uk
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Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of proposal</th>
<th>Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead officers</td>
<td>Nigel Tyrell and Gerry McAneney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other stakeholders | Residents and visitors to the borough  
Local businesses, employers and the Chamber of Commerce  
Elected members  
Local assemblies  
Residents/tenants groups  
Neighbouring boroughs (Southwark/Greenwich, Bromley) for borough boundary arrangements |
| Date of Equality Analysis | January 2015 |

Introduction

As part of the Council’s 2015/16 budget saving process the Cleansing Service has been required to identify further savings of £394k for financial year 2015/16. This will ultimately result in changes being made to the way Cleansing services are delivered to the residents of Lewisham.

The Council is obliged to comply with cleansing standards defined within the Environmental Protection Act 1990. 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.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (set out in the Equality Act 2010) requires the Council to have ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

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, within employment and training.

Proposed changes to the way the service is currently delivered

The proposed changes to the way the service is provided are as follows:

- 14 street sweeper’s posts are to be deleted achieved by the loss of 14 agency staff. In 2012 there were 112 residential street sweepers, this was reduced to 92 following an 18% budget reduction. The proposed reduction to 78 residential street sweepers will effect a 30% reduction since 2012.
- Two cleansing manager posts will be deleted effecting a 40% reduction in supervisory management since 2011/12 (15 posts reduced to nine).
The current breakdown of spend within the overall budget shows that 36% of the overall budget is allocated to residential street sweeping and 9% to supervision. Street markets, estate sweeping and estate lumber collection costs are recharged.

Since 2010 the overall budget for Cleansing Services has reduced by £1.42m with a further saving of £394k proposed for 2015/16.

There are concerns the service reduction may lead to:

- failure to comply with standards defined under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
- a negative perception of and loss of confidence in the Council’s ability to provide a key universal service.
- a negative impact on people’s sense of community safety and community well-being across all protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and may disproportionately impact older and disabled people.

To help to mitigate the loss of the residential street sweeper posts, it is proposed that:

- mobile sweeping staff within the four cleansing mobile teams (not drivers) are taken off their current teams and the four mobile teams will be reduced to two drivers per team.
- the frequencies of sweeping to residential roads within the borough will have to be reduced in certain areas.
- the allocation of work to all beats across the borough will be reviewed and a number of sweeper’s beat sizes will have to be increased.
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- A large percentage of supervisory management work will be re-distributed.

#### Impact Assessment

The overall assessment is that the reduction in street cleansing and cleansing management costs may have a negative impact on people’s sense of community safety and community well-being across all protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and may disproportionately impact older and disabled people.

As part of their operational business processes, the service managers will need to monitor the impact of reductions in service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.

As this proposal will have an impact on staffing levels, it has been subject to consultation as stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies, and the service will be required to undertake an analysis of its workforce profile as part of its restructuring process.
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O – Public Services

Savings proposals O1 is presented here. It is:

O1  End of the discretionary freedom pass scheme

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and the additional papers analysis requested at that meeting.

The appendix references are:
18a  O1 Proposal
18b  Additional analysis requested by M&C on the 12 November
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O1: End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End the Discretionary Freedom Pass Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 5.

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Controllable Budget: Public Services (Benefits)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.273 (253.762)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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.
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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:

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

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)
## Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME:</td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discretionary Freedom Pass – Additional Information

1. Introduction

This briefing contains a summary of the saving information, with the most up to date figures, and a London Borough comparison. It also includes an analysis of potential impact as a result of discretionary Freedom Pass (Freedom Passes) being withdrawn.

The proposal is to withdraw the discretionary Freedom Pass with effect from 2015. As the cost is based on usage it is difficult to be precise about exactly how much could be saved as a result of this but estimates suggest a saving of approximately £200k pa.

There are 2 sets of criteria for qualification for a discretionary Freedom Pass, these being for physical disability (mobility) and mental health. The criteria are shown in Appendix A.

There are 1,246 discretionary Freedom Passes in issue. Of these, 195 have been awarded under the mobility criteria and 1,051 under the mental health criteria.

**Important**

The proposal does not impact on the national Freedom Pass scheme for elderly persons and for specific disabilities.

- There are 32,000 elderly persons national Freedom Passes in use.
- There are 5,000 disabled persons national Freedom Passes in use. See appendix 2 for the qualifying criteria for the national scheme.

2. London picture

The table below shows the discretionary Freedom Pass position across London. Of the 33 boroughs, 19 (58%) have a discretionary scheme and 15 of these do not intend withdrawing it. Excluding Lewisham, of the remaining 3 boroughs, 2 are reviewing their qualifying criteria and one did not respond.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Discretionary Scheme? (Y / N)</th>
<th>If &quot;Yes&quot;, are you intending to end it?</th>
<th>If so (intending to end it) when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Never had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Reviewing criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impact on residents

Withdrawing the discretionary Freedom Pass may impact on some residents but there are alternative schemes that could mitigate the impact and are at no cost to the Council.

- **Job Centre Plus travel discount card** (valid for up to 3 months) – available to residents who have been unemployed for 3 months or more, receive a qualifying benefit or are working with an advisor for a return to work. Those who meet this criteria 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 – Including Lewisham - and who are over the age of 60 but who do not qualify for a Freedom Pass. They will qualify for free travel.

A recent sampling of those residents currently receiving a discretionary Freedom Pass suggested that 68% would qualify for an alternative concession - 63% would qualify for the Job Centre Plus travel discount card and 5% for the 60+ London Oyster card.

Community Services undertook an analysis of a sample of the 32% who would be affected by the withdrawal but did not qualify for an alternative concession. This was very difficult as they had to try and determine whether there would be an impact on their welfare or create additional costs elsewhere in the ‘system’ e.g. passenger transport by reviewing their records.

Impact – cases awarded under mobility criteria

A total of 10 cases were reviewed.

There are 2 cases where there are known mobility issues and where it is considered removing the discretionary Freedom Pass would have an impact on their welfare and could mean they rely on other Council services (e.g. transport).

There is 1 case where there are mobility issues that ‘fluctuate’ due to the condition but where it is considered the discretionary Freedom Pass could be withdrawn with no impact.

There are 7 cases no longer receiving Council services where it is considered the discretionary Freedom Pass could be withdrawn with no impact.

Impact – cases awarded under mental health criteria

A total of 40 cases were reviewed.

There are 28 (or 70%) cases still receiving services

Of the 28 receiving services there are 13 (or 46%) where there is a requirement under Section 117 of Mental Health Act 1983 to provide aftercare. The discretionary Freedom Pass could be seen as part of that aftercare.

The remaining 12 cases are no longer receiving care.
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Other options

The Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee recommended that further work be carried out to assess alternative options for the scheme. The committee asked that, before a decision is taken to end the discretionary scheme, information be provided which sets out the financial and administrative implications of ceasing to issue new passes, whilst retaining the scheme for existing users. The committee also recommended that options for changing the eligibility criteria for the scheme be further examined.

Close the discretionary freedom pass scheme to new applicants – saving £20,000 in year 1 plus a further £20,000 in year 2.

Based on 2012 and 2013 there is an average of 100 discretionary freedom passes holders per year that are no longer entitled because their circumstances change, they move or they reach the national scheme age for an elderly persons freedom pass.

If the scheme was closed for new applications but retained for existing discretionary freedom pass holders there would be an approximate saving of £20,000 in year 1 with an additional £20,000 in year 2. There would be further increases in the savings achievable beyond year 2 but the amount would be dependent on the numbers leaving the scheme.

Review the eligibility criteria to reduce the number of persons entitled to a discretionary freedom pass.

Whilst it would be possible to review the eligibility criteria to reduce the number of persons entitled it is not a simple piece of work. The following steps would be required:

- Work with Community Services and SLAM to look at caseload and costing of different scenarios and saving predictions.
- A change in the policy with the relevant consultation.
- A review of each case by Concessionary Awards team to implement new eligibility criteria.
- Most cases will require referral to an Occupational Therapist for an assessment.
- A review of each case by Community Services and SLAM as care package may need adapting.

The cost of the above work is estimated to be £100,000. Without carrying out the work it is difficult to estimate the possible saving.

Conclusion

It is difficult to determine with any confidence exactly what the impact would be of withdrawing the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme on those that currently receive it without reviewing each case and going through a detailed reassessment. However, a sample exercise suggests that some would not be entitled to an alternative, one of which only lasts up to 3 months in any event and would suffer an impact on their welfare.
Appendix A

Discretionary freedom pass qualifying criteria

Criteria for mobility disability:

- Applicant is able to walk a distance of 300 metres but not able to walk further than this without pain or discomfort; or
- Applicant has a degenerative medical condition effecting mobility

Criteria for mental health conditions:

- The applicant has an enduring mental health condition and has accessed secondary care mental health services in the last 12 months.
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Appendix B

National Freedom Passes scheme disability criteria

- 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.
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Q – Safeguarding and Early Intervention Services

Savings proposals Q1 is presented here. It is:

Q1 Improve triage for Children’s Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and report for M&C decision.

The appendix references are:
19a Q1 Proposal and supplementary
19b Q1 M&C Report
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead officer</th>
<th>Ian Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directorates affected by proposal</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference no.</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short summary of proposal</td>
<td>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. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 6.

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,181 of which 3.2m relates to the re-setting of the CSC Placements budget as set out in CYP14/15.02b</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Description of service and proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 31 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
### 3. Description of service and proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>saving of £322k would arise in 2015/16 and £322k in 2016/17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts, re-configure Children’s Centres to be more flexible and focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ be open, and staffed, 9am-5pm, 5 days a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ open 48 weeks a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ be subject to inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ comply with an extensive set of data and monitoring requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ provide a range of services as specified by statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Savings to other Children’s Social Care budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 a)</td>
<td>Section 20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 b)</td>
<td>Residential Placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Description of service and proposal

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 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.
4. Impact of proposal

- 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.
- Loss of social workers may impact morale although it is intended to redeploy social workers internally.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

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

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 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:</th>
<th>Gender reassignment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low/ Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>BME:</td>
<td>White:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1 – supplementary - Improve triage for Children’s Social Care services & re-design
Children Centre & Early Intervention offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Intervention and Safeguarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorates affected by proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short summary of proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 7.

1. Financial information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Controllable Budget:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure £000’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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3. Description of service and proposal

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>reduce the unit cost of working with each family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts, re-configure Children’s Centres to be more flexible and focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Savings to other CSC budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

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

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?

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

Ethnicity: Low/ Neutral
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Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: (Young People)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partners</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Head Count |             |               |           |           |             |     |
| 8          |             |               | 10        | 1         |             |     |

| Vacant*    |             |               |           |           |             |     |
| Vacant**   |             |               |           |           |             |     |
| Vacant***  |             |               |           |           |             |     |

Workforce Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 7. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>BME:</th>
<th>White:</th>
<th>Other:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation:</td>
<td>Where known:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose

1.1 As part of the 2015-18 budget strategy, savings were proposed to Mayor and Cabinet on 12 November 2014 relating to Early Intervention and Safeguarding services.

1.2 A consultation exercise was undertaken 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 and the savings proposed in the report of the 12th November.

1.3 This report gives a summary of the results of the consultation and recommends that the Mayor accepts the proposals of savings of £3.834m.

1.4 The report also updates on other savings in children’s social care costs

2. Executive Summary

2.1 The report for the meeting of Mayor and Cabinet on 12th November set 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, £2.611m of which was proposed for delivery in 2015/16.

2.2 Part of these savings concerned the reshaping of early intervention services run through the Children’s Centres in order to reduce costs by £1.936k and this reports updates on these proposals.

3. Recommendations

The Mayor is recommended to agree the proposals to:

3.1 Make savings of £3.834m by reducing the number of targeted families and the unit costs of the work carried out by Children’s Centres. Part of the savings will be made by using £1.388m of the Troubled Families Grant to support vulnerable families.
3.2 To agree to a public consultation on the proposed deregistering of OFSTED registration for the Children’s Centres at Besson Street Gardens, St Swithun’s, Heathside and Lethbridge, Evelyn, Amersham, Hatcham Oak, Manor House, Torridon, Marvels Lane, Kelvin Grove and Elliot Bank, Beecroft Gardens and Kilmorie;

3.3 To agree that the proposals to secure improvements in the costs of placements and social care support for young people, set out in section 8 of the report.

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’s Society, 2 by the Pre-School Learning Alliance (PSLA) and 7 are school-run Children’s Centres. In addition to the Children’s Centre sites, services are run from other venues in the Borough by Children’s Centres, Deptford Park Forster Park and TNG. 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 main outcomes that is part of their contracts and we continuously monitor the outcomes for children throughout contract performance meetings. The three outcomes that we expect from the Children’s Centres are:

- to improve parenting and attachment
- to improve school readiness
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- to prevent escalation to more specialist services, such as Children’s Social Care or child mental health services (CAMHS)

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 on a) the number of targeted families reached and b) the outcomes achieved with these families. We have no plans to change these outcomes measures that we will expect from our providers when re-tendering although we will improve the systems associated with the payment by results to secure efficiencies for us and the providers.

5.5 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 and have reached their target of 400 families due at the end of March 2015 by December 2014. We are proposing to increase the scope of the contract for TFS to support young people as outlined in the Youth Service Report.

5.6 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.

5.7 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.

5.8 For the £1.936m savings proposals from the Children’s Centres to be taken forward, it will 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
5.9 The proposal is to re-designate many of our Children's Centres so that they are freed from these requirements so that they can operate more flexibly and at lower cost. We are asking the Mayor to agree that we should consult on deregistering from OFSTED the Children’s Centres Besson Street Gardens, St Swithin’s, Heathside and Lethbridge, Evelyn, Amersham, Hatcham Oak, Manor House, Torridon, Marvels Lane, Kelvin Grove and Elliot Bank, Beecroft Gardens and Kilmore.

5.10 With the exception of Heathside and Lethbridge where the site is being demolished, we do not plan to stop running targeted services from any of the other sites. In order to make the savings we need to give the centres more flexibility to run services for their communities without the demands that being an OFSTED registered Centre has on what they provide. For example, there would be no need for reception staff to be there every day from 9.00 to 5.00 even if there are no services being run in the Centre at that time.

5.11 We plan to consult on having four designated Children’s Centres in the four areas. These will be Clyde in Area 1, Ladywell in Area 2, Bellingham in Area 3 and Downderry in Area 4.

5.12 A public consultation has been carried out between 9th December 2014 and 11th January 2015 on the key strands to the proposals for Children’s Centres as outlined in the report to Mayor and Cabinet of the 12th November 2014. The consultation covered:

• reviewing the way Lewisham’s Children’s Centres are registered with Ofsted;
• reducing the number of targeted families to be worked with by Children’s Centres;
• reducing the unit cost for each targeted family worked with.

5.13 The consultation document is attached at Appendix B.

6 Results of the consultation

6.1 The public consultation was carried out between 9th December and 11th January and used the following approaches:

• drop in sessions at four Children’s Centres, one in each children's service area of the borough;
• online consultation using UEngage;
• paper consultation documents were distributed to each Children’s Centre.

6.2 98 people attended the drop in sessions across the four Children’s Centres (35 at Clyde, 23 at Bellingham, 15 at Downderry and 25 at Beecroft Garden). 3 narrative responses were received without direct reference to the questions in the consultation paper; 119 responses were completed online through UEngage and 389 hard copies of the consultation paper were received; a total of 508 responses to the consultation paper.

6.3 446 of the respondents said they attended a Children's Centre in Lewisham. 10 respondents said they didn't attend a Children's Centre and 52 gave no answer.
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6.4 Distance travelled:
65% attended centres/venues within walking distance from their home;
12% attend centres/venues within a bus ride away;
9% attend centres/venues travelling by car.

6.5 Frequency of use of Children's Centres:
51% of respondents attend several times a week;
30% of respondents attend once a week;
4% of respondents attend once every two weeks;
3% of respondents attend once a month;
2% of respondents attend less than once a month.

6.6 Importance of services:
Respondents were asked to rate different services from a given list. The results below are for those services rated as "most important" by respondents. More than one service could be chosen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children's Centre Service</th>
<th>% scoring this as the most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stay and play for children of specific ages</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messy play</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a chance to meet other parents in similar situations</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical tips and advice on how to do the best for your child</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experts who can inform me how my child is developing</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a person I know and trust to ask for advice</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parenting programmes</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child developmental checks</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support with breastfeeding</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parenting courses</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health visitor appointments</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice and info on where to get other help</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help with domestic abuse, drug/alcohol use or mental health problems</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one to one help</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immunisations</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maternity appointments and clinics</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help to get employment</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one to one help and advice in the home</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help with finance problems</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7 Who responded (of the 178 who answered this question)?
73% of the respondents who identified their status were parents
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7% of the respondents who identified their status were carers
7% of the respondents who identified their status were childminders
3% of the respondents who identified their status were staff
2% of the respondents who identified their status were members of the local community
A further 8% identified themselves as professionals representing an organisation.

6.8 Comments:
There were many comments on the following:
the welcoming and friendly nature of staff in Children’s Centres
the value of the professional advice provided by the staff in Children’s Centres
the benefits of meeting with other parents and sharing experiences
the benefit of services for new mothers
the benefits for children’s development and improvement in school readiness
meeting other parents has an effect on improving mental health and addressing isolation
Children’s Centres are seen as community hubs where people can feel part of their communities
Reducing support for early years development will have an impact in the longer term.

6.9 Suggestions given for cost-savings:
A number of respondents gave suggestions as to how cost savings could be made. These included:
more volunteering of parents and carers
charging for sessions
parent and/or voluntary donations
fundraising
private business sponsorship
hiring out of rooms

6.10 Services respondents most wanted to see in Children’s Centres (as part of narrative question where there were 4 or more respondents citing these):
Meeting other parents and carers and reducing isolation
Music, singing and dance
Family or parenting support
First Aid
Stay and Play sessions
Sessions for children with additional needs
Feeling part of the community
Sessions to help with children's development
ESOL classes
Toy library
Cafe or food and drinks available
Exercise classes for parents and or with babies
Healthy eating or cooking
Outdoor play and learning.

6.11 15 of the 508 respondents stated they didn't want services cut whilst the majority understood the reasons why savings had to be made although there was anxiety
Parents at Evelyn Children's Centre have expressed concern about the ending of the contract with the Children's Society and the plans for the future running of their Children's Centre. They have also expressed concern about the timing of the consultation over the Christmas period. Officers will be meeting representatives from this Centre to listen to their concerns and work out a way forward.

A parent from Manor House has also raised concerns about the timing of the consultation over the Christmas period and that in her centre the consultation was not well publicised by the Children's Society or the Council and that the online process was not easy to use and was available only in English. There was also a concern that the public meetings were only in held in 4 of the Centres. Whilst there was understanding of the reasons why the Council had to make savings it was felt that the consultation process had been rushed and not inclusive enough. It was asked for this to be extended.

The timing of the consultation was over the Christmas period but there was time before Christmas and after Christmas for us to gather views (9th December until 11th January). We are assured by the Children's Society that the consultation process was well publicised in their centres. Legal advice was sought about the number of public consultations that were held and one in each of the four areas was felt to be appropriate. The fact that we received over 500 responses indicates that we obtained a good response that gives us a good indication of the public's views.

Further consultation will be required on the proposals to deregister a number of the Centres as outlined at 5.11 above.

Equal opportunities monitoring information is provided in Appendix A.

7. Proposals

The consultation shows that Children's Centres in Lewisham and the services offered are greatly valued by those who use them and that the majority of respondents (65%) go to Centres within walking distance from their homes.

Respondents to the consultation suggested a range of ways of making cost savings including more volunteering, charging for sessions, parent and carer donations, fundraising and sponsorship.

In addition to recommending that the Mayor agrees to the savings originally proposed it is also proposed that officers will explore these ideas for income generation with the Children's Centre for a future savings round.
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7.4 Having taken into account the results of the consultation and that the majority of people who responded understood the need for the Council to make savings even if they would have preferred for the Council to not be in that position, it is recommended that we can progress plans to make the savings as proposed on the Early Intervention Service.

7.5 If the Mayor agrees the proposals to make the savings as outlined, we will be looking to retender for the contracts to run the services from October 2015. The current contracts are due to end at the end of March although there is provision within the contracts to extend them. We propose to extend the contracts until October. All our providers have agreed to this except for the Children’s Society who run 8 Children’s Centres in Areas 1 and 2. Please see the map at appendix C.

7.6 All of the Children’s Centre providers have met the targets set out in their contract except for the Children’s Society. The providers who have met the targets are the school based Centres at Clyde, Beecroft Garden, Downderry, Marvels Lane, Kelvin Grove and Elliot Bank and Kilmorie and the Children’s Centres run by the Pre-School Learning Allowance (PSLA) at Torridon and Bellingham. By mutual agreement we have agreed that we will not renew the contract with The Children’s Society. We are discussing with existing providers, PSLA and Clyde about running these Centres until we retender for October.

7.7 A consultation with service users of these Centres specifically on the redesignations will be needed to meet requirements detailed in the DfE Children's Centres Statutory Guidance April 2013.

8. Savings to other Children’s Social Care Budgets

8.1 In addition to the proposals concerning reforms to the triage arrangements and the Children Centre contracts there are a series of proposals on the procurement of placements and support for young people in the children’s social care system. These are in section 5 of the original pro-forma setting out savings in social care budgets.

8.2 Since proposing these steps work has been undertaken to prepare for the changes by 1 April or to pursue them as part of the existing focus on improving performance within the service in this area. Steps have been taken toward achieving 5a to 5f below and they are on target for delivery in 2015/16. In respect of 5g the first steps have been taken on the new front door and this will promote the increased capacity that is essential to the delivery of 5g in 2017/18. The steps described do not require public or staff consultation to deliver them.

8.3 5a) 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
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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.

8.4 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 care planning panel to review 12 cases and reduce residential placements costs to generate £500k in a full year.

8.5 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 roles then that leaves 15 more to achieve a saving of c£25k per placement or £375k saving.

8.6 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 £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.

8.7 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 more economic option than semi-independent unitsWhilst providing the young people with an appropriate level of support 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 type of accommodation.

8.8 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 2015/16.

8.9 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 the number of 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
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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 safely at a lower level of intervention.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 The November report to Mayor and Cabinet set 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, £2.611m of which was proposed for delivery in 2015/16.

9.2 The savings concerned with the reshaping of early intervention services run through the Children’s Centres are in order to reduce costs by £1.936m over 2015-6 and 2016-17.

9.3 The savings from proposals 5a to 5g total £1.57m for 2015/16 and a further £11k in 2017/18

9.4 Capital Financial Implications
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.

10. Key Risks

10.1 If the proposals are agreed by the Mayor we will be retendering on the basis of a reduced amount of money for a reduced number of targeted families. From our discussions with existing providers we feel justified in feeling that this will be achievable although there does remain the risk that we may not be able to successfully find a provider who is willing to take on the services

10.2 Fewer families will be included in the contracts for targeted support. As these will be families in need they will have fewer services to rely on in the borough and their needs may escalate, leading to poorer outcomes for children.

10.3 There are also risks associated with capital clawback as outlined in 8.3 above.

11. Legal Implications

11.1 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.

11.2 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)

11.3 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”.

11.4 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.

11.5 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.

11.6 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.

11.7 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.

11.8 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.

11.9 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.

11.10 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.

11.11 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.

11.12 It follows that children’s centres are as much about making appropriate and integrated services available as about providing premises at particular geographical sites.

11.13 Notwithstanding this, as stated in paragraph 10.3 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.

11.14 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.

11.15 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.

11.16 The proposals to re-configure the children’s centres as part of their re-procurement as set out at paragraph 5.6 to 5.9 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.

11.17 s.17 Children Act 1989 imposes a duty upon all Local Authorities to promote and safeguard the welfare of children within their area who are in need, and, so far is as consistent with that duty, to promote the upbringing of such children by their families, by providing a range and level of services appropriate to those children’s needs (sch2).

11.18 The assistance can be in monetary form or in kind, and can also take the form of services run to benefit qualifying children and their families
  • a child is a child in need if
  • a) s/he is unlikely to achieve or maintain, or to have the opportunity of achieving or maintaining, a reasonable standard of health or development without the provision for him of services by a Local Authority
  • b) his/her health or development is likely to be significantly impaired, or further impaired, without the provision of services OR
  • c) s/he is disabled
  • s20 Children Act 1989 imposes a further duty on every Local Authority to provide accommodation for any child in need in their area who appears to them to require accommodation as a result of
  • a) there being no person who has parental responsibility for them or
  • b) they are lost or have been abandoned or
  • c) the person who has been caring for them being prevented (whether or not permanently or for whatever reason) from providing them with suitable accommodation or care.

11.19 The provision of accommodation to a child for a period of 24 hours brings with it duties to that child or young person, set out in the Act and Guidance, as a Looked After Child. There is a range of possible placement options available to the Local Authority, suitable to meet the needs of the child or young person, from placement with “connected persons” (subject to assessment), to mainstream foster carers, specialised foster carers, residential and other types of accommodation.

12. 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.

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

12.2 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.

12.3 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/](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/)

13. **Equalities Implications**

13.1 An Equalities Impact Analysis for each Centre to be re-designated will be carried out as part of the consultation exercise around re-designation. The impact of the reduction in the number of targeted families worked with and the unit costs is appended to this report.

14. **Crime and Disorder Implications**

14.1 There are no crime and disorder implications arising directly from this report.

15. **Environmental Implications**

15.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising directly from this report.

**Background documents**

Appendix A – Map of the Children’s Centres in Lewisham.
Appendix B – Consultation Document.
Appendix C - Equalities Analysis Assessment

If there are any queries arising from this report, please contact Ian Smith, Director of Children’s Social Care, telephone 020 8314 8140.
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Appendix A

Additional monitoring information given by respondents in the Children's Centre consultation exercise in December 2014-January 2015:

Gender (of the 427 who answered this question):
- 95% of the respondents were female;
- 4% of the respondents were male;
- 1% Would rather not say.

Age (of the 460 who answered this question):
- 99% of respondents were in the 18-64 age range;
- 1% of respondents were in the 65+ age group;
- There were no responses from those aged under 18.

Ethnicity (of the 444 who answered this question):
- 28% White British
- 16% Other White Background
- 14% English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
- 13% Black British African
- 5% Black British Caribbean
- 3% Asian/Asian British Chinese
- 2% Asian/Asian British Bangladeshi
- 2% Other Asian Background
- 2% Any Other Ethnic Group
- 1% Other Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Background
- 1% Mixed White and Black African
- 1% Other Black/African/Black British Background
- 1% Any Other Ethnic Group Arab

Religion (of the 447 who answered this question):
- 50% Christian (all denominations)
- 34% None
- 7% Muslim
- 3% Would rather not say
- 2% Buddhist
- 2% Hindu
- 2% Any other religion or belief
Public Consultation on Proposals for Children’s Centres

Children’s Centres Aims and Objectives

The aim of our Children’s Centres is to help families improve their children’s chance in life, particularly families who experience difficulties and would benefit from support and guidance to help their children develop to their full potential.

Children’s Centre services aim to:

- support the families most in need of help.
- help develop parenting skills, knowledge, confidence and attachment with their child;
- help children develop well, so they arrive at school ready to learn;
- support families facing greater challenges, helping them to resolve problems before they escalate, and reduce the need for more specialist services, such as Children’s Social Care or child mental health services (CAMHS)

Children’s centres’ activities and services include parent and toddler sessions, baby massage, messy play and song and story sessions, courses on first aid and healthy eating, and can help access to specialist services such as educational psychology.

The current children’s centre programme

At the present time we operate 17 Children’s Centres across the borough, each one delivering a full range of services to a specified local catchment, or reach area. 8 centres are currently run by The Children’s Society, 2 by the Pre-School Learning Alliance (PSLA) and 7 are school-run.

Children’s Centres run by The Children’s Society, with a single group Ofsted registration, are:

- Evelyn Children’s Centre, 231, Grove St, Deptford, SE8 3PZ
- Amersham Children's Centre, 75 Amersham Rd, New Cross, SE14 5AE
- Besson Street Children’s Centre, Besson St Gardens, New Cross, SE14 6QQ
- Hatcham Oak Children’s Centre, 29 Wallbutton Rd, Brockley, SE4 2NX
- Heathside and Lethbridge Children’s Centre, Melville House, Sparta St, SE10 8DP
- Ladywell Children’s Centre, 30 Rushey Mead, Ladywell, SE4 1JJ, 020 8690 6696
- St. Swithun’s Children’s Centre, Hither Green Lane, SE13 6RW
- Manor House Children’s Centre, Old Rd, Lee, SE13 6RW
Centres run by the Pre-School Learning Alliance, with a single group Ofsted registration, are:

- Torridon Children's Centre, 103 Torridon Rd, Catford, SE6 1RQ
- Bellingham Children's Centre, 109a Randlesdown Rd, Bellingham, SE6 3HB

School-run Children’s Centres are:

- Clyde Early Childhood Centre Alverton St, Deptford, SE8 5NH
- Beecroft Garden Children’s Centre Beecroft Rd, Brockley, SE4 2BS
- Downderry Children's Centre Shroffold Rd, Downham, BR1 5PD
- Marvels Lane Children's Centre Riddons Rd, Grove Park, SE12 9R
- Kelvin Grove Children's Centre, Kirkdale, Sydenham, SE26 6BB
- Eliot Bank Children’s Centre, Thorpewood Avenue, Sydenham, SE26 4BU
- Kilmorie Children's Centre Kilmorie Road, Forest Hill, SE23 2S

Kelvin Grove and Eliot Bank have one group registration with Ofsted, the other five have individual centre registrations.

**Why are we proposing changes to the way we deliver Children’s Centres?**

Lewisham has delivered reductions in expenditure of £93 million since May 2010. Children’s Centres were transformed, with services commissioned to external providers, with financial incentives in new contracts with providers to ensure services were targeted at those who could benefit most.

Further reductions in Government funding now require the Council to make further savings of £85 million by 2018. Whilst our vision and determination remain strong, these savings require further changes in the way we organise and deliver children’s centres across Lewisham.

We are considering how to deliver £836,000 of savings by 2016/17 from a current budget of £3.2 million. This is a saving of approximately 26% which is proportional with the savings that is required to be made across the Council. We are also looking at how we can make better combined use of different services and funding streams to ensure we maintain a strong service.

Current children’s centre contracts run until end March 2015. Due to the time it takes for the re-commissioning of service specifications to be thought through, bidders to be engaged with, bids written and evaluated and mobilisation periods for any new providers to recruit and train staff, the proposal will not be in place before October 2015. In the interim period we will need to extend some contracts to enable continuity of service while we work up the detail of the savings proposal below.
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The Savings Proposal

We want to review the way that our Children’s Centres are configured and planned and we want to ensure our Ofsted registrations are in line with our approach.

At present, all our centres are registered with Ofsted, either in group or single registrations, and are required to offer the full range of children’s centre services in each location. We are legally required, under Statutory Guidance, to “make arrangements so that there are sufficient children’s centres, so far as reasonably practicable, to meet local need”. We remain fully committed to that objective, and propose to review the services we deliver from each building, and reconfigure services so that:

- Services are delivered from suitable spaces. For example, large Stay and Play sessions are best delivered from large spaces with adjacent outdoor space, whilst midwifery clinics require rooms which enable confidentiality and good medical standards;
- Services are delivered in locations enabling good access to families across Lewisham;
- We deliver the right volume of the right services to meet Lewisham’s needs;
- We are making efficient use of the space and buildings available.

We propose to review the way our centres are registered with Ofsted to better reflect the way we propose to coordinate service delivery across each area, and consider having a single registration for each area which includes all of the service delivery locations.

This would reduce the burden of preparing for, and undergoing, a much larger number of individual and smaller group inspections. Around 30 working days involving head teachers, children’s centre managers and staff, and other services providers were spent during our most recent inspection, in addition to preparatory work. Reducing the number of inspections, but with each one covering a wider area, means that we can focus more on supporting families.

Ofsted is considering moving away from inspecting individual centres, and groups of centres, and inspecting the children’s centre services provided across a whole Local Authority. The proposal would leave Lewisham well-placed to adjust to a future change in inspection regime.

Children’s centres are contracted to give more support to families who could benefit most. We propose to concentrate more on slightly fewer families – reducing target numbers from 5,500 to 3,800 children. Centres will continue to provide some services for all families, and to work with Health Visitors and Midwives in delivering ante-natal clinics, child development checks etc.

We also propose to reduce the unit costs per family that we pay the Children’s Centres. The top performing Children’s Centres in the Borough are achieving good performance at a cost of £462 per family. We will be expecting all Children’s Centre service providers to achieve good outcomes for children based on this amount.

Families will be given reasonable notice of any significant change in available activities and services, and informed of alternative service where necessary.
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Alternative Options

We have considered other options within the context of making the savings:

1. **Directly managing children’s centre delivery.** This would increase costs. Making the savings would then require significantly more reduced services.

We want to know what you think about this proposal and to hear your views about any other options that you would like to put forward. Please give us your views online at [http://lewisham-consult.objective.co.uk/portal](http://lewisham-consult.objective.co.uk/portal). If you prefer you can also give us your views using a printed feedback form available at Children’s Centres. Your views will be considered before any final decision is taken on this proposal. Please let us know what you think by **midnight on 11th January**.

Why are we consulting on these proposals?

The Council wants to be sure that decisions about reducing costs and changing how services are delivered are taken after listening to the views of everyone affected, and after considering alternatives.

How parents, carers and professionals can get involved and influence decisions

The consultation can be responded to in the following ways:

- Online, at [http://lewisham-consult.objective.co.uk/portal](http://lewisham-consult.objective.co.uk/portal)
- Attending a drop-in session at a children’s centre. These will be scheduled from 5th to 8th January at children’s centres across the borough and advertised in all our children’s centres. Please see below for dates, times and locations.
- By post. Paper copies of the consultation will be available at each children’s centre and can either be handed back to the children’s centre or posted to: Robert Allen, Early Intervention Service Manager, 1st Floor, Laurence House, Catford Road, SE6 4RU.

Details of when drop-in sessions will take place in relation to each of the Children’s Centres:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downderry</td>
<td>Monday 5th January</td>
<td>9.30 am – 11.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shroffold Road, Downham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BR1 5PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Tuesday 6th January</td>
<td>12.30 pm – 2.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109a Randlestown Road, Bellingham SE6 3HB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Early Childhood Centre</td>
<td>Wednesday 7th January</td>
<td>9.30am - 11.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alverton Street, Deptford SE8 5NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beecroft Garden</td>
<td>Thursday 8th January</td>
<td>9.30 am – 11.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beecroft Road, Brockley SE4 2BS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What will happen next?

The results of the consultation will be shared with those who use Children’s Centres and fed into the decision-making process. The Mayor of Lewisham is expected to consider this proposal, and responses to this consultation at a meeting of Mayor and Cabinet in February 2015.

A full Equality Analysis Assessment will be completed and will be informed by the outcomes of the consultation processes.

We will let people who use Children’s Centres in Lewisham know what decision has been taken as soon as we can.

Proposed timescale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th Dec 2014</td>
<td>Consultation process begins with parents, carers and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th – 9th Jan 2014</td>
<td>Consultation events for staff, parents/carers and public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Jan 2015</td>
<td>End of consultation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th Jan 2015</td>
<td>Feedback to staff, parents/carers and public on results and comments of consultation exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th Jan 2015</td>
<td>Proposals for Children’s Centres to be considered by Mayor and Cabinet finalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Feb 2015</td>
<td>Proposals considered by Mayor and Cabinet, and decisions made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 12th Feb 2015.</td>
<td>Decisions fed back to parents and carers, public and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback form

It is important to the local authority to hear your views on this proposal. Please fill in the form below to share your thoughts with us. You can also call Robert Allen, Early Intervention Service Manager, at Lewisham Council (020 8314 6300) if you have any questions or comments.

To return the form:

- Email to: earlyinterventionservice@lewisham.gov.uk
- Send to: Robert Allen, 1st Floor, Laurence House, Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU
- Complete on the council’s consultation website: http://lewisham-consult.objective.co.uk/portal

The deadline for returning the form is midnight on Sunday January 11th.
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Please could you let us know what you think about the proposals including any other ways you feel cost savings could be made?

It would also help us if you could answer the following questions.

Do you go to a Children’s Centre in Lewisham?  Yes  ❑  No  ❑

If yes, how often do you go?
❑ Once a week
❑ Several times a week
❑ Once every two weeks
❑ Once a month
❑ Less than once a month

Also, if yes, how far do you travel?
❑ It’s within walking distance
❑ I take a bus ride
❑ I go by car
❑ I take a train
❑ Other (please tell us):

Which Centres or other venues have you visited?

Which Centres or other venues would you use?

Have you used any Children’s Centre services which take place outside of the Centre itself? For example, one-to-one support from a family support worker.

Yes  ❑  No  ❑
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We are interested in what you think is important for Children’s Centres to provide. Please give us your views on the following by circling the numbers on the list. 1 means less important and 5 means most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternity appointments and clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health visitor clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child developmental checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with breastfeeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay and play sessions for children of specific ages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messy play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help to get employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to one help and advice in your home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and information on where to get other help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with finance problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with domestic abuse, drug/alcohol use or mental health problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A chance to meet other parents in similar situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical tips and advice on how to do the best for my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person I know and trust to ask for advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts who can inform me how my child is developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to one help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there anything else you would like Children's Centres to provide? Please let us know below.
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Please could you provide us with some information about yourself overleaf...

**Your details**

How would you best describe yourself in relation to this consultation? *(please tick one)*

- □ Parent
- □ Carer
- □ Childminder
- □ Staff
- □ Member of local community
- □ Other professional

- □ I am representing an organisation in making this response *(please specify)*

- □ Other *(please specify)*:

If other, or you are representing an organisation, please specify:

........................................................................................................................................

**About you**

The following questions are for the specified purpose of the monitoring of our services, to ensure that Lewisham Council is being fair and inclusive. We need to know who our customers are to check that everyone in the borough is accessing the services they are entitled to, and that nobody is discriminated against unlawfully. All questions on the form are voluntary and you do not have to answer them. Any information that you do choose to provide on this form will be treated confidentially in accordance with the Data protection Act 1998.

**Age**

- □ Under 18
- □ 18-64
- □ 65+

**Gender**

- □ Male
- □ Female
- □ I’d rather not say
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**Ethnicity**

To which of these groups do you consider you belong?

**White**
- □ British
- □ Irish
- □ Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- □ Any other White background, please state:

**Asian/Asian British**
- □ Chinese
- □ Bangladeshi
- □ Pakistani
- □ Indian
- □ Any other Asian background, please state:

**Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups**
- □ White & Asian
- □ White and Black African
- □ White and Black Caribbean
- □ Any other Mixed background, please state:

**Black/African/Caribbean/Black British**
- □ African
- □ Caribbean
- □ Any other Black background, please state:

**Any other ethnic group**
- □ Arab
- □ I’d rather not say
- □ Other ethnic group, please state:

**Disability**

Under the Equality Act 2010, a person is considered to have a disability if he/she has a physical or mental impairment which has a sustained and long-term adverse effect on his/her day to day activities. This also includes people with HIV, cancer and multiple sclerosis (MS).

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

- □ Yes    □ No

**Religion and Belief**

- □ None
- □ Christian (all denominations)
- □ Buddhist
- □ Hindu
- □ Jewish
- □ Muslim
- □ Sikh
- □ Any other religion/belief please state:

- □ I’d rather not say
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**Sexual Orientation**

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

- Heterosexual
- Homosexual
- Bisexual
- Other
- I’d rather not say

Would you like to receive the Lewisham Life enewsletter for local events and things to do, news, discounts and other consultations?

- Yes please
- No thanks

If you would like to give us your contact details, please do below (this is optional):

Name

Contact details (email, phone and/or address)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form.
## Equalities Analysis Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of proposal</th>
<th>Children’s Centres Savings Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead officer</td>
<td>Ian Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date of Equality Analysis</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End date of Equality Analysis</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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 characteristics.\(^3\)

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.

---

\(^3\) 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)
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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 also mean a reduction in the number of targeted families that children centres will work with from 5,500 targeted families to 3,800. The impact of any reduction in, or closure of, services is detailed in this assessment.

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
Children’s 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>% of 0-4 Children using Children’s Centres that have a disability</th>
<th>% of adults using Children’s Centres that have a disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockley</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catford South</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton Park</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downham</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Hill</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Park</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Green</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Central</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Vale</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushey Green</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Hill</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitefoot</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Population (2011 Census)</th>
<th>% of 0-4 Children using Children’s Centres that are BME</th>
<th>% of adults using Children’s Centres that are BME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockley</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catford South</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton Park</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downham</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Hill</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Park</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Green</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Central</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Vale</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushey Green</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Hill</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitefoot</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce Profile Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and maternity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and civil partnership:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 DFE Children Centres statutory guidance April 2013.

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 delete 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 ___________
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APPENDIX 20 – Proposal and report for saving Q2

Q – Safeguarding and Early Intervention Services

Savings proposals Q2 is presented here. It is:

Q2 Youth Service – Option 1 only

This appendix presents the individual savings proposal proforma as presented to Mayor & Cabinet on the 12 November 2014 and report for M&C decision.

The appendix references are:
20a Q2 Proposal
20b Q2 M&C Report
APPENDIX 20a – Proposal for saving Q2

Q2: Reduction in Youth Service provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction in Youth Service Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mervyn Kaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorates affected by proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short summary of proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Financial information

2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Net Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>3,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | DSG | HRA |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.

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.

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.

The Service’s targeted support for young people in relation to education, employment and training consists of 9 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...
3. Description of service and proposal

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.

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.

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 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.
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### 3. Description of service and proposal

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:**
  - 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:
- 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**
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3. Description of service and proposal

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current budget for youth service and re-engagement services</th>
<th>Proposed starting point for mutual after savings</th>
<th>Proposed budget for re-engagement service after savings</th>
<th>Proposed budget for statutory element of youth service</th>
<th>Total Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£3,460</td>
<td>£1,754</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>*1 100</td>
<td>*2 £1,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-service may exceed supply. The Service will consequently look to make either one or both
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4. Impact of proposal

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Corporate Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Priority – Most Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
<th>Impact of saving on corporate priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Option 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Disability:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Belief</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/Maternity</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Low/ Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

- [ ]

### 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 2 FTE</th>
<th>Scale 3 - 5</th>
<th>Scale 6 - SO2</th>
<th>PO1 – PO5</th>
<th>PO6 – PO8</th>
<th>SMG1 – SMG3</th>
<th>JNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant****</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workforce Profile Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female: 49</th>
<th>Male: 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## 7. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BME:</th>
<th>White:</th>
<th>Other:</th>
<th>Not Known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: BME</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Not Known</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: Where known:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: Not Known:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**1. Summary**

1.1. As part of the Council’s budget strategy for 2015-2018, officers presented a report to Mayor and Cabinet on 11 November 2014 which proposed making budget reductions totaling £1.4m.

1.2. The same report also set out options for consideration on the future of the Youth Service.

1.3. This report details the outcome of the requested consultation on both savings and future options and appraises these future options.

1.4. The report also responds to the recommendations of the Youth Service Working Group.

**2. Purpose**

2.1. The purpose of this report is to outline for the Mayor the outcome of public consultation on proposals for savings to and future of the Youth Service and responds to the recommendations of the Youth Service Working Group. It seeks his agreement to the recommendations outlined below.

**3. Recommendations**

The Mayor is recommended to:

- **Initial Savings**

3.1. note the outcome of consultation on Savings to the Youth Service.

3.2. agree the base savings of £1.4m including:
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3.2.1. a reduction to youth worker capacity and removal of Council staff from two youth sites, namely Rockbourne and Ladywell

3.2.2. a reduction to commissioned provision by 31% (£290,000), as set out in Section 11.

3.2.3. a reduction to management and business support staff as set out in Section 10.

3.2.4. further efficiency savings as set out in Section 7.1.3.

3.3. agree the reshaping of youth re-engagement services (see Section 7.1.5) including the re-specification and commissioning of the specialist 1:1 service as part of a broader targeted family support service, funded from other sources

3.4. agree the re-specification of the NEET Programme in accordance with Raising the Participation Age (RPA) and alternatively fund the programme.

3.5. agree the list of commissioned provision for 2015-16, as set out in the Part 2 paper entitled Commissioned Service 2015-16, including delegation to Executive Director for Children and Young People to make decisions on how to fill known gaps in provision.

The Future

3.6. consider the options analysis of future options found in Section 19.

3.7. note the outcome of consultation on the Future options for the Youth service

3.8. agree the development of a detailed plan to mutualise the Youth Service within the next financial year.

4. Policy context

4.1 Local Policy

4.1.1 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.
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4.2 National Policy

4.2.1 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.

4.2.2 The priorities of last year’s restructure were aligned with this strategy.

4.2.3 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.

4.2.4 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, as a part of the wider Council savings, 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 33% 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, of £956k, from which voluntary sector and other providers could bid to run youth services.

5.4. In the first year post-restructure, the Service has been embedding performance management, income generation and contract management capabilities.

5.5. The Council now requires further savings and to facilitate this a report was submitted to Mayor and Cabinet on 11 November 2014 which
proposed making budget further reductions to the youth service totaling £1.4m.

5.6. A number of proposals, detailed below, made up this total and on 11 November 2014 the Mayor resolved that there should be full consultation on these proposed reductions and requested a full report brought back to him reporting the outcome of that consultation to enable him to make the decision on the proposed cuts. This is that report.

5.7. Given the level of savings required by the Council and that the Youth Service is largely non-statutory and therefore considered at risk of being reduced further in subsequent years, the same Mayor and Cabinet report of 11 November 2014 proposed it was important strategically to establish alternatives for the future of the Youth Service.

5.8. Alternatives were presented as a set of possible future options and it was resolved that alongside a consultation on the proposed savings that the public were also consulted on these. The responses to this consultation and an appraisal of these future options are contained in part 2 of this report.

5.9. Both savings and future options have been through scrutiny both at CYP scrutiny and three special working groups. The latter made recommendations which have been incorporated into this report.

5.10 Youth Service maintains the following vision and aims:

- 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.

- To support young people in Lewisham in need of extra help, to achieve the skills they need to become happy, healthy and successful adults.

5.11 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

5.11.1 It is not proposed to alter the vision and aims either as part of savings or any of the future options.

5.12 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
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independent (PVI) sector. The activities are now focused on developing young people’s life skills as agreed in the previous reorganisation of the service.

5.13 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.

5.14 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.

5.15 Additionally, the NEET Traineeship Programme, a Government-recognised traineeship, in partnership with Bromley College, offers 3 programmes with school terms, each of 12 weeks. The programme works with cohorts of 15 young people who currently have no clear pathway to education, employment or training (EET). It allows them to achieve qualifications including accredited numeracy and literacy support. The scheme ensures pathways to EET post completion. The scheme also allows participants to continue to receive out of work benefits whilst on the scheme.

5.16 All activities and support 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.

5.17 The current Youth Service sites are:

Riverside Youth Centre, Deptford
Bellingham Gateway Youth & Community Centre, Bellingham
Honor Oak Youth Club, Brockley
Ladywell Youth Village (run from Ladywell Adult day-care center)
Rockbourne Youth club, Forest Hill
The New Generation Youth Centre (TNG), Sydenham
Woodpecker Youth Centre, New Cross

Deptford Adventure Playground, Deptford
Dumps Adventure Playground, Bellingham
Home Park Adventure Playground, Sydenham
Ladywell Adventure Playground, Ladywell
Honor Oak Adventure Playground, Brockley
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Baseline Drop in shop, Lewisham Town centre

A map of these is included at appendix 4.

5.18 From its sites the Youth Service offers various activities, and hosts other activities provided by commissioned PVI sector providers and volunteers. Below is a summary of what is provided by whom and at which site during term time only. Non-term time hours and activities vary by holiday.

5.19 Riverside Youth Centre

5.19.1 The average attendance per session at Youth Service-provided activities is 23 young people.

5.19.2 The Youth Service directly provides a juniors club (8 – 13 year olds) on Mondays and a seniors club (13 – 19 year olds) on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The MEND weight management Programme operates on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and the Scouts deliver provision on Wednesdays. An alternative education provider is about to be trialled at the centre during term time weekdays. This is provided by an outside group and is income generating for the service.

5.20 Bellingham Gateway Youth & Community Centre

5.20.1 The average attendance per session at Youth Service-provided activities is 21 young people.

5.20.2 The Youth Service directly provides a juniors club on Fridays and a seniors club on Mondays, Thursdays and Fridays. On Wednesdays, there is a scout pack and provision for young women by Beleve.

5.21 Honor Oak Youth Club

5.21.1 The average attendance per session at Youth Service-provided activities is 27 young people.

5.21.2 The Youth Service directly provides a seniors club on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. On Wednesdays the site is used by the Scouts.

5.22 Ladywell Youth Village

5.22.1 The average attendance per session at Youth Service-provided activities is 17 young people.

5.22.2 The Youth Service directly provides a seniors club on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays. On Saturdays, Millwall Community Trust deliver street dance.

5.23 Rockbourne Youth Club
5.23.1 The average attendance per session at Youth Service-provided activities is 20 young people.

5.23.2 Direct youth service provision is a senior club on Tuesdays and a junior club Fridays. Mondays and Wednesdays are taken up by SEN provision for seniors (13 – 25) delivered by Children’s Social Care and Thursday is a Scout pack.

5.24 TNG

5.24.1 The average attendance per session at Youth Service-provided activities is 24 young people.

5.24.2 On Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays the Youth Service directly provides a seniors club and on Tuesdays and Fridays a juniors club. Also on Tuesdays, the Youth Service hosts a girls-only night. Supplemental to direct provision a judo instructor teaches classes for young people for a nominal fee each Monday, Millwall Community Trust delivers football provision Mondays and Wednesdays and street dance programme Thursdays. On Saturdays Lewisham Homes also hosts a street dance programme and a Russian dance group hosts themed dance. Much of the rest of the available time is used for private rentals, use by the local children’s centre and other partners.

5.25 Woodpecker Youth Centre

5.25.1 The average attendance per session at Youth Service-provided activities is 19 young people.

5.25.2 The Youth Service directly provides a juniors club on Tuesdays and a senior club on Wednesdays, Thursday and Fridays. On Saturdays dance provision is delivered by an outside provider.

5.26 All Adventure Playgrounds

5.26.1 Each of the Adventure Playgrounds (Deptford, The Dumps, Home Park, Ladywell and Honor Oak Adventure Playgrounds) delivers direct, open access play provision during term time on Tuesday through Friday, between 3:15pm and 7pm. On Saturdays, play provision is delivered between 11am and 5pm. The average attendance per session across all adventure playgrounds is 55 young people.

6. Consultation Overview

6.1 The public consultation took place between 19th November 2014 and 31st December 2014 with a focus on reaching young people, but open to all. The consultation was done in two parts. The first focused on the savings proposed to the Youth Service. The second part focused on the future options for Council-funded youth provision. As such, responses to the consultation are delineated to reflect this.
6.2 The following methods were used to facilitate engagement with the consultation process:

- A leaflet for young people clearly outlining the proposals and the various avenues available to them to express their views available in each club and adventure playground and sent to all secondary schools in the Borough
- A publicised event at each club and adventure playground (at which young people also prepared healthy food to a £10 budget) to discuss the proposals and give young people the opportunity to respond
- Two meetings with the Young Mayor’s team and advisors
- Youth workers and Participation and Engagement Officer responding to specific needs of young people to enable them to engage with the process, providing additional support where necessary
- An online survey with supporting documents on the Lewisham consultation portal
- Paper copies of the documents and response pages available at each club and adventure playground
- Mailings of the consultation paper to commissioned providers and individual discussions with providers during monitoring meetings

6.3 The table in section 7.6 illustrates the overall number of responses received from young people, parents/carers, members of the PVI sector and other members of the public.

6.4 The PVI sector took part in the public consultation. This included responses provided via the online survey, a separate written response from the CYP Voluntary Sector Forum and feedback from face-to-face meetings with Millwall Community Trust, Teachesport and Wide Horizons. All responses have been summarised and included in Section 8.

6.5 Staff were consulted separately during two events on 25 November and 27 November 2014. Staff were also provided a consultation paper that outlined the savings proposal and future options.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockbourne Youth Club</td>
<td>Friday 12\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell Youth Village</td>
<td>Friday 19\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Oak Youth Club</td>
<td>Tuesday 16\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham Gateway Youth Club</td>
<td>Thursday 18\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNG</td>
<td>Monday 15\textsuperscript{th} -17\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Youth Club</td>
<td>Tuesday 9\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpecker Youth Club</td>
<td>Tuesday 16\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell Fields APG</td>
<td>Friday 19\textsuperscript{th} December</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Home Park APG                          | Thursday 11\textsuperscript{th}  
Friday 12\textsuperscript{th} December | 10/35      |
| Deptford APG                           | Tuesday 16\textsuperscript{th} December to 18\textsuperscript{th} December | 15         |
| Honor Oak APG                          | Tuesday 16\textsuperscript{th} December | 15         |
| Dumps APG                              | Wednesday 10\textsuperscript{th} December | 8          |
| Young Mayor's Advisors                 | Monday 15\textsuperscript{th} December | 20         |
| CYP Vol. Sector Forum                  | Thursday 27\textsuperscript{th} November | 51         |
| Millwall Community Trust               | Wednesday 10\textsuperscript{th} December | 5          |
| Teachsport                             | Friday 19\textsuperscript{th} December | 3          |
| Sydenham/Forest Hill YF                | The response was received on the consultation portal. | tbc        |

### 6.6 Summary of number of responses received during the public consultation

6.6.1 The following table sets out the number of consultation responses received during the public consultation:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Total no of responses</th>
<th>Young People</th>
<th>PVI sectors</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portal online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.2 226 young people and parents/carers took part in group discussions – at these discussions, feedback forms were completed and input to the Consultation portal online.

6.7 Consultation questions

6.7.1 The full consultation document is attached in appendix 1. All respondents were asked the following questions in response to the proposals. These questions were incorporated in the consultation document after each element of the proposed changes and future options were detailed as well as in summary at the end and on online and hard copy response forms:

2. What would you like to see running at Ladywell and Rockbourne (ie. after the removal of Youth Service provision)
3. Is there anything you think we should consider when we think about how to reduce spend on commissioned youth provision?
4. Are there other ways you think the Youth Service could raise money?
5. What do you think to the idea of an employee and youth led mutual?
6. Are there other ideas that you think we should consider?
7. Do you have any comments on these proposals?

7. Part 1: Savings proposals

7.1. Below is the full savings proposal for the Youth Service as proposed in the Mayor and Cabinet report entitled “Savings Proposals and the Future of the Youth Service” 11 November 2014 alongside a summary of consultation responses and an officer response to these.

7.2. With the following savings proposals the general scope of the Service would remain intact, whilst capacity to deliver provision would reduce.

7.3. In order to release savings across the Youth 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.
7.4. Appendix 4 shows a map of the current youth centres and adventure playground sites.

7.5. It is therefore proposed to cease direct Youth Service provision and 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 hosts a scout group, 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.

7.6. 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. Any future plans for provision at Ladywell specifically will involve community services who manage the site and run daytime provision there.

7.7. 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

7.8. 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.
7.9. 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 (2.5 FTE Senior and 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.

7.10. 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.

7.11. 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.

7.12. 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% (c.£290,000). 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 has commenced.

7.13. 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.

7.14. 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.

7.15 Reshaping youth re-engagement services

7.15.1 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. In the case of a mutual, the Council could commission an Employee Led Mutual (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:

17. Specialist 1:1 Service
18. The NEET Programme
19. NEET tracking services

c) **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.

d) **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.

e) 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
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communications budget. Minor reductions are proposed to be made to the communications budget. This will leave a budget of £200k.

7.15.2 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

8. Summary of consultation on Savings

Key themes raised by public in response to savings proposal

1) Input on reduction of youth provision at Rockbourne and Ladywell
2) What youth provision the Council should fund

8.1 Input on reduction of youth provision at Rockbourne and Ladywell

8.1.1 No responses to the consultation, including from the PVI, addressed the other specific proposed savings other than removal of services at Ladywell and Rockbourne and to comment generally about cuts to the service.

8.1.2 No responses offered an alternative model or means to make the same level of savings, though some responses recommended areas of the current Service that could be further reduced: 8% of responses from young people suggested a reduction in the days the centres are open; and 3% suggested reducing expensive youth activities such as trips. 7% of the PVI responses and one from a member of the public suggested a reduction in management. A few responses expressed concern over the proposed reduction in Council-funded youth provision with 12% of the 65 responses from young people and 22% of responses from parents and members of the public asserting specifically that no cuts should be made at Ladywell and Rockbourne. However the majority of responses - 34% of young people responses and 28% of PVI responses stated that, in the event of cuts, Council-funded youth provision should be either replaced by more targeted services or refined to ensure provision specifically addresses the needs of vulnerable young people, such as those with disabilities (e.g. vision impaired), those at risk of being bullied, excluded or isolated, and/or those who are not in education, employment or training.

8.1.3 Suggestions from Private, Voluntary and Independent sectors included making Rockbourne a community hub or providing space to uniformed organisations such as Scouting for Lewisham; and unique projects such as motorbike/bicycle maintenance; or making space available for groups that work with young people from smaller ethnic minorities, such as the Vietnamese community or faith groups.

8.1.4 Two responses from the PVI also suggested ways to attract resources to continue delivery of provision, such as involving former youth club
members as volunteers and/or engaging local businesses to deliver
employability programmes, and/or to obtain sponsorship for activities
for young people. One example of an employability programme was
given by the Sydenham and Forest Hill Youth Forum:

“Bringing in career development/employability programmes like the one
the Sydenham and Forest Hill Youth Forum did with RBS, getting a
team of professionals to put on business workshops for teenagers
based at TNG. Use this programme as a model that can be bought by
private sector companies who want to offer their staff some career
development. The staff members get to work cross-organisations
(RBS, Barclays, Accenture for e.g.) and use their skills to produce a
12-week youth programme on topics they know about, from
communications to I.T. to strategy and financial forecasting. “

8.1.5 Concerns were raised by the Voluntary Sector Forum, who suggested
that providers from this sector should be involved in future youth
provision at Rockbourne at Ladywell. None however suggested means
to fund this provision or clear ways to enable this involvement.

8.2 What youth provision should the Council fund?
8.2.1 The most common requests from young people included increases in
music/dance/drama (75%); media (58%) and sports related activities
(54%).
8.2.2 A majority of responses from young people (51% of responses)
requested general, youth led provision, with some requesting more
community involvement. Some suggested finding an alternative
provider that could offer a form of training or extracurricular activity, use
the space for a music studio or theatre, or provide an under-18 night
club. Some respondents suggested improved links with schools.
8.2.3 The majority of responses from Others (61%), which included
parents/carers and members of the public, requested provision related
to employability and education.
One of these responses noted:
“The Youth Service should] focus on improving employment and
compulsory training for young people without the necessary
qualifications working in partnership with businesses, colleges and
schools.”

8.2.4 The Metro Centre suggested that, in the event of reduced funding for
young people, negative repercussions could likely abound, specifically
for those young people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual,
transgender, or questioning their sexuality. They further suggested
that broader funding should be allocated to target minority populations
that may face discrimination.

8.3 Response
8.3.1 The Youth Service is committed to seeing Rockbourne and Ladywell
remain open, and are actively looking for providers capable of
delivering provision for young people from both sites.
8.3.2 With regard to Ladywell, the Service will run an additional evening senior club at Ladywell APG and continue, with colleagues in the voluntary sector, to look for providers for the remaining 3 nights at Ladywell day care centre. In response to the consultation, and given the nature of the space, this would ideally be increased sports provision.

8.3.3 With regard to Rockbourne, we are currently in discussion with a major local youth provider about moving them to the site to run their own activities and also manage the building. These would backfill lost Youth Service provision as well as best manage the continuation of current non-Youth Service activities.

8.3.4 In addition to provision at these two sites, there is other youth provision for young people to access in the areas surrounding Rockbourne and Ladywell. This was included as an appendix in the public consultation and is again included in Appendix 1.

8.3.5 Last year the Youth Service designed and implemented a robust commissioning process, whereby PVI sector organisations could submit bids for funding. The amount allocated and spent on commissioning was roughly twice what had spent on the sector in the years prior. The process allowed for input from young people and we continue to look at better ways to incorporate the voice of young people both with this and across the service. The Service is constantly looking at the way it commissions services and has made improvements throughout this past year.

8.3.6 In order to recommend contracts for 2015-16 whilst meeting a reduced budget officers considered current contracts' performance, known needs and demands of young people. The contracts proposed for continuation, detailed in a separate report, are those that offer the optimum balance of cost and quality, with the key driver being the attainment of the best possible outcomes for young people at the best price and to ensure the total value of all bids matches the available budget. In some cases contracts were proposed to continue with a level of negotiated change in order to allow saving, ensure best value and meeting of need. This process also left a level of unallocated funding and known gaps. In order to fill these gaps officers will look to spot purchase provision, ensuring the involvement of young people with this process.

8.3.7 During the last Youth Service restructure (2013), management was reduced by 33%. During this savings round management the Service has proposed a 25% reduction to management. If agreed, management will therefore have been reduced to a minimum level to ensure future operations of the Service and it is not believed that there is any means to further reduce this with the current level of delivery.

8.3.8 Officers have already made solid progress towards developing income generating capacities, which has included using Groupon to stimulate demand for certain services and leveraging youth sites to raise
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revenue from private hires. The Service is currently positioned to generate c.£105,000 by the end of next fiscal year, which is why this was included as part of the £1.4m initial savings.

9. **Key themes raised by staff in response to savings**
   1) Understanding the need for savings
   2) No additional savings models were suggested
   3) Desire to see more reductions to management
   4) Desire to see parity in cuts across adventure playgrounds and clubs
   5) Request for changes to job descriptions

9.1 **Understanding the need for savings**

9.1.1 Broadly, staff demonstrated an understanding of the Service’s need to make reductions and contribute to the broader savings targets required by the Council. A few staff suggested the savings should not happen and indicated frustration with the need to endure another round of cuts following last year’s restructure. Several respondents claimed that staffing numbers at youth clubs are already low and further cuts could jeopardise the safety of young people.

9.2 **No additional savings models were suggested**

9.2.1 Staff initiated a number of proposals, but no alternative savings models were put forward for consideration.

9.3 **Desire to see more reductions to management**

9.3.1 Several staff demonstrated a desire to see a greater percentage of the cuts come from among management, in order to protect frontline staff and preserve Council-funded youth provision at Rockbourne, Ladywell or both. Some staff said they felt the reductions unfairly targeted frontline workers.

9.4 **Desire to see parity in cuts across adventure playgrounds and clubs**

9.4.1 Several staff suggested that cuts should not be made singularly to youth clubs, but that adventure playgrounds should also experience the same or similar level of reductions. Some viewed it as an issue of fairness, whilst others felt that youth clubs were of greater advantage to the Service going forward.

9.5 **Requests for changes to job descriptions**

9.5.1 Staff expressed some concern that frontline youth workers will be burdened with excess duties in the face of cuts. Others suggested staff pay and job descriptions should reflect the similarity and/or difference in job duties between adventure playground and youth club workers. Some staff suggested that aligning play leader and youth worker job descriptions would enable the Service to enjoy greater staffing fluidity.
9.6 Response

9.6.1 Management has communicated to frontline staff the need to make further reductions to the Youth Service during meetings with youth workers and play leaders and two consultation forums alongside corporate messaging around savings. In assembling its proposal, management sought to retain the scope of the Service whilst reducing capacity in a way that would render the smallest impact on the community.

9.6.2 Including both this and last year’s restructure, management will have been reduced c.50% and streamlined. This has left a minimum capacity to ensure the most efficient operation going forward. Management responsibilities may shift in the future to reflect growing and diminishing demands for management capacity in different areas of the Service.

9.6.3 Currently, our sites are not operating at capacity. Whilst staff to young person ratios will always be looked at, we are not presently concerned that our sites will become overfilled and remain vigilant to ensure the safeguarding of young people.

9.6.4 In looking at savings to the Service, management considered reducing adventure playgrounds and youth clubs. Playgrounds are ultimately less costly and the savings to the Council would not be as great – to operate one playground is, on average, roughly 1/3 the cost of running one of our centres. In addition, if we were to remove provision from any playground, the site would almost surely close; whereas removing provision from Rockbourne and Ladywell will not result in either site shutting. This is in part because these two sites are used by other services and, in the case of Ladywell, it is not a Youth Service-run site. In contrast the other youth clubs and playgrounds are wholly run by the Youth Service.

9.6.5 Management is looking at the best way to align frontline staff so that, going forward, we can leverage our staff in the best way possible to ensure the needs of young people are met.

10. Impact of the savings proposals

10.1 On staff

10.1.1 The current structure contains 60.7 FTE posts (including the NEET Tracking Service posts x 3); the proposed new structure contains 50.2 FTE posts.

10.1.2 The posts being deleted are:

1 fte Specialist Support Manager (PO6)
1 fte Specialist Group work Co-ordinator (PO3)
1 fte Business and Commissioning Support Officer (SO1)
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2.5 fte Senior youth workers (PO1)
5 fte Support youth workers (Sc5)

A total loss of 10.5 fte posts

10.1.3 There is a current vacancy level of 2 FTE Senior Youth Worker posts and a vacancy level of 2.5 FTE Support Youth Worker posts. These will be taken first leaving a further 0.5 Senior Youth Worker posts and 2.5 FTE Support Youth Worker posts lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Posts budgeted for 2014/15</th>
<th>People in post currently</th>
<th>FTE – Current</th>
<th>FTE - Proposed</th>
<th>Current Vacancies - FTE</th>
<th>Proposed reduction - FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Youth Workers (incl NEET Traineeship)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Youth Workers (incl NEET Traineeship)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APG Seniors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APG Asst Playleaders</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Youth Workers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.1.4 Until detailed restructuring proposals for the Youth Service have been finalised in relation to the number and hours of Support Youth Worker
contracts, it is not possible to specify exactly how many individual redundancies there might be.

10.1.5 Staff will be asked to indicate whether they wish to request for redundancy, this would not be guaranteed but will be taken into account in the management assessment process, of staff to be retained. Every effort will be made to offer redeployment where possible.

10.1.6 The service reflects the diversity of the borough. Therefore there is no disproportionately significant impact on any one group with protected characteristics.

10.1.7 The total saving from staffing reduction is £418,000

10.1.8 The current number of support youth work hours budgeted for equate to 402.5. There will need to be a reduction of 174.50 support youth work hours. The Youth Service will need in order to provide a service the minimum of 228 hours delivery time, which is the amount budgeted for.

10.1.9 This also equates to

- If 19 people did the equivalent of 12 hours each (228) the service would be maintainable with the potential for growth in the future with adult volunteers as support
- 25@ 9 hours, 225 total
- 38@6 hours, 228 total
- 9@12 hours and 20 @6 hours, 228 total
- @15 and 20@ 6 hours, 225 total
- Any other combination that complies with rule one

11. On spend

11.1 The current budget for the Youth Service is £3,460,000. The proposals consulted on for Option 1 equate to a saving of £1.4m from April 2015.

11.2 The table below shows a comparison of the current Youth Service budget (2014/15) and the proposed budget (2015/16), including where savings have been made. The majority of savings come from management costs in order to maximise frontline delivery.

Youth Service Expenditure 2014-16
### Area of spend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of spend</th>
<th>14/15 budget</th>
<th>% of current total budget</th>
<th>15/16 Budget</th>
<th>% of proposed total budget</th>
<th>Saving on current budget</th>
<th>% saving of current budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£000's</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>£000's</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>£000's</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td>£956</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>£663</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>£293</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Centres &amp; APGs</td>
<td>£1,054</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>£760</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>£287</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 Intensive youth work</td>
<td>£390</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>£390</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£390</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET Programme</td>
<td>£197</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>£115</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>£197</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Commissioning Support</td>
<td>£285</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£234</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>£51</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>£286</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>£64</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General efficiencies</td>
<td>£277</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£260</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-£58</td>
<td></td>
<td>-£100</td>
<td></td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£3,451</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,608</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,406*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note that an element of this saving is via grant substitution and still represents expenditure.

### 12. Proposed timetable for implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff restructure</td>
<td>Feb/March 2015</td>
<td>New structure in place 1 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning process for contracts April 2014 onwards</td>
<td>March 2015 to March 2016</td>
<td>Reduced contracts to begin April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition arrangements for centres where youth service staff are being removed</td>
<td>March 2015 to June 2015</td>
<td>March 2015 onwards, exploration of the best way to support venues from April 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of specification for full service commissioning including if</td>
<td>March 2015 to April 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required exploration of mutualisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Financial implications of savings

13.1 The current revenue budget for the Youth Service is £3,460k;

13.2 The proposal set out in this report to reduce the budget for the Youth Service will provide a full year saving of £1,406k. The amount delivered in 2015/16 will depend on the timing of the implementation of those proposals and the agreement of the Mayor to the recommendations.

13.3 There are likely to be redundancy costs for the Council emerging from these proposals, these are estimated to be £154k although at this stage it is too early to say what the exact amount will be as it will depend on the staff finally selected for redundancy.

13.4 If some of the buildings are no longer required they will be considered either for use by alternative providers or sold as a capital receipt for the Council. The revenue savings on premises running costs will accrue to the corporate asset management savings budget.

14. Crime and disorder implications of savings

14.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

15. Equalities implications of savings

15.1 See appendix 3 for full Equalities Analysis Assessment of the proposals

16. Environmental implications of savings

16.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising from this report
17. Part 2: The future of the Youth Service and youth provision

17.1 Given the level of savings required by the Council and that outcomes for young people are a priority, it was important strategically to establish alternatives for the future of the Youth Service. The Youth Service is largely non-statutory and is thus at risk of being reduced further in subsequent years. Consequently, officers examined a variety of options that could ensure the future of a Council-funded youth offer.

17.2 All future options considered the broader context in which the Youth Service operates, namely that the Council is required to make savings of £85m by 2017/18, yet wishes to maintain – as is possible – its vision for youth provision.

18. Summary of Future Options

18.1 Within this context there are two primary options, with four sub-options housed within the second of these. These options were all included in the public consultation.

1) Stop providing all but the statutory obligation. This would release a further £1.7m saving, result in the closure of all direct provision and leave only a NEET tracking team and promotion of activities delivered by others.

2) Continue providing youth services through one of:
   a) commissioning an alternative sole provider from current market
   b) break up the service and commission a mix of providers
   c) continue providing direct provision at the reduced budget
   d) commission an employee and youth-led mutual

18.2 Option 1 was already ruled out by the Mayor on 11 November 2014. It was however included in the consultation. Of the remaining future options consulted on, some would necessitate the Youth Service delivered via alternative means. There is risk and reward inherent in every future option for the Youth Service, including one that retains the status quo. Officers remain cognizant of this, as well as the financial challenges currently facing the local authority.

18.3 Note that option D could be seen as variant of option A. However, due to the amount of opinion raised during scrutiny and consultation about option D and the specific complexities of mutualising, over and above commissioning to current market providers, we have considered this as a separate option.

19. Future Options Appraisal

19.1 How options are appraised
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19.1.1 Officers addressed each option against the following set of criteria, which are shown below:

a) Short-term sustainability
b) Value for money
c) Long-term sustainability

a) Short-term sustainability:
The extent to which each option could enable services to continue without disruption whilst a level of council funding is available. This extent was determined independent of whether or not an option would yield good value for money. Officers also addressed each option’s effect on staff and the way this would impact on delivery, as well as the effect on young people’s attendance, engagement and outcomes.

b) Value for money:
The potential to deliver the best outcomes for young people, as judged against the already agreed Youth Service vision and aims, at the lowest cost. In evaluating value for money, officers especially considered how the form of delivery would impact on service users and community members.

c) Long-term sustainability:
The potential to allow the Council to make further required savings and what level of youth provision – either provided directly by the Council or external organisations – could continue. Considered as part of this was an option’s capacity for engaging young people and enhancing the youth voice as well as the role staff would play in any option and how these might contribute to future sustainability.

19.2 Options analysis:

19.2.1 Below is a summary of each option followed by an appraisal which provides both detailed analysis and scores of “high” “moderate” or “low” against each of the criteria. In measuring the impact of each option against each criterion, officers also considered the potential social value to be derived. In every case officers used their best professional judgment – which was, where possible, informed by best practice and conversations with other professionals. Each option was analysed independent of other options. This analysis is concluded with a summary table comparing all options’ scores.

19.3 Operationalisation of scoring:

19.3.1 Officers scored an option as “high” when there was sufficient reason to believe that the model of service delivery maintained a strong likelihood of faring well against most – if not all – of the different elements of a criterion.
19.3.2 Officers scored an option as “moderate” when there was sufficient reason to believe that the model of service delivery maintained a probable, but not high, likelihood of faring well against most -- if not all - of elements of a criterion.

19.3.3 Further, a “moderate” score indicates officers’ awareness of possible negative implications (shortcomings) of an option when measured against a specific criterion. These implications were not, however, so critical in nature as to merit a "low" score.

19.3.4 Officers scored an option as “low” when there was sufficient reason to doubt that the model of delivery maintained reasonable likelihood of faring well against most – but not necessarily all – of the different elements of a criterion.

19.3.5 Sufficiency of confidence in the relativity of scoring was assured by engaging in dialogue with peers in other local authorities (Kensington and Chelsea, Luton and Knowsley) who had experience deploying the service delivery models inherent in the options put forth by Youth Service officers as well as discussing with organisations who have already spun out from a parent body (Wide Horizons) and with input from the Cabinet Office’s Mutual Success Programme.

19.4 Option A: commissioning an alternative sole provider from current market

19.4.1 The Youth Service could commission a provider from the current market to deliver the Youth Service at scale, in its entirety (adventure playgrounds, youth clubs and NEET Traineeship Programme). After implementing the base savings of £1.4m, the Council could solicit bids and tender a Youth Service contract, ultimately awarding the contract on the basis of best value.

a) Short-term sustainability

Short-term sustainability prospects are moderate. Youth provision has been – and remains – a mayoral and Council priority, as specified in the Children and Young People’s Plan 2012 – 2015, and the Council has the capacity to commission a Youth Service contract.

Commissioning an external provider to run the Service has the potential to ensure continuity of youth provision in the Borough for at least the duration of the contract period.

It is likely that continuity of service and outcomes would best be achieved if a local provider won a bidding process. Although it is possible an outside provider could offer similar continuity prospects by basing itself in the Borough and utilising local staff, which would also align with the Service’s aim to recruit locally. Since the vast majority of Youth Service staff live in the Borough, any disruption to continuity could have significant implications for them. In commissioning out the
Service, staff would have the right to be TUPE transferred to the provider, which could ensure continuity of employment for a predominantly local labour force, as well as continuity of provision, so long as staff were retained following the transfer.

An effective transfer and assimilation of staff would, however, require the commissioned organisation to deploy robust change management in order to mitigate against negative staffing implications – similar to that following a merger or acquisition in the corporate realm. This presents risks to continuity of provision, which could be amplified by the recency of the last restructure and the accompanying programme of change. A provider, especially a larger organization, could have the resources to successfully manage this change; however the risk could make bidding for delivery an unattractive prospect, further reducing an already small – if existent – market of potential providers.

There is a very limited market for delivering a contract the scale of the Youth Service, and potentially none locally. This is based on officers’ initial market testing and conversations with heads of some of the Borough’s largest youth providers. Among those with whom officers spoke, there is neither a desire to bid for, nor the demand to take on the Service at its current scale.

If there were competition for a commissioned contract it would likely come from providers outside the Borough.

The Youth Service currently commissions 35 PVI sector organisations, most of which are Lewisham-based. As of quarter 3, results reveal that c.25% of commissioned groups are failing to meet contractually specified targets at a level where it is recommended to end the contract, review and amend performance targets and/or cost in order to achieve agreed value for money. This reduces confidence that our local PVI sector has the capacity to operate the Service in its entirety.

b) Value for money

Value for money prospects are moderate. The current Youth Service has a unique infrastructure in its adventure playgrounds and youth centres, as well as a strong set of capabilities in its staff. The Council could benefit if a provider capable of assuming staff pension and redundancy liabilities came forward. This would likely only be possible if a large provider in good financial health competed for the contract.

If a large provider – from within or outside of the Borough – were to win the contract, it could also have the resources and capacity to grow the Borough’s youth offer and/or capably attract external resources. This would, however, necessitate that a provider used its own financial resources, as there is no indication the Council would increase the Council could specify a requirement for match funding in a bidding process. Though, again, this could reduce the market for potential providers.
If staff were TUPE’d to a large commissioned provider and immediately made redundant, this would have negative implications for the local labour market and reduce the social value capable of being derived from the contract, as the majority of Youth Service staff live in the Borough.

If staff were retained and the contracted provider had an incentive to recruit local talent and forge partnerships with voluntary sector providers that would help ensure the sustainability of the sector, positive social value implications for the local labour market. There is reason to believe that a social sector provider would have a greater incentive to deliver social value than a private sector organisation, as the latter would be bound first and foremost to the best interest of shareholders and profit generation.

Commissioning a provider will also result in a cost to the Council, as there would exist the need to monitor and manage the contract. This could likely be covered by 0.5 FTE at the PO8 grade.

c) Long-term sustainability

Long-term sustainability prospects are low. Unless a provider offered a level of match funding, a commissioned provider would characteristically deliver services corresponding to the contract’s value. The Council could, however, specify in a contract that a commissioned provider must: provide some level of match funding, assume pension and redundancy liabilities, retain local staff, cooperate with the local voluntary sector, include young people on its governing board, and look to grow the Borough’s youth offer in the face of further Council funding reductions.

In theory, if a contracted provider could honour these stipulations, positive implications could abound. Officers have pursued this notion in conversations with potential providers, where it was made clear that the aforementioned stipulations would limit interest in the contract, thereby reducing the market for bidders.

Given that long-term sustainability of youth provision is important to the Council and that embedding in a contract any or all of the aforementioned stipulations would limit – or render nonexistent – the market, any future Council funding reductions to youth provision would likely result in less youth provision.

It is likely that such future spending reductions by the Council could have negative implications for youth engagement and the ability to enhance the youth voice in the Borough.
19.5 Option B: Break up the remaining service and commission a mix of providers

19.5.1 The Youth Service could divide and spin-out sites, either in clusters or independently. After implementing the base savings of £1.4m, the Service could separate e.g. splitting-off adventure playgrounds from youth clubs, making each site independent or grouping sites geographically. Once spun-out, sites could incorporate as charities, trusts, social enterprises or employee-led mutuals. Each site, or group of sites, could be managed independently and governed by a board of trustees/directors. Doing this would require the Council to ultimately commission multiple providers – each offering youth provision to a particular part of the Borough.

A. Short-term sustainability

Short-term sustainability prospects are moderate. Dividing the Youth Service into separate sites could devolve responsibility, bring management closer to the end-user and community members, and enable each site(s) to make decisions in its (their) own best interest. A largely local staff group would transfer under TUPE ensuring continuity of service delivery and relationships with young people, the community and local organisations.

Each site(s) would retain its own management team, which would be equipped with new authority over how best to spend its money and deploy resources in line with contractual obligations and based on the needs of the local community, whilst ensuring relationships endure.

Management would be located alongside frontline staff, which could yield improvements in staff culture, strengthening short-term gains. More specifically, sites would have flexibility to define their organisational culture, operations, policies and guidelines. All decision-making power with regard to budget planning, business development, youth provision, youth engagement, partnership working, etc. would be at the discretion of site management and a board of trustees or governors, depending on the organisational model selected. Given this, some of the sites could prosper.

Further, this option could yield significant non-financial benefit to the Council in the form of social value to the local labour market, as the majority of Service staff live locally and would continue in employment.

Looking at provision holistically, problems could arise with regard to cohesion of service delivery. A piecemeal approach to youth provision could immediately create a disjointed youth offer and impede the sharing of best practices and information across sites, unless significant funds were invested in remote working capabilities and improved IT infrastructure. This could have a negative effect on outcomes for young people. This could be mitigated against by
implementing a requirement for sites to cooperate and partner with each other.

B. Value for money

Value for money prospects are low. In dividing the Service the Council would be required to commission multiple providers and manage and monitor multiple contracts, adding to the cost burden that would accompany the commissioning process.

As a singular entity, the Youth Service realises economies of scale with regard to its capacities (e.g., management, planning, income generation, hiring, data analysis, etc.). In dividing the Service in any way, these economies of scale would be lost, also putting at risk the sustainability prospects of individual sites (or group of sites). Management capabilities, business development capabilities and back office functions are all costly; as a singular entity the cost of these capabilities is spread across multiple sites, keeping unit costs low. If the Service were to divide, sites themselves would assume the burden of hiring management – along with other capabilities – which would drive up unit costs, decreasing value for money substantially.

Individual sites would be incentivized to generate supplementary income to add value for money to a Council contract. But the success with which this happened would likely vary widely from site to site. With Council funding reductions, some sites would sustain and continue to deliver the same level of provision whilst other sites would be forced to decrease provision relative to funding reductions.

It is highly unlikely that individual sites would have the financial capacity to assume staff pension and redundancy liabilities from the start. These would need to remain with the Council, at least in the short-term.

The potential social value that could be engendered via this option could vary significantly across sites.

This noted, all frontline services are currently delivered by trained, qualified youth workers, all of whom could prove better motivated outside the restrictions of a local authority bureaucracy with tightly defined constraints. A more engaged workforce could be realised -- one that maintains a greater stake in the success of its organisation and could deliver improved outcomes for young people at a lower unit cost.

C. Long-term sustainability

Long-term sustainability prospects are low. It is the Council’s aim (which is delineated in the Children and Young People’s Plan 2012 – 2105) to have as much youth provision as possible, not less, which could occur if sites failed. Sites would lose the ability to share frontline
capacity, a core focus of the last restructure in order to better allow the Service to react dynamically to service user demand. With the loss of economies of scale, high unit costs could also jeopardise sites’ ability to submit competitive bids for external funding, forge partnerships and attract investment.

A divided Service could also create a disjointed youth offer in the Borough, prevent the realisation of natural synergies between sites and risk potential future strategic planning specifically in relation to leveraging Lewisham regeneration schemes. Playgrounds and youth clubs are naturally positioned to complement each other and serve all segments of our target demographic. In the event that one or more youth clubs or playgrounds failed, this could leave a gap in provision and prevent Lewisham from meeting the needs of young people in one or more parts of the Borough. If sites failed, this could have negative implications on the local labour market.

19.6 Option C: continue providing direct provision at the reduced budget

19.6.1 The Youth Service could continue operations as a Council-run service with reduced capacity, after implementing the base savings of £1.4m.

a) Short-term sustainability

Short-term sustainability prospects are moderate. As long as Council funding for youth provision remains, the Service could continue to deliver a part of the Borough’s youth offer through its adventure playgrounds and youth centres.

Remaining a Council-run service would reduce the need for the type of broad organisational change management inherent in other options. This would lead to a continuity of service – sites could remain open as long as funding levels sustained.

Many Youth Service staff have worked for Lewisham Council in excess of 5 years, and there is great institutional knowledge that accompanies this longevity. Remaining a Council entity would enable the Service to – at least in the short-term – leverage this knowledge base to better support the delivery of the Service and the Council itself.

However, this could all be offset by the threat of future reductions, which could negatively impact staff morale and culture and result in a knock-on effect with regard to outcomes for young people. The threat could also mean negative implications for talent retention and make it more difficult to engage young people in a constantly shrinking service.

b) Value for money

Value for money prospects are low to moderate. With some level of Council funding for direct provision, the Youth Service could continue
APPENDIX 20b – Report for saving Q2

to deliver services from sites at a low unit cost, as well as commission services from the PVI sector.

The Service could continue to generate some income to supplement Council funding. However, as a local authority service area, income generation prospects are limited, as officers are precluded from soliciting private donations and applying for the majority of youth provision-related grants delivered by charities/trusts.

Any further decrease in funding for youth provision could result in negative implications for the local voluntary sector, as reductions to the Service would likely necessitate further reductions to the amount the Service spends on commissioning.

c) Long-term sustainability

Long-term sustainability prospects are low. After this year, the Council will be required to identify a further savings of c.£45m. Given the scale of savings required, it is unlikely the Council would have the financial flexibility to retain the Youth Service budget at its current level. This would cause the Service to reduce the scope of its youth offer – resulting in site closures, further reductions to commissioning funds, and fewer services for young people in general.

As noted above, it is difficult – and in many cases impossible – for the Youth Service to avail itself of different funding streams. Very few large grant-making trusts and charities fund public bodies and, in officers’ experience, corporates have demonstrated an unwillingness to contribute money to local authorities.

19.7 Option D: Commissioning of an Employee and Youth led mutual

19.7.1 The Youth Service could mutualise. After implementing base savings of £1.4m, Youth Service staff could, over the next 6-12 months, develop a business plan, vote to spin-out of Lewisham Council and establish an employee and young person-led mutual company. The organisation could continue to operate the Council’s youth sites and deliver provision on a service contract with the Council. Staff could be transferred to the mutual company, which would operate as a legal entity independent of local authority control.

a) Short-term sustainability

Short-term sustainability prospects are moderate. A youth mutual comprised of the current sites and staff could retain and build upon its existing capabilities. The Service’s predominantly local staff group could be transferred to the new entity, ensuring continuity of service for a predominantly local labour force and existing relationships with the community.
Management would be equipped with new authority over how best to deploy resources based on its service contract with the Council and the needs of the local community.

Layers of Council bureaucracy would be removed, creating a flatter structure for Service staff, which could yield improvements in staff culture, strengthening short-term gains. The organisation would have flexibility to define its organisational culture, operations, policies and guidelines. All decision-making power with regard to budget planning, business development, youth provision, youth engagement, partnership working, etc. would be vested in the mutual and board of directors.

The organisational and governance model of mutual ownership would allow for the formal engagement and input of young people with the services they use, consequently enhancing the strength of the youth voice. Staff members could also gain election to board posts and maintain voting authority, offering them more control over their careers.

Some of the potential short-term advantages could be tempered if the spin-out process proved arduous and time-consuming. Transforming the Service culture from one accustomed to Council operations to one grounded in shared ownership and a business ethos would require robust change management and is grounded in risk. This could enhance the burden placed on managers and has the potential to disrupt service delivery if not administered effectively.

b) Value for money

Value for money prospects are high. Unlike a contracted provider that would deliver youth provision to the value specified in a contract, a mutual company would have in its DNA the aim of becoming self-sustaining by growing revenue streams, which would enable a level of match funding.

Given Council savings requirements, mutualising the Youth Service could sustain a consistent level of youth provision across the Borough whilst enabling the Council to make further reductions to its budget for youth services. This would, naturally, be contingent on a mutual’s ability to raise supplementary funds.

Once removed from the local authority, a mutual company could go to the market to procure back office functions at lower cost, adding further savings to the Council.

All frontline services are currently delivered by trained, qualified youth workers, all of whom could prove better motivated outside the restrictions of a local authority bureaucracy with tightly defined constraints. A more engaged workforce that maintains a greater stake in the success of its organisation could deliver improved outcomes for young people at a lower unit cost. In conversations with Youth Service
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officers, staff from Epic CIC (Kensington and Chelsea’s former youth service) and Knowsley Youth Mutual (Knowsley’s former youth service) affirmed that mutualising their respective services has improved employee engagement and efficiency. Further, scholarly research on staff owned enterprises and the mutual model indicates that employees are more productive in such organisations than those that retain traditional structures.\(^4\)

There could also exist a significant non-financial benefit in social value to the Lewisham labour market, as the mostly local staff group could retain employment.

A further non-financial benefit could be delivered via partnership arrangements between the mutual and local providers. Such arrangements could include submitting joint bids, sharing services or back office functions and engaging in collaborative strategic planning.

If a mutual proved capable of yielding a surplus, it could look to expand operations in and around the Borough and seek to employ more local talent to support this.

Officers recognise the expertise retained by the voluntary sector. A mutual commissioning providers from the sector would be a way to leverage this to the benefit of young people, while not expending limited resources to duplicate skills.

It is clear from the consultation that a number of organisations in the current local VCS see a mutual as a way to strengthen current delivery and sector wide income generation.

c) Long-term sustainability

Long-term sustainability prospects are moderate. Long-term sustainability would be a mutual’s chief organisational aim from the outset, which could be brought to fruition by raising income to retain at least a constant level of youth provision in the face of Council reductions.

Whereas embedding certain stipulations into a contract specification could reduce the market for a Youth Service contract, a staff and youth-led mutual would have a natural inclination to provide a level of match funding, retain and recruit local staff, cooperate with the local voluntary sector, strengthen the youth voice by including young people on its governing board, and look to grow the Borough’s youth offer in the face of further Council funding reductions.

There are a number of revenue generation prospects a mutual could take advantage of, as it would be positioned to avail itself of income streams currently unavailable to local authorities (e.g. grants, subcontracting, social investment, individual philanthropy, corporate partnerships, etc.) in time to meet Council savings requirements. A mutual would be directed by a governing board responsible for ensuring the realisation of the organisation’s strategy and aims, mitigating against its risk of failure and potentially securing inroads to corporate philanthropy.

To ensure long-term sustainability, current staff could need support and training in fundamental commercial skills, which could be offered in part by experts from across the youth, charitable/VCS sector as well as drawing skills and support from the private sector.

Two youth mutuals exist currently, both of which were launched within the last 12 months. It is thus difficult to draw inferences about the durability of the mutual model in delivering youth provision. However, the mutual model has been replicated c.100 times across the country and succeeded in delivering public/social services. It is reasonable to believe that, so long as a mutual could identify profitable markets and generate income, the model could succeed in delivering the Borough’s primary Council-funded youth offer.

In the long-term, the Council tendering process could impact on the sustainability of a mutual. Whilst the Council can choose to contract a mutual for up to three years, after this point it must allow for an open bidding process. If a mutual failed to win a Council contract after three years, it could be required to downsize significantly or cease operations.

### 19.8 Options summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Options</th>
<th>Short-term Sustainability</th>
<th>Value for Money</th>
<th>Long-term Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Mod Low</td>
<td>High Mod Low</td>
<td>High Mod Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission sole provider</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break-apart Service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue as Council service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutualise Youth Service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19.9 **Consultation on future options**

19.9.1 As requested in the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of November 11th, 2014 Officers conducted a consultation on a broad set of options for the future of youth provision, beyond the initially proposed savings.

19.9.2 This was carried out as a separate section to the consultation on the savings and as such the information relating to methodology and level of participation is detailed above in Section 6. The full consultation document is included at appendix 1.

19.9.3 There was no support for the option to reduce the Youth Service to its statutory minimum, with all responses relating to it suggesting only that it would result in highly negative outcomes for young people. Since the Mayor had already ruled out this option during Mayor and Cabinet 11 November officers did not address it further.

19.10 **Key themes raised by public in response to future options**

- 1) Support and concern over mutualisation of the Youth Service
- 2) Concern over a mutual’s potential impact on voluntary sector providers
- 3) Ways to generate income for youth provision beyond Council-funding

19.10.1 All commentary from the consultation focused on the option of mutualisation, with no comment on the other options other than the statutory service option already ruled out by the Mayor on 11 November 2014. Equally, no one recommended any alternative service delivery models.

19.10.2 Officers have not provided responses to key themes raised as issues are dealt with as part of the options appraisal, except in the few instances where consultation respondents may have raised issue not pertinent to the appraisal.

19.11 **Support and concern over mutualisation of the Youth Service**

19.11.1 The idea of a young person and employee-led mutual received generally positive support from 35% of the responses from young people; 27% of the responses from the PVI sectors and 10% of other responses. A number of the responses – including those from young people, voluntary sector providers and community members – suggested that it was the most practical way to ensure the survival of high quality youth provision in the Borough.

19.11.2 From the PVI, Millwall, Wide Horizons and Teachsport all expressed strong support for the prospect, viewing it as the most viable way to deliver Council-funded youth provision whilst noting a desire to partner with it in the future both for delivery and fund raising.
“It has huge potential in terms of the fundraising that can be achieved when not existing as a council structure. It will unsettle lots of voluntary organisations who are used to applying to the local authority for grants. It will seemingly put the mutual in direct competition with some voluntary organisations. It may not bring in desired funding and later leave the former statutory services at greater risk of collapse. Youth-led needs to be honoured as such and include as many young people from across the borough as possible. Youth-led has the potential to reinvigorate spaces with young people often having wonderful fresh ideas that with the right facilitation, could provide better and well-attended services at a fraction of the cost. Youth-led also reduces costs.” - Sydenham and FH Y Forum

“Young people strongly feel that a mutual is the best option for the service and club as it would allow us to generate more income independently and would allow them as young people to contribute towards ideas of how to the service can become self-sustaining. They also feel the mutual would allow the service to provide different sessions and activities for the young people. However young people are very worried and sceptical about the thought of the club potential closing after the withdrawal of the governments funding. Young people do not like the idea of the service being commissioned to another organisation or company as they are worried about the potential changes this could lead to e.g. change of staff and a drastic change of activities. Overall the young people are very excited about the prospect of a mutual as they feel it will enable them to engage in more activities which are currently more difficult to do being part of the service e.g. fairs and carnivals. To generate income the young people feel the service should partner up more with schools and carry out sessions, rent the building and do afterschool clubs within the youth clubs.” - Riverside Youth Centre consultative group

19.11.3 8% of responses from young people; 47% of PVI responses and 25% of other responses supported the idea of a mutual but with caveats - such as having a robust business plan; youth input; and one PVI response recommending that the focus should be on education employment and enterprise.

19.11.4 3% of responses from young people and 6% of responses from the public said they felt unable to comment on the idea without more information available, and two responses (1 from the PVI and 2 from members of the public) suggested that the Council should wait to see if government funding increases in the future before making decisions on the future or to lobby the government to rethink the investment in youth provision.

19.11.5 6% of young people responses; 20% of PVI responses and 25% of other responses stated that they did not think mutualisation was a good idea. One of the responses from the PVI sector stated that they were concerned about the long term sustainability of a mutual, particularly if the Council were to be the only or main funder. One of the responses from the Public and one specifically from the PVI
sectors demonstrated concern about the availability of alternative funding in the future and would want to see a detailed business plan.

19.11.6 The CYP Voluntary Sector Forum specifically noted concerns over a prospective mutual’s ability to generate income, and noted:

“We would ask the Youth Service take on board the fundraising potential of the local voluntary sector. The sector has a proven record, unlike mutuals that are only in operation in 2 or 3 places throughout the UK, of being able to raise significant funds…”

19.11.7 Two respondents indicated the Council should hold-off mutualising the Youth Service until the success or failure of other youth mutuals can be verified.

19.12 Concern over a mutual’s potential impact on voluntary sector providers

19.12.1 The CYP Voluntary Sector Forum raised concerns over a mutual’s relationship with voluntary sector providers. The Forum asserted it would like to see the following conditions satisfied: significant board representation awarded to voluntary sector providers, a duty to cooperate with the voluntary sector, and commitment of a significant proportion of a mutual company’s budget to fund voluntary sector provision. The Forum’s concerns were not raised by other voluntary sector providers or other respondents.

19.13 Ways to generate income for youth provision beyond Council-funding

19.13.1 The following suggestions were included in the consultation to generate further income: hiring out facilities; reduced rents to charities; sponsorship/partnership by businesses; fundraising ideas; talent shows/bake sales etc; charging fees; donations from businesses/local community

19.13.2 6 responses (33%) from the PVI sector and one from a member of public similarly requested closer partnerships with businesses and the use of sites to promote social enterprise.

19.13.3 52% of responses from young people did, however, suggest fundraising ideas including 20% of young people who suggested charging for some activities or a minimal entrance charge of 20p per session, for example. One response from young people at Bellingham Gateway suggested partnerships with the private sector and better links with schools. One member of the public requested an increase to council tax to specifically fund youth services.

“Young people strongly feel that a mutual is the best option for the service and club as it would allow us to generate more income independently and would allow them as young people to contribute towards ideas of how the service can become self-sustaining. They
also feel the mutual would allow the service to provide different
sessions and activities for the young people. However young people
are very worried and sceptical about the thought of the club potential
closing after the withdrawal of the governments funding. Young
people do not like the idea of the service being commissioned to
another organisation or company as they are worried about the
potential changes this could lead to e.g. change of staff and a drastic
change of activities. Overall the young people are very excited about
the prospect of a mutual as they feel it will enable them to engage in
more activities which are currently more difficult to do being part of
the service e.g. fairs and carnivals. To generate income the young
people feel the service should partner up more with schools and carry
out sessions, rent the building and do afterschool clubs within the
youth clubs.” - Riverside Youth Centre consultative group (18 young
people)

19.13.4 Two responses from the public said the Council should commission
fewer services and instead spend on Council-run services, which they
believed offer better value for money. The CYP Voluntary Sector
Forum expressed concerns that the £100k income generation, which
is part of the initial £1.4m savings, was overly ambitious.

19.14 Key themes raised by staff in response to future options

1) Support for the notion of mutualisation
2) Future concerns
3) Support for other future options

19.15 Support for the notion of mutualisation

19.15.1 The majority staff response was in favour of mutualisation as a way
to deliver the future of Council-funded youth provision. In general,
staff indicated confidence that it would offer best value for money,
more effectively free staff to create innovative solutions to generate
income and enable better delivery of outcomes for young people.

19.16 Future concerns

19.16.1 Some support for mutualisation was tempered by queries and
concerns. The most prominent concern centred on the future of
redundancy and pension rights. Other concerns included
sustainability of a mutual company, the role TUPE would play and
what other changes may be required to job descriptions to make a
new organisation viable. Several indicated broad concern for the
notion that a mutual could fail, which could result in loss of services
for young people. Related to this was one person’s concern that a
mutual might alter negatively the focus of youth provision away from
meeting the needs of the most vulnerable.

19.17 Support for other future options
19.17.1 Staff demonstrated a low level of support for the option of dividing
the Service. Some showed interest in developing two mutuals –
one for playgrounds and one for youth clubs. Others who
addressed this point demonstrated no enthusiasm for the prospect,
but sought clarity on why management supports a one-mutual
approach.

19.18 Response

19.18.1 Management acknowledges the broad staff desire to deliver the
Service via a mutual. Officers understand that much more
information is needed in order to ensure staff make a fully informed
decision on mutualisation, conscious of the benefits, potential
drawbacks and implications for youth provision. Management will
continue to look at ways to implement staff suggestions and
recommendations as we move forward.

19.18.2 Managers will keep staff abreast of any and all information that is
revealed via future planning processes. Managers will also aim to
better align all areas of the Service, manage change associated
with downsizing, and utilise appropriate channels to communicate
messages in a timely and effective manner.

19.19 Conclusion of Future options appraisal

19.19.1 Alongside the proposed savings for 2015-16, it is recommended the
Mayor agree that officers develop a full plan to mutualise the Youth
Service. This recommendation is based on the need to further
explore the potential benefits a mutualised service could bring to
bear, the supportive responses to both the public and staff
consultations, and the opportunity mutualisation could bring the
Council with regard to future savings.

19.19.2 The plan will include a governance framework that aims to ensure
that:

- The local voluntary sector is involved and represented,
  possibly via the Voluntary Action Lewisham CYP Forum, in the
governance arrangements of the ELM
- The governing body of the ELM is represented as a
  stakeholder in public services, possibly through representation
  on the CYP Strategic Partnership Board.
- Staff and Young People, and potentially the Council, are
democratically represented in the ELM.

19.19.3 The plan will also cover:

- How to achieve necessary asset locks.
- A business plan/case required for any single tender
  action.
19.19.4 In planning officers will consider risks including:

- Potential LGPS and redundancy liabilities.
- The ELM’s liability for VAT.
- The ELM’s liability for Corporation Tax.
- Funding from the Council being viewed as state aid.

20. Financial implications of recommended future option

20.1 The recommended “future” option is to pursue a Mutual for the provision of youth services in the borough. The Council’s support for this option would be capped at c£1.7m and offers the prospect that over time that contribution would decrease as alternative income resources were developed and achieved by the Mutual.

20.2 It is anticipated that staff would continue to be paid on their current terms and conditions thus maintaining a level of employment in the borough.

20.3 To maximise the chances of success the Mutual as envisaged would need to operate at arms length from the Council and be released from a range of corporate systems and requirements. This may lead to some reduction in Council overheads but that may be insufficient to maintain the economies of scale of the organisation. In making a final decision on its funding of the Mutual, the Council will need to consider the exact financial implications of this.

20.4 The Mutual model described does not anticipate any change in the use of capital assets deployed so no capital financial benefit to the Council is anticipated at this stage.

20.5 Options A, B and C provide continuity in terms of the Council commitment to a service financially but they do not offer the prospect of a similar level of service at a reduced or possibly nil cost. They could offer a reduced cost if in commissioning services the Council specified an income earning target that was built into the contract.

21. Legal implications of savings proposals recommended future option

21.1 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.

21.2 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.

21.3 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.

21.4 Local authorities are required to supply and keep up to date information regarding those leisure-time activities and facilities that are available locally.

21.5 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. A local authority can fulfil the duty to make services available either by providing them itself or by making arrangements with others, which could include other local authorities.

21.6 The proposals set out in this paper have to be consistent with the local authority’s ability to meet its statutory responsibilities.

21.7 In exploring the option of an employee led mutual (ELM) due to the value of any potential contract, this would trigger a procurement exercise under the EU Directive. Under the current EU Directive the services would be Part B services which would invoke a much lighter touch regime requiring only the use of non-discriminatory contract terms and a contract award notice. However, the anticipated Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (due to come into force in Spring this year) will permit local authorities to reserve the award of certain services including youth services to mutuals/social enterprises. The maximum duration of such a contract is three years and would enable a mutual to gain experience of running its own business before it is formally subject to a procurement exercise thereafter.

21.8 Notwithstanding the possible award of a contract in accordance with the anticipated Public Contracts Regulations 2015 the local authority will still have to be satisfied that it fulfilled its best value
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duty and would be required to consider the usual factors of service quality, cost, ability of the contractor to provide the service.

21.9 The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 (and the EU Directive) enables local authorities to take into account social and environment aspects of any contract they are procuring as well as the relevant skills and experience of the individuals involved when procuring any services.

21.9 Under the Council’s Constitution, this is usually done through an open tender exercise. However, if there are special circumstances warranting a single tender action the customary open tender exercise can be dispensed with. Whether such a departure from the usual open tender process is permissible will be a question of fact and a case for departure will need to be made out.

21.10 In the event that the option of a staff led mutual progresses and is successful in providing the service, at the end of the three year contract, the normal provisions would apply. Either the delivery of the service would revert to the Council or arrangements would be required to let another contract. Alternatively, the Council could decide at that stage to pursue the statutory minimum option and divest itself of discretionary youth service provision and leave it to other providers with no contractual relationship with the Council.

21.11 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.

21.12 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.

21.13 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.

21.14 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/

21.15 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

21.16 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/

22 Crime and disorder implications of recommended future option

22.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

23. Equalities implications of recommended future option

23.1 See Appendix 3

24 Environmental implications

24.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising from this report

Background documents

If there are any queries on this report please contact Mervyn Kaye,
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Service Manager, Youth Service, Children and Young People’s Directorate, London Borough of Lewisham, mervyn.kaye@lewisham.gov.uk / 020 8314 6661
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Appendix 1: Public consultation paper

Public consultation on proposals for the future of youth services
The Youth Service aims and objectives
We want to support young people in Lewisham in the best possible way, with services and activities that:

- are fun, vibrant and high quality
- support their learning and life skills
- enable them to make the most of what London and Lewisham have to offer.

Providing support and activities for all young people remains a top priority for the Mayor and Council. At the same time, because of the Government’s continued squeeze on public spending, we also need to reduce the amount of money we spend on services across the Council. This means we have to think differently about how we deliver youth services in the future.

Regardless of any changes, our aims for the youth service remain the same:

- To encourage a broad range of organisations to deliver a vibrant range of opportunities for all our young people to enjoy and benefit from.

- To support young people in Lewisham in need of support in becoming happy, healthy and successful adults.

The outcomes that we want to achieve for young people also remain the same:

- Improved life skills.
- Increased involvement in education, employment or training.
- Staying safe and well, and preventing needs from escalating.

Why are we consulting on the youth service?
Alongside setting up the above vision for the service the youth service restructure in 2013/14 also released savings to the Council of £1.03m. This was required as part of a wider £93m reduction across the Council which began in May 2010. These savings were achieved through a complete reshaping of the service, creating a leaner, more efficient service more capable of responding to young people’s needs. It also introduced a commissioning fund from which voluntary sector and other providers could bid to deliver youth provision.

Further reductions in Government funding now require the Council to make further savings of £85m by 2018. Whilst the vision remains the same the Council reductions will require further changes in how we organise and deliver support to young people in Lewisham. It also gives us an opportunity to think creatively about how we do this. The level of saving being requested is in line with savings required across the Council, i.e. the youth service is taking a fair share of the required cuts. We are therefore considering proposals to make £1.4m of savings from the current £3.46m budget (41%).

Part one of this paper explains the current proposals to save £1.4m. Part two then considers the future of the Youth Service after these savings. We are asking you to help inform both these proposals.

Please take some time to read this paper and then complete a short survey to have your say on the proposed changes. Throughout the paper you will see highlighted questions which we would like for you to consider.
PART 1: Initial £1.4m saving proposal:

To save £1.4m it is proposed to:

- reduce the number of staff we employ;
- reduce the current commissioning of youth provision run by organisations other than the youth service;
- Generate more income;
- re-shape our youth re-engagement services (*explained below*)

What will be the effect of a reduction in staff?

The reduction in staff includes management, business support, and youth workers. Although the reduction in management and business support will have a minimal effect on service provision, the reduction of youth workers will mean, from April 2015, we will need to make a change at two of our centres. We are proposing that the two sites are Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne Youth Club as well as a reduction in the Youth Services’ street based work.

Instead of our youth service delivering services at these two sites, we want to find other providers who can deliver youth provision in them.

- **What would you like to see running at these sites?**

Why Rockbourne and Ladywell?

The choice of Rockbourne Youth Club and Ladywell Youth Village was based on the suitability of the sites to allow others to deliver provision, and the potential of remaining sites to be used for purposes of generating money to pay for services in the future. Any money generated in the future by any of our sites would be used to fund youth provision.

In addition to the youth service provision at Rockbourne and Ladywell Youth Village, both centres already have other provision running from them. Rockbourne offers short break provision (for young people with Special Educational Needs - SEN) on two weekday evenings and Saturdays, and Ladywell Youth Village offers short break provision on Saturdays. Rockbourne also hosts a Scout group, whilst Ladywell operates as an adult day care centre the majority of the time. These proposals will therefore allow this provision to continue and the sites to remain open, enabling the savings to result only from the reduction of youth service delivery. *For more information on this and on alternative nearby provision see FAQ section below.*

What will happen to other sites?

Lewisham youth service will continue providing a range of youth work and income generating from the five other youth centres:

- Woodpecker, New Cross
- Honor Oak, Brockley
- TNG, Sydenham
- Riverside, Deptford
- Bellingham Gateway, Bellingham

and all five Lewisham Adventure Playgrounds:
What will happen to street based work?

Currently, there is a capacity for the service to carry out street based work, to engage young people not using the service or to respond to unforeseen incidents. The skills for outreach and street based work would remain in the service and some outreach/street based work would continue, especially when this is needed for unforeseen issues. The reduction in staff numbers would however now require a reduction in centre-based activities on any evening that street based work takes place. However, that is the reality of what actually happens already, because of current vacancies in the service. Our Participation and Engagement Officer’s role also involves outreach work to engage young people not using the service and this will continue, making up for some of the loss of street-based capacity.

What is commissioning and what is the effect of a reduction?

Currently the Youth Service commissions a range of youth provision from the private and voluntary sector. In other words it pays people other than Lewisham Council youth workers to offer activities to young people. This happens at different locations and times of the year, including sometimes in Lewisham Youth clubs. This allows a mix of provision across the borough that the Youth Service alone does not have the capacity to meet.

The initial saving of £1.4m proposes reducing this by 31.5% in line with the total reduction of money the Council will have to make. This will still leave over £600,000 of funding to enable the Youth Service to commission other provision – an amount greater than was available before the last restructure in 2013.

A clear process for deciding how to reduce the budget will take into account how best providers can meet the Youth Service aims, including considering the needs of specific groups of vulnerable young people; ensuring a good spread of service across the borough as well as opportunities outside of the borough; and provision during all times of the year. It will also look at where providers this year have not met their expected performance and look instead to get more for our young people from the money being spent.

- Is there anything you think we should consider when we think about how to reduce spend on commissioned youth provision?

How will we generate income into the youth service?

The service will generate income by renting space to private and community sector users, and by bidding for relevant, available grants.

- Are there other ways you think the youth service could raise money?

What do you mean by re-shaping youth re-engagement services?

There are three elements of the current youth service that are proposed would be better when brought together to form a youth re-engagement service. These are:

- Deptford Adventure Playground, Deptford
- Dumps Adventure Playground, Bellingham
- Home Park Adventure Playground, Sydenham
- Ladywell Adventure Playground, Ladywell
- Honor Oak Adventure Playground, Brockley
• The Specialist 1:1 (keywork) service
• The NEET Traineeship
• NEET tracking services

The first two of these services will remain initially under the youth service, but this may change in the future; the NEET tracking service will remain unchanged. Savings will be made by looking at alternative funding for the Specialist 1:1 service and the NEET Traineeship, including other non-council funding. It may be that in the future the Specialist 1:1 service is commissioned as part of other family support services.
Part 2: Thinking about the future for the youth service after these savings

Given the level of saving required across the council, £85m by 2016/17, we believe that even with the proposed initial £1.4m detailed in part 1 of this consultation, further change will be required. Part 2 of the consultation therefore asks you to help us consider this longer term future.

There are many possible future options for delivering youth provision including ideas you may have which we have not yet thought of. Currently the preferred option is to create an employee and youth led mutual. This is explained in detail below. This is currently preferred as we think that it best offers an opportunity to protect the level of youth service provision – after the savings outlined above – as well as making it possible to increase the amount of money the service can generate as income, and therefore make further savings for the Council.

Below we detail this option and also a number of other ideas. We also discuss why we believe these other ideas to be less preferential. We would like you to also consider these and let us know where you agree with our thinking, where you disagree and where you may have other suggestions. This will help the Mayor make decisions that can seek to offer a long term vision for youth provision.

What is an employee and youth led mutual?

When we talk about an employee and youth led mutual, we are talking about a company (a legal organisation) that is shared by the employees and young people in the borough. Our employees are currently employed by the Council directly. If the youth service became a mutual, it would mean the youth service moves out of the Council. The Council would no longer directly control the youth service and its employees would no longer work for the Council, although the Council would, certainly in the short term, continue to fund this new organisation.

The youth service would instead become its own organisation, governed by the employees and other stakeholders, including representation by young people themselves. Employees and stakeholders would directly share responsibility for this new organisation’s success. We believe young people ought to have a greater say in what they get and feel more empowered to make decisions. This new organisation, where employees and young people share responsibility, would better allow this.

For at least the first 3 years, the Council would fund this new organisation to provide services on its behalf. During this time, the new organisation would need to develop ways to fund itself so that at the end of a 3 year period the Council could either stop or reduce funding to provide further savings. To protect against this resulting in the end of youth provision the mutual would, over the first three years, work hard with partners including the voluntary sector to bring in money from sources other than just the Council. Because it is part of the Council, the youth service is currently restricted from accessing several funding streams. As a mutual, the organisation could sell a variety of services that would benefit the community, such as desk space for start-ups, venue space for entrepreneurs, and physical education activities. In partnership with community organisations, the Service could also develop entirely new activities to sell – for example, activities for foreign students who stay in Lewisham, bicycle tours and support for at-risk pupils, to name a few. All money generated by these activities would be reinvested in the organisation to continue the core business of providing positive activities and safe spaces to Lewisham young people, which would in turn meet the aims described at the start of this document.

The exact detail of how a mutual would work will, however, take some time to work out; we anticipate that planning and organisational design will take a year.

Currently two other youth service mutuals exist in the UK in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and in Knowsley (near Liverpool). These two mutuals are working
well, but are very new. We are in contact with both organisations and would continue to learn from them and seek to embed best practices into Lewisham.

To bring to life the idea of a Lewisham employee and youth-led mutual will require working in partnership with Lewisham’s community and voluntary sector organisations. Ultimately, there are a number of benefits to be realised by setting up the youth service as a mutual. These include:

- a greater opportunity for involvement of young people in the borough, by allowing them to become part owners of the mutual and have an elected place on its board
- a greater ability to strategise, innovate and better meet the needs of young people
- a greater opportunity to tap into new grant funding streams, sponsorships and income generation opportunities currently unavailable to local authorities
- the potential to positively influence organisational culture, embed a feeling of shared ownership, minimise sick days and increase influence over future decisions
- the opportunity for the Council to retain a relationship with a staff group that has already-established relationships with young people and community members

**What do you think to the idea of an employee and youth led mutual?**

Other ideas considered but not put forward as options:

**Retain the youth service as part of the Council**

Given the extent of savings required by the Council over the next 3 years, it is possible that further reductions to the service will be required. Further reductions would result in the removal of more youth work staff from additional centres and playgrounds, further reduced funding to commissioned services from the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector, and an overall decrease in the amount of youth provision available in the borough.

We believe that this would have a detrimental impact on young people from a level of constant uncertainty regarding youth club and playground closures. This would make it more difficult for youth workers to gain young people’s trust and engage them in provision.

In addition, youth service staff would operate in an environment of constant uncertainty, not knowing if jobs would exist the following year. Such an environment would serve as a disadvantage to staff culture and motivating staff to provide their best to young people. It would also likely cause an environment of disbelief and make it very difficult to retain talent and hire new talent.

**Reduce the service to a statutory service**

We could reduce the service to a statutory service only model. This means the council would only provide those services that the government says we legally have to. Legislation imposes a duty on local authorities, so far as is reasonably practicable, to promote the well-being of persons aged 13 to 19 (and up to 25 for those young persons with learning difficulties) by securing access for them to sufficient education and recreational leisure time activities and facilities”. The authority can fulfil this duty by providing activities and facilities or assisting others to do so or by making arrangements to facilitate access which can include the provision of transport, financial assistance or information. The Council is also required to supply and keep up to date information regarding leisure time activities and facilities that are available locally. This would release further savings of £1.7m (in addition to the £1.4m above – making a total of £3.1m). By reducing the service to this statutory minimum, we would prevent the Council from making painful cuts to the service year after year. If reduced to its statutory minimum, the Service
would carry out only two functions – facilitate access to non-Council run youth provision and track and report on young people who are not in education, employment or training. Reducing the service in line with this option would mean that roughly four staff members would remain. All youth workers, managers and commissioning and business support staff would be made redundant and all commissioned and direct provision would end. Under this option, all of our youth centres and APGs would either close or be rented to community sector providers.

This idea was originally put forward as a formal option to Mayor and Cabinet on 12 November; however at this meeting the Mayor decided no further work on this option should be taken forward.

**Commission out the youth service to a private, voluntary or independent sector provider**

The council could advertise for a contract to deliver or run the Youth Service including all activities. This would have to be based on a total cost recovery model, meaning full costs to delivering services, including IT; building maintenance; HR; finance support etc. were included. The organisation could be a private, voluntary or independent sector organisation. This is something that some other boroughs already do. The council could look to do this based on a concession contract where a provider is awarded a contract that pays them less than the full cost of the service, because they bring in external funding to add to the amount the council funds.

At present we do not believe commissioning out the service would allow for the same level of savings as option 1 whilst also retaining the same level of service with a strong local ethos and connection to young people. There have been no contracts of this scale, and certainly none of this size on a concession model, for youth services in Lewisham. For the contracts that do exist within our current commissioned fund many are not based on a full total cost recovery model with the council paying for use of buildings, logistics support and promotions in addition to the actual cost of the contract. This model may also preclude any of the benefits of staff and young people's ownership that a mutual would deliver.

**Create individual youth centres and adventure playgrounds, e.g. establish them as separate mutuals or charities/trusts.**

The youth service could seek to “spin-out” each of its remaining adventure playgrounds and youth centres – in some cases pairing two or three together – and enable them to operate as stand-alone charities, mutuals or not-for-profit organisations.

In the current youth service, youth workers are allocated to centres and playgrounds as and when needed but can move around to meet changing needs. Also management and overhead costs are absorbed across all of our sites collectively. In this way the service sees economies of scale and a flexibility to best meet young people’s needs. Should services instead be split up they would have to employ one manager or one administrative officer for each site individually. They would also lose bargaining power for buying including in areas such as IT, maintenance and equipment. They would also lose the advantage of a broader staff group that gives flexibility in terms of both numbers of staff at a site and the amount of differing skills.

If each part of the youth service mutualised or we made independent individual adventure playgrounds and youth centres, costs per part or site would increase. The economies of scale currently realised by the Service – or which would be realised by a wholesale mutualisation of the youth service – would not exist. This would likely create an unsustainable situation for individual sites – they would be forced to spend considerable
time seeking external funding to bring in missing capabilities. Such a situation would also enhance competition throughout the borough for limited funding resources, placing undue strain on the local private voluntary independent sector.

Ultimately, we believe this option is not practical, as it fails to realise economies of scale and would not provide better value for money.

- **Is there anything you want to say about these ideas?**
- **Are there other ideas that you think we should consider?**
Tell us what you think

We are asking for your views on this proposal from November 18th to December 31st. You can share your views and find out more by completing the feedback form which is available online and in clubs/APGs and submitting it:

1. Online: Youth Service Savings Consultation 2014

2. By Post: YS consultation 2014, Lewisham Youth Service, 3rd Floor Laurence House, SE6 4RU

3. Putting your completed form into boxes at youth clubs and APGs

or

4. Posting your opinions to Twitter with the #ysconsultation2014:

5. Posting your opinions to the youth service Facebook page here: Lewisham Young Citizens Panel (YCP) | Facebook

6. Between now and 19 December youth workers will be talking to you at centres and adventure play grounds and gathering your opinions.

The deadline for responses is 31 December 2014

→ The Mayor will consider our proposals in February 2015, including the responses from young people, parents/carers, staff and the wider public.

→ If the proposals are accepted, the first stage of changes will be implemented from April 2015.

Feedback form

1. What would you like to see running at these sites?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Is there anything you think we should consider when we think about how to reduce spend on commissioned youth provision?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Are there other ways you think the youth service could raise money?
4. What do you think about the idea of an employee and youth led mutual?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

5. What do you think of the (other) ideas?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

6. Are there other ideas that you think we should consider?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

If you attend one of our youth centres please answer the following questions;

7. What is your post code?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

8. Which youth club or adventure playground do you attend the most?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

9. What type of activities would you like to take part in if there was no provision at Ladywell Youth Village or Rockbourne? (Please tick all that apply)

- Arts and crafts
- Media
- Uniform groups
- Educational and life Skills
- Dance and drama
- Computing and technology
- Environmental and conservation projects
- Youth-led projects, social action and youth participation
9. How far would you travel to go to a Youth Centre or Adventure Playground? (Please tick all that apply)

- Catford
- Lewisham
- Deptford
- Sydenham
- Forest Hill
- Ladywell
- Brockley
- New Cross
- Bromley
- Downham
- Bellingham
- Grove Park
- Blackheath
- Other (please specify)

10. Do you currently take part in other activities/clubs? (Please circle)

- Yes
- No

If yes, please tell us more.

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

11. If the club that you attend most was to close, do you think you would like it if your youth worker went with you to visit other local clubs? (Please circle)

- Yes
- No
- N/A

12. Have you got any suggestions on how the youth service could help you to attend other provision?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

About you
How would you describe yourself in relation to this consultation? (Please tick the one which describes you best)

- Young person (8-25 years old)
- Parent/ carer of a child or young person
- Private, voluntary or community organisation

If so, please specify, which organisation………………………………………………………………………………

Do you deliver youth services or activities? Yes / No

Do you deliver youth services or activities on behalf of the Council? Yes / No

Member of the public

Other (please specify):………………………………………………………………………………

Would you like to receive the Lewisham Life eNewsletter for local events and things to do, news, discounts and competitions? Yes / No

How did you find out about this consultation? (Please tick all that apply)

- Council website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- At a consultation event
- Through school, college, youth worker/ youth centre, or another service or member of staff
- Any other way? (Please specify):………………………………………………………………………………

Equalities monitoring is the collection of information which helps Lewisham Council ensure that we are providing a fair and inclusive service. We need to know who our customers are to check that everyone in the borough is accessing the services they are entitled to, and that nobody is discriminated against unlawfully.

Any information provided by you will be treated confidentially and in accordance with the Data Protection Act. All questions are voluntary and you do not have to answer them. However, by answering the questions you will help us to ensure that our services are fair and accessible to all.

How would you describe yourself? (Please tick)

- Under 15
- 15–24
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Age</strong></th>
<th>25–34</th>
<th>35–44</th>
<th>45–54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>Asian Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black other</td>
<td>Indian other</td>
<td>Mixed other</td>
<td>Mixed White and Black African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Other Ethnic Group</td>
<td>Other Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>White British/Eng/Welsh/Scot/N Irish</td>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>White other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Turkish/Cypriot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Some answers to frequently asked questions:

**Why Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne?**
Ladywell Youth Village has been proposed primarily because it’s building is not managed by Lewisham Youth Service. The centre primarily operates as an adult day centre; short break provision is offered on the weekends. To make savings, Council-run youth provision will end, whilst other youth provision, including short breaks, will continue. We will also try to find others to run activities during those evenings when we are no longer there. Similarly alongside providing mainstream youth club Rockbourne runs youth sessions for young people with special education needs. This specialist work will continue and we will look for other non-council providers to continue running mainstream activities from the club.

**What does that mean for young people?**
If you currently attend the youth sessions at Ladywell Youth Village and/or Rockbourne, it means that you may need to attend somewhere else. The nearest alternatives to these clubs are discussed below and detailed in Appendix 3. We will also seek to find other organisations (i.e. non youth service) to provide service at both sites.
What else is there for young people in Ladywell and Forest Hill?
If alternative providers cannot be found there are other options near both sites:
The closest youth service provision to Ladywell Youth Village is Ladywell Adventure playground. The playground offers a wide range of outdoor activities and also has table tennis, pool, arts and cooking facilities. To better support the loss of provision we will look to alter service at the APG to better accommodate some of the older young people who may only currently attend Youth Village. The closest Youth centre to Ladywell Youth Village is Honor Oak, which is accessible by 484 bus or 122 to Crofton Park and a short walk. The nearest provision to Rockbourne is The Next Generation (TNG) youth centre in Sydenham. TNG is new, designed for young people by young people, and offers youth sessions throughout the week including sporting activities and clubs which include boxing, dance, football, climbing wall, recording studio and a Cafe. This is accessible by bus 122 and then 202 or train to Sydenham and bus 202. Other services and activities are listed see appendix 2.

Fully updated information about known youth provision in the borough is also always available on the Lewisham website. www.lewisham.gov.uk/youngpeople (See appendix 3 for a list of all activities)

How far will young people need to travel?
There are several bus routes that go through Ladywell such as 122, 484, 284, Brockley 171, 122, 172, P4 and to Lewisham 47, 136, 122, 484, 284 and more. Depending on what activity/club/event you attend, you may need to use Transport for London’s website https://www.tfl.gov.uk/plan-a-journey/ to check on exactly how to get there from your home/school.

There are several bus routes that go through Sydenham such as 122, 202, and 356. The train station at Sydenham also provides links from Forest Hill, Brockley, and New Cross. Depending on what activity/club/event you attend, you may need to use Transport for London’s website https://www.tfl.gov.uk/plan-a-journey/ to check on exactly how to get there from your home/school.

Will the same youth workers be at other sites? What will happen to the staff at Ladywell and Rockbourne?
Making savings means that some staff will lose their jobs. However, the process used to select who stays and who does not, is not based on the location of where staff are currently working. Youth Service staff work for the Youth Service, not directly for one of our sites. This means that just because we are removing our staff from Ladywell and Rockbourne, the staff currently based there may not lose their jobs. Some of the youth workers may be allocated to other Youth Centres across Lewisham. All Lewisham Youth service venues are staffed by professionally trained staff, who are there to support you in your development and allow you to have fun in a supervised, supportive environment.

How will you ensure youth centres remain safe environments for young people if the young person to staff ratio increases?
All staff are responsible for knowing and maintaining a safe ratio of staff to young people. If demand rises at some clubs and falls in others, we will work to ensure that our supply of staff meets the demand for the centre’s activities, which may mean moving staff around. Furthermore, the Youth Service is looking to raise money from alternative sources to enable services to meet demand.

Will young people travel to other areas to access Centres that are still open?
Statistics already show that young people are travelling to access provision. Between April and August this year, 48% of young people who attended Rockbourne Youth Club and 45% of attendees at Youth Village live more than 1500m from the club. This indicates that young
people would be willing to travel to access other projects if the current youth service delivery at Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne were to end.

**How do you plan to enable young people to access facilities across the borough?**

We are offering to take young people to their nearest youth centres during March 2015 to acquaint them with new environments, as well as other staff and young people. We will continue to promote activities for young people including through Lewisham website: www.lewisham.gov.uk/young-people.

**When will decisions be made and by who?**

Decisions about the future of the youth service will be made by the Mayor of Lewisham - Sir Steve Bullock. To make this decision he looks at responses to the consultation presented to him in a report written by Council staff, he also talks to his fellow councillors, including some who look at the plans in detail in meetings called ‘scrutiny’ and then prepare reports of their own for him. These reports will be sent to him in January 2015 so he can make a decision at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting in February, 2015.
### Appendix 2: Other activities in and around Forest Hill and Ladywell

(The most up to date version of this is accessible at www.lewisham.gov.uk/youngpeople)

#### Activities near Ladywell Youth Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Delivery address</th>
<th>Distance from Ladywell Youth Village</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>How do people access your service? (drop in, referral etc.)</th>
<th>Do you charge Young People to access the provision?</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td>16 Dussington Avenue, Ladywell SE4 1JF</td>
<td>0 Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>8 - 19</td>
<td>Up to 18 with SEYN</td>
<td>Open Access</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>07572 271387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAQ</td>
<td>Ladywell Fields Adventure Playground, Malpas Road SE13 7NB</td>
<td>0 Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>Contact Provider</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>064446 9000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phoebe@group.org.uk">phoebe@group.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell Fields Adventure Playground, Malpas Road SE13 7NB</td>
<td>0 Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>Contact Provider</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>064446 9000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phoebe@group.org.uk">phoebe@group.org.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands Primary School</td>
<td>Anguish Road, Brockley SE4 1HJ</td>
<td>300 Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>Students Only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>07812 000506</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheethee@lewisham.gov.uk">sheethee@lewisham.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway Primary School</td>
<td>Dogger Road, Catford SE4 0GB</td>
<td>300 Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>Students Only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>07812 000506</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheethee@lewisham.gov.uk">sheethee@lewisham.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penge Project Ladywell Fields, Marwood Road SE4 1EA</td>
<td>400 Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>Students Only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>07812 000506</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheethee@lewisham.gov.uk">sheethee@lewisham.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Church-on-the-Hill Youth</td>
<td>430-442, Lewisham High Street SE13 6AD</td>
<td>500 Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>Application form, Varies</td>
<td>For most services there is no charge but for some there is a small voluntary subscription</td>
<td>0208 947 2670</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@lewishamchurch-onthehill.org.uk">info@lewishamchurch-onthehill.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Park (Young Muslim Academy) South East District Group</td>
<td>Lewisham and Docklands Centre, 290-295, Lewisham High Street, Lewisham SE13 8NB</td>
<td>550 Y Y</td>
<td>3-5, 7-12</td>
<td>Application form, Varies</td>
<td>For most services there is no charge but for some there is a small voluntary subscription</td>
<td>0208 900 6600</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@lewishampark.com">info@lewishampark.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Islamic Centre - Young Muslims Academy</td>
<td>290-295, Lewisham High Street, Lewisham SE13 8NB</td>
<td>550 Y Y</td>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>Application form, Varies</td>
<td>For most services there is no charge but for some there is a small voluntary subscription</td>
<td>0208 900 6600</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@lewishammicentre.com">info@lewishammicentre.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prince of Wales</td>
<td>400 Lewisham High Street SE13 6AD</td>
<td>550 Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Drop in</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0208 900 6622</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.smith@btinternet.com">mark.smith@btinternet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Park Baptist Church</td>
<td>Dobson Park Baptist Church, Brockley Grove, London SE4 1EB</td>
<td>600 Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>0208 947 4101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.smith@btinternet.com">mark.smith@btinternet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's Lewisham CE Primary School</td>
<td>Lewisham High Street SE13 8NH</td>
<td>610 Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>Students Only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0208 900 6622</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@stmarys.lewisham.sch.uk">admin@stmarys.lewisham.sch.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Community Sports CIC</td>
<td>Penge Project, Hillsfields College, SE4 1EA</td>
<td>740 Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>Fees and wear and tear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0208 4728416</td>
<td><a href="mailto:simonseawardports@yahoo.com">simonseawardports@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation name</td>
<td>Delivery address (where the activity takes place)</td>
<td>Delivery Postcode</td>
<td>Distances from London: B Youth Village</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth Theatre Arts</td>
<td>Princes Gardens, Wells College</td>
<td>SE8 1LE</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendergast Hillfields College</td>
<td>Hillfields, Adelaide Avenue</td>
<td>SE8 1LE</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth A.D.L. Lewisham</td>
<td>15-27 Greenford Road, Catford</td>
<td>SE13 8HQ</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Disability Association</td>
<td>2 Clapham Broadway</td>
<td>SE12 6SP</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catford Library</td>
<td>Catford Library, Lawrence House</td>
<td>SE12 8MJ</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Youth Theatre</td>
<td>The Broadway Theatre, Catford</td>
<td>SE12 8PU</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Park Library</td>
<td>375 Brooklands Rd, London</td>
<td>SE12 6AG</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ele Tonning You</td>
<td>38 Campbell Hill Road, Lewisham</td>
<td>SE13 8QT</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen Central, Lewisham</td>
<td>1st Floor, School, SE13 8NJ, 37-39, Lewisham High Street</td>
<td>SE13 8QW</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechfield Nursery Primary School</td>
<td>Beechfield Nursery, SE13 8SS</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Dunstan's College</td>
<td>St Dunstan's Road</td>
<td>SE13 8TV</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Family and Youth Link</td>
<td>3a St Andrew's Centre, SE13 8AT</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teddington Library</td>
<td>Teddington Library, SE13 8QA</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Library</td>
<td>20-21 Lewisham Library, SE13 6LG</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization name</td>
<td>Delivery address (where the activity takes place)</td>
<td>Delivery Postcode</td>
<td>Distance from Ledger at Youth Village</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Life Long</td>
<td>Mental Health &amp; Wellbeing</td>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Laurence's Community Centre</td>
<td>St. Laurence's Church, Breaking Road, Cardiff</td>
<td>SE8 2TS</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kildas Collieries</td>
<td>St. Kildas Church, Breaking Road, Colinton Park</td>
<td>SE2 3PL</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Cornwall South Shore Group</td>
<td>Holmwood School, Holmwood Road, Colinton Park</td>
<td>SE2 3LD</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>Holmwood Road, Colinton Park</td>
<td>SE2 3LD</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>St. Saviours Church, Breaking Road</td>
<td>SE2 3AL</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's North Shore Group</td>
<td>Church of St. John's North Shore, Breaking Road</td>
<td>SE2 3PN</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trackway 2010 CC</td>
<td>Millbrook Park, Millbrook Road</td>
<td>SE2 3AN</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaseheath Brown Primary School</td>
<td>Reaseheath Brown, Reaseheath, Shropshire</td>
<td>SE2 3SR</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Road Primary School</td>
<td>Beacon Road Primary School, Shropshire</td>
<td>SE3 1DB</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucknall Music Hub</td>
<td>Finneaport Yate College, Finneaport</td>
<td>SE2 3TB</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finneaport Yate College</td>
<td>Elms Street, Finneaport</td>
<td>SE2 3TB</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Youth Club</td>
<td>St. Saviours Church, Llwyd More Church, Llwyd</td>
<td>SE2 3PP</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Dar Adventure</td>
<td>Old Treherne Road</td>
<td>SE2 3LD</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Dar Youth Club</td>
<td>Old Treherne Road</td>
<td>SE2 3LD</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Peace Mission</td>
<td>Old Treherne Road</td>
<td>SE2 3LD</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation name</td>
<td>Delivery address [where the activity takes place]</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>Distance from Ladder Hill Youth Village</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>How do people access your service? [drop-in, referral etc. ]</td>
<td>Do you charge Young People to access the provision?</td>
<td>Phone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Scout Group</td>
<td>50 Tatham Road, Broxburn</td>
<td>EH54 1UD</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020 8463 9663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Mill Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Glass Mill Leisure Centre, 4 Loompht Yrk</td>
<td>SE1 7TF</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020 8463 9663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Crown Swimming Club</td>
<td>Glass Mill Leisure Centre, 4 Loompht Yrk</td>
<td>SE1 7TF</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020 8463 9663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon Drop-in Service</td>
<td>39 Lanslie Grove, Leighton</td>
<td>SE1 6BG</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020 8463 9663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Youth Work Survey</td>
<td>39 Lanslie Grove, Leighton</td>
<td>SE1 6BG</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020 8463 9663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation name</td>
<td>Delivery address where the activities take place</td>
<td>Delivery postcode</td>
<td>Distance from Rockingham Youth Club in Metres</td>
<td>Distance from Rockingham Youth Club in Miles</td>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>How do people access your service? Drop in, referral etc.</td>
<td>Do you charge Young People to access the provision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th Forest Hill Brownies</td>
<td>William of York Primary School, Bradley Park</td>
<td>SE23 1PS</td>
<td>024</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St William of York Catholic School</td>
<td>Bradley Park</td>
<td>SE23 1PS</td>
<td>024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Forest Hill Scout Group</td>
<td>66 St German’s Road, Forest Hill</td>
<td>SE23 1EV</td>
<td>059</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Youth Club</td>
<td>St Saviour’s Church Hall, 5 Leather Hill Bradenstoke Rise</td>
<td>SE23 1FZ</td>
<td>075</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Primary School</td>
<td>Thorpeness Avenue, Sydenham</td>
<td>SE26 4BU</td>
<td>938</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th Forest Hill Scout Group</td>
<td>Church Hall, Vancouver Road, Forest Hill</td>
<td>SE23 2DG</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham Secondary School</td>
<td>Dunmeath Road</td>
<td>SE26 4RD</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Hill School</td>
<td>Darkes Road</td>
<td>SE23 3HN</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Hill Sports Centre</td>
<td>Sports Hall, Forest Hill Secondary School, Brampton Road</td>
<td>SE23 3NN</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2Q</td>
<td>Sydenham Hill Estate</td>
<td>SE26 4HL</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillness Junior School</td>
<td>Bradley Rise</td>
<td>SE23 3HH</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bartholomew’s CE Primary School</td>
<td>The Park, Sydenham</td>
<td>SE26 4LJ</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathfern Primary School</td>
<td>Rathfern Road</td>
<td>SE26 4HL</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In His Presence Ministry</td>
<td>SI Turner Road, Sydenham</td>
<td>SE26 2ID</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewsState Group</td>
<td>SI Turner Road, Sydenham</td>
<td>SE26 2ID</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Church, London Cattedrall</td>
<td>Oakwood Road</td>
<td>SE26 4PS</td>
<td>2322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Grove Primary School</td>
<td>Kirkeby, Sydenham</td>
<td>SE26 4BB</td>
<td>2114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LifeWayz Therapeutic Education</td>
<td>Kelvin Grove Primary School, Kelvin Grove, Sydenham</td>
<td>SE26 4BB</td>
<td>2114</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Current PVI providers funded or contracted by the Youth Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total contract value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Project (1CP)</td>
<td>Community Project (Youth Link)</td>
<td>£44,153.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Lewisham South Scout Group</td>
<td>12th Lewisham South Scout Group</td>
<td>£1,795.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th South Deptford (St. Peter’s) Brownie Guide Pack</td>
<td>12th South Deptford (St. Peter’s) Brownie Guide Pack</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th Lewisham South (Holy Cross) Scout Group</td>
<td>14th Lewisham South (Holy Cross) Scout Group</td>
<td>£2,503.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd Deptford Scouts</td>
<td>Always Room For Another</td>
<td>£6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th South Deptford Brownies</td>
<td>6th South Deptford Brownies</td>
<td>£650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BelEve UK</td>
<td>The BEAM Programme</td>
<td>£15,997.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley and Downham Youth Club</td>
<td>Youth Work Provision</td>
<td>£71,513.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Lewisham</td>
<td>Juniors Young Carers Respite</td>
<td>£33,274.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevating Success UK</td>
<td>Grove Park Half-Term Holiday Programme</td>
<td>£19,412.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich &amp; Lewisham Young People’s Theatre</td>
<td>Lewisham Arts College</td>
<td>£52,466.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork London</td>
<td>ECO-BIZ</td>
<td>£14,930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart n Soul</td>
<td>Do Your Own Thing with The Squidz Club</td>
<td>£40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horniman Museum and Gardens</td>
<td>Horniman Youth Work Placements</td>
<td>£18,996.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham District Scout Council</td>
<td>Lewisham Scouts</td>
<td>£62,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Youth Theatre</td>
<td>Free Youth Theatre for Lewisham Young People aged 8 to 19</td>
<td>£7,505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Youth Theatre</td>
<td>The Step-Up Project</td>
<td>£5,230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Centre Ltd</td>
<td>LiVE (and Zest)</td>
<td>£26,146.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwall Community Trust</td>
<td>Premier League Kicks Extra</td>
<td>£41,381.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playback Studio</td>
<td>The Creative Workshops</td>
<td>£18,995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school Learning Alliance</td>
<td>FYG (Fun for Young people at Goldsmiths)</td>
<td>£53,866.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaggy Development Trust</td>
<td>The Wash House Youth Project (WHYP)</td>
<td>£9,918.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprezent</td>
<td>U Reprezent</td>
<td>£33,707.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLSB (Royal London Society for Blind People)</td>
<td>VIP Club</td>
<td>£22,434.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow-Camp</td>
<td>Snow-Camp</td>
<td>£20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SociaCapita Solutions CIC</td>
<td>The Ignite Project</td>
<td>£34,789.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread the Word</td>
<td>LiP (Lewisham in Poetry)</td>
<td>£17,574.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham Independent Scout Group</td>
<td>Weekly Meeting &amp; Adventurous Activities for Young Independent Scouts</td>
<td>£5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany</td>
<td>Albany Uncover Summer Arts</td>
<td>£63,108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midi Music Company</td>
<td>Beatz Family</td>
<td>£14,688.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Woodcraft Folk</td>
<td>Group Night and October Camp</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple Helix Training</td>
<td>Lee Green Youth Club</td>
<td>£44,810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Men</td>
<td>Lewisham NEET Young Fathers</td>
<td>£71,474.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Lewisham Project</td>
<td>Art and Edible Garden Project</td>
<td>£7,656.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Lewisham Project</td>
<td>Bicycle Maintenance Workshop</td>
<td>£8,421.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Equalities Analysis Assessment

Equalities Impact Assessment

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 characteristics. 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 £83m 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.*

---

5 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)
• It is therefore local authorities’ duty to secure, so far 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:

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.

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, number (6.7%) young people’s statuses were unknown in relation to education, employment or training. This is 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools action/ early</td>
<td>School action plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. Previous 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 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 MNP 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 60.7 FTE (89 people);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time equivalents (FTEs)</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>approx 66</td>
<td>Approx 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8. The breakdown of current staff in post according to protected characteristics is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities group</th>
<th>No. of staff</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Bangladeshi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British/Eng/Welsh/Scot/N.Irish</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Turkish / Turkish Cypriot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Potential Impact: Option 1

On young people

5.1. The impact of these proposals on young people is expected to be negative, as a result of decreased direct funding and, consequently, less provision and less reach.

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 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 any other provision would likely cease.

5.3. Given the need to make savings and the resultant leaner staffing structure, it is not believed that the Service would be as responsive to the needs of young people as it is currently. However, the Service would continue to open up opportunities available to young people in Lewisham and London. 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 continue to have a big say in how resources are allocated by feeding back what they need and want from youth provision, helping the council and providers to find services and activities that meet those 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 will 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 46.2 FTE (approximately 66 people). This equates to an estimated reduction of 10.5 FTE’s or 23 people. The exact breakdown of people and the effect against protected characteristics is not possible to calculate due to the high number of very 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 – achieve savings of £3.16 by reducing Service to statutory service only model

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 9.6 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: option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group affected</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Youth Services, Commissioners</td>
<td>Ongoing but with regards to commissioning timescales for commissioned services (April 2015 to September 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people with disabilities</td>
<td>Ensure that youth centres and activities are accessible for young people with disabilities. Ensure this is built into planning for an ELM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Youth Services, Commissioners, commissioned services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing but with regards to commissioning timescales for commissioned services (April 2015 to September 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group affected</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Youth Services, Comms team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPENDIX 20b – Report for saving Q2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young people’s engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Ensure this is built into planning for an ELM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>Youth Services, commissioned services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 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 |
### APPENDIX 20b – Report for saving Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition plan</th>
<th>Commissioning process</th>
<th>PVI providers</th>
<th>Youth Services, Commissioners, Procurement</th>
<th>November 2014 – April 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Youth Services, Commissioners</td>
<td>November 2014 – full handover of mutual c. 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

### 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.

### Staff & community members

- Youth Services, Commissioners

### November 2014 – ongoing
Reasons for lateness: The report is late because the Public Accounts Select Committee had not held its meeting before the agenda despatch date for the Mayor & Cabinet meeting.

Reasons for urgency: The report is urgent because the views of the Select Committees need to be considered alongside the report from officers on the 2015/16 budget.

1. Summary

1.1 This report informs the Mayor & Cabinet of the comments and views of the Public Accounts Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the officer report entitled 2015/16 Budget Report at the meeting on 5 February 2015.

2. Recommendation

2.1 Mayor & Cabinet is recommended to note the views of the Public Accounts Select Committee as set out in section 3 of this referral; the views of the other Select Committees as set out in the appendices to this referral; and the views of the two working groups, also set out in the appendices to this referral.

3. Public Accounts Select Committee views

3.1 On 5 February 2015, the Public Accounts Select Committee considered a report entitled 2015/16 Budget Report. The Committee resolved to advise Mayor and Cabinet of the following:

3.2 The Committee noted the referrals made by the Sustainable Development and Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committees (attached at Appendix A) and the final reports of the Public Health and Youth Service Working Groups (attached at Appendix B) and asked that the Mayor takes these referrals and reports into account alongside officer reports when taking a decision on the 2015/16 Budget Report. In relation to the final report of the Youth Service Working Group, the Committee noted that, at the meeting of the Children and Young People Select Committee held on 4 February 2015, it was recommended that, in relation to Recommendation 1 of the Working Group report, all councillors should be kept updated on progress, and not just the ward members for Ladywell and Perry Vale.

3.3 The Committee discussed and endorsed both the Working Group reports.
3.4 The Committee endorsed the Sustainable Development Select Committee referral and recommended that Mayor and Cabinet should take the concerns of the Sustainable Development Select Committee into consideration.

3.5 The Committee noted the Safer, Stronger Communities referral and, in relation to savings proposal Q1c: Blue Badge Administration Fee, asked for a definitive note to be drawn up and circulated on the costs of producing blue badges, including the costs of administering the scheme, before Mayor and Cabinet makes a decision on this matter.

3.6 The Committee would like Mayor and Cabinet to consider savings proposal L4: Broadway Theatre further, in light of the comments made by Members, including:
- Making more innovative bookings (which require less technical support and backstage facilities)
- Looking at external funding options
- Preserving the Pantomime season if possible
- Ensuring that BME productions will still have access to the theatre.

3.7 In relation to the “A” savings (smarter and deeper integration of social care and health) the Committee recommended that Mayor and Cabinet pay particular attention to the cumulative impact of the proposals and the method by which this will be addressed (individual service reviews for each user).

3.8 The Committee would like the Mayor to consider savings proposal Q1: Improving Triage for Children’s Social Care Services and Redesigning the Children’s Centre and Early Intervention Offer further; to ensure that vital early years services are not unnecessarily damaged.

3.9 The Committee recommends that the equalities impact in respect of savings proposal O1: End of the discretionary freedom pass scheme is particularly taken into account when making a decision on this proposal.

3.10 In relation to savings proposal B1: Reduction and remodelling of supporting people service, the Mayor is asked to consider the appendix 8b before making a decision on this proposal.

4. **Financial Implications**

4.1 Should the Committee’s referral result in the budget being changed, this may affect the amount of savings achieved, potentially resulting in a savings shortfall that would mean that alternative proposals would have to be identified and built into the budget planning process. However, as these decisions are ultimately for the Mayor (in recommending his budget), and then the Council, there are no direct or immediate financial implications arising from this report.

5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.
Background papers

2015/16 Budget Report - Meeting of the Public Accounts Select Committee, 5 February 2015.

http://tinyurl.com/lt6q7ef

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Charlotte Dale, Interim Overview and Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49534).
1. **Summary**

1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee on the Lewisham Future Programme – 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings report.

2. **Recommendation**

2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee as set out in this report.

3. **Sustainable Development Select Committee views**

3.1 On 20 January 2015, the Sustainable Development Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme. They considered four Budget Savings proposals that had been referred back to the Committee after its meeting on 29 October 2014. The four Budget Savings were as follows:

- E1: Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration & Asset Management division
- H1: Restructuring of enforcement & regulatory services
- N1: Reorganise environmental services, close and cease to maintain a number of small parks
- N2: Street sweeping

3.2 The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:

**N1: Reorganise environmental services, close and cease to maintain a number of small parks**

a) If the borough’s parks are not properly maintained there might be a reduction in play-space.
b) The risks associated with alternative management options should be considered as part of the consultation.
c) The results of the consultation should be presented to the Select Committee for further scrutiny.
d) The consultation should be communicated more widely across the borough. Furthermore, there needs to be broader public engagement, beyond the proposed user groups.

Therefore, the Select Committee recommends that:

a) The consultation on N1 should be considered by all Local Assemblies, to increase public engagement.

b) The results of the consultation on N1, plus any proposals derived from the consultation, must be presented to the Select Committee for consideration and scrutiny.

c) There should be no closure of any of the borough’s parks.

N2: Street sweeping

a) An improvement in enforcement in areas such as trade waste could increase revenue for the Council, and lessen the need for budget savings in future years.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 Should the Committee’s referral result in the budget being changed, this may affect the amount of savings achieved, potentially resulting in a savings shortfall that would mean that alternative proposals would have to be identified and built into the budget planning process. However, as these decisions are ultimately for the Mayor (in recommending his budget), and then the Council, there are no direct or immediate financial implications arising from this report.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

Background papers

Lewisham Future Programme – 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings – Officer Report to the Select Committees (October and November 2014)

http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s31821/03LFP201516RevenueBudgetSavings30102014.pdf

Sustainable Development Select Committee – Agenda of 20 January 2015

http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=136&MId=3447&Ver=4

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Roger Raymond, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49976).
1. Summary

1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the budget savings report, considered at its meeting on 3 February 2015.

2. Recommendation

2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Select Committee as set out in this report.

3. Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee views

3.2 On 2 February 2015, the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme – budget savings report (2015/16) The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:

3.3 The Committee recommends that the Public Accounts Committee reconsider savings proposal G1c: Blue Badge Administration Fee, with a view to finding an outcome that is cost neutral. The Committee notes the cost of each Blue Badge (£4.60, excluding the cost of administrating the scheme) and the proposed charge being put forward (£10). The Committee does not believe that the Council should generate income from the implementation of this proposal.

3.4 The Committee endorses the recommendation of the Overview & Scrutiny Business Panel for the Public Accounts Committee to consider the two new savings proposals - L3: Community Development budgets and L4: Broadway theatre.

3.5 The Committee also recommends that the Public Accounts Committee consider the overall equalities implications of the savings proposals.

5. Financial implications

4.1 Should the Committee’s referral result in the budget being changed, this may affect the amount of savings achieved, potentially resulting in a saving shortfall that would mean that alternative proposals would have to be identified and built into the budget planning process. However, as these decisions are ultimately for the Mayor (in recommending his budget), and then the Council, there are no direct or immediate
financial implications arising from the implementation of the recommendations in this report.

5. **Legal implications**

5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

6. **Further implications**

6.1 At this stage there are no specific environmental, equalities or crime and disorder implications to consider. However, there may be implications arising from the implementation of the Committee’s recommendations.

**Background papers**

Lewisham Future Programme report ([http://tinyurl.com/lbaqbkj](http://tinyurl.com/lbaqbkj)) considered at Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee on 3 February 2015

If you have any queries about this report, please contact Timothy Andrew, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 47916)
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Chair’s Introduction

The transfer of responsibility for public health to local councils in 2013 was an opportunity for all council services to work more closely to reduce the health inequalities which affect too many of our residents. The budget allocated to public health (around £20 million) is ring-fenced until 2016 and can only be spent on services which have clear public health outcomes. The allocation of public health funding to support free swimming for over 60s and under 16s began the process of using a less restrictive interpretation of how outcomes may be achieved and we look forward to further imaginative initiatives in the future.

The Working Group wanted to be sure that even before any reinvestment was considered that the proposed savings were fully scrutinised. In our two meetings we were able to benefit from the contributions of the Director of Public Health and his team, the Executive Director for Community Services and her staff, the Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group who provided their comments on the proposed savings and mitigations and the Co-Chief Executive of Lewisham Citizens Advice Bureau and we appreciate the time they gave us.

We hope that the Health and Wellbeing Board, the Safer Stronger Select Committee and the Healthier Communities Select Committee will take note of the recommendations we make in relation to them.

Lewisham’s motto, Salus populi suprema lex, could not be more appropriate, the health of the people is the highest law.

Councillor Stella Jeffrey
Chair of the Public Health Working Group
Executive summary

The Lewisham Future Programme is the Council’s approach to making the transformational changes necessary to reposition itself strongly for the future, whilst living within the financial resources at its disposal. The savings proposals relating to public health that have been put forward as part of this programme, are cross-cutting and significant, and it was agreed by Council that a working group should be set up to look at these proposals in more depth.

The working group has examined the proposals in detail and the impact that they might have on service improvement; health protection; and health improvement.

In relation to this, the Working Group is particularly concerned that the achievement of UNICEF/WHO baby friendly status in 2015 might be put at risk by the renegotiation of contracts relating to breastfeeding cafes; and feels that the steps that will be taken to avoid this must be clearly set out. The impact of the reduction in funding on Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) organisations also needs to be monitored.

It is clear that further scrutiny on the impact of the proposals is required, and in particular, on the options for reinvesting the savings made in other activities with positive public health outcomes. It is for this reason that many of the working group’s recommendations involve suggestions for further member involvement.

Specifically, the working group expects the Healthier Communities Select Committee, which has the statutory responsibility under the Health & Social Care Act 2012 to consider significant changes in provision by relevant health bodies, including the Council itself in relation to public health services, to be kept abreast of any ongoing work in this area.
Recommendations

The Committee would like to make the following recommendations:

Public Health at Lewisham

1. The Working Group notes that the staffing arrangements in Public Health are due to be reviewed with a restructure effective from April 2015. The Working Group would like the Healthier Communities Select Committee to be updated on the new staffing structure once this is in place.

Mitigation

2. The Working Group supports the concerns raised by the Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group that the achievement of UNICEF/WHO baby friendly status in 2015 might be put at risk by the renegotiation of contracts relating to breastfeeding cafes. Mayor and Cabinet should be provided with a list of the steps that will be taken by officers to ensure that this does not happen.

3. The integration of services via the neighbourhood model is crucial to achieving the required savings and further integration is clearly required. The Healthier Communities Select Committee should continue to receive updates on the integration programme including information on the savings being achieved via the programme.

4. The Health and Wellbeing Board will need to satisfy itself that the approach being taken in relation to the neighbourhood model involves a high degree of risk management and continuous review.

5. The impact of the reduction in funding on VCS organisations needs to be monitored and it is suggested that the Safer Stronger Select Committee reviews this at the end of September 2015.

Reinvesting savings

6. The Healthier Communities Select Committee should have the opportunity to comment on and scrutinise the proposed use of the savings resulting from the implementation of the 2015/16 public health savings proposals. A full breakdown of the use of the savings resulting from the proposals should be provided to the Healthier Communities Select Committee once this has been agreed.
Purpose and structure of review

1. As part of the Council’s 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings, two savings proposals relating to public health were put forward. These were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 29 September 2014 and each of the Select Committees in October and early November, before being submitted to Mayor and Cabinet on 12 November 2014. The Mayor then authorised officers to carry out the required public/stakeholder/ staff consultation in relation to the proposals.

2. The Overview & Scrutiny Business Panel requested that a working group on public health be established, as the public health changes being proposed might have an impact across the whole council and the panel wanted the group to consider, in particular, whether any alternative application of public health funding would fulfil public health outcomes.

3. At its meeting on 26 November 2014, Council agreed to set up a time limited Public Health Working Group to operate until the end of February 2015 to consider the proposals to change public health services being proposed as part of the Council’s budget process for 2015/16.

Terms of Reference

4. It is acknowledged that the Healthier Communities Select Committee has the statutory responsibility under the Health & Social Care Act 2012 in relation to significant changes in provision by relevant health bodies (including the Council itself in relation to public health services). It is also acknowledged that it is the Healthier Communities Select Committee which has the duty to review and scrutinise health service matters by virtue of regulations made under Section 244 NHS Act 2006. The establishment of the Public Health Working Group was not intended to detract from the statutory or other remit of the Healthier Communities Select Committee in any way. Rather it was intended to make a contribution to the Council’s debate about the future of public health services in Lewisham.

5. The terms of reference agreed for the working group were:

"Without prejudice to the remit of the Healthier Communities Select Committee, to consider any proposals to change public health services being proposed as part of the Council’s budget process for 2015/16. To make any comments it considers appropriate about those proposals to the Council’s Public Accounts Committee (PAC) prior to any submissions PAC may decide to make to the Mayor in February 2015 in relation to budget proposals for 2015/16. The Working Group will consist of 6 members (7 if the councillor outside the majority party wishes to sit on the Group) and will cease to exist at the end of February 2015”.

Scope

6. The working group had two formal meetings to consider the following:

First meeting (15 December 2014)
(1) Receiving a written report providing information on:
The context:
(i) The Council’s public health responsibilities
(ii) The nature of the ring-fenced budget
(iii) How public health is structured at Lewisham in terms of staffing (structure and reporting lines) and governance (the role of the Healthier Communities Select Committee, the Health and Wellbeing Board etc.) and how this compares to other local authorities.

The proposals:
(i) The savings being proposed (including any alternative services that exist/will be put in place to replace reduced or stopped services)
(ii) Options for redirecting the savings made to other activities with a public health outcome.

(2) Questioning officers on the written report.

Second meeting (13 January 2015)
To consider and agree a final report presenting all the evidence taken and to agree recommendations for submission to the Public Accounts Select Committee on 5 February 2015 (and on to Mayor & Cabinet on 11 February 2015).

7. Informal work took place between the two formal meetings to ensure that the working group collated all the evidence it needed for this report. The working group also received the results of the consultation with Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group on the savings proposals, attached at Appendix C.
The context

The Council’s public health responsibilities

8. The 2012 Health and Social Care Act provided the legal basis for the transfer of public health functions from the NHS to local authorities. On 1 April 2013 the Council assumed responsibility for the provision of most public health functions, with the remaining functions provided by Public Health England and NHS England.

9. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 places a duty on local authorities and their partner clinical commissioning groups to prepare and publish joint health and wellbeing strategies to meet needs identified in their joint strategic needs assessments (JSNAs).

10. In line with the Health and Social Care Act, the Council has three overarching responsibilities in relation to public health¹:

   1) To deliver its statutory duties to take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of people in its area, and to plan for and respond to emergencies involving a risk to public health.

   2) To deliver the key public health outcomes in the National Public Health Outcomes Framework.

   3) To deliver a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (providing officers and elected members with appropriate advice, based on a rigorous appreciation of patterns of local health need, what works and potential for improving health) and a Health & Wellbeing Strategy for the borough.

11. These overarching functions encompass the three domains of public health: service improvement; health protection; and health improvement.

12. The Council is mandated to provide public health commissioning advice based on quality population-level analysis of health data and needs assessment at no cost to the Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group. Official Department of Health guidance on the proportion of time and resource spent by Local Authorities on public health commissioning advice for the CCG is around 40% of the specialist public health function.

13. The key elements of public health advice and support to clinical commissioners includes: assessing needs and strategic planning; reviewing service provision; deciding priorities; service re-design and planning; managing performance; supporting patient choice and seeking public and patient views; and maintaining workforce expertise.

¹ Public Health in Local Government: The new public health role of local authorities, DH 2012
Health protection

14. The Council, and the Director of Public Health (DPH) acting on its behalf, has a mandatory duty to protect the health of the population, both in terms of helping to prevent threats arising and in ensuring appropriate responses when things go wrong. The Council needs to have available the appropriate specialist health protection skills to carry out these functions.

15. The Council, through the DPH, has a duty to ensure plans are in place to protect the population including screening and immunisation. It provides assurance and challenge regarding the plans of NHS England, Public Health England and providers. The DPH needs to assure the council that the combined plans of all these organisations, when delivered in Lewisham, will deliver effective screening and immunisation programmes to the population. There are a large number of screening and immunisation programmes including: cervical, bowel and breast cancer screening; ante natal and neo-natal screening; abdominal aortic aneurysm screening; routine immunisation of children and influenza immunization; and diabetic retinopathy screening.

Health Improvement

16. The Council has specific responsibilities, supported by its ring fenced public health grant (see next section), for commissioning public health services and initiatives. Some of these functions are mandatory and the Council is obliged to deliver the defined function, others are discretionary and the Council can determine the level of provision, guided by the Public Health Outcomes Framework, the local joint strategic needs assessment and the joint health and wellbeing strategy. These responsibilities are:

Mandatory commissioning responsibilities:

- National Child Measurement Programme
- NHS Health Check assessments
- Comprehensive sexual health services (including testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, contraception outside of the GP contract and sexual health promotion and disease prevention)

Locally determined commissioning responsibilities:

- Tobacco control and smoking cessation services
- Alcohol and drug misuse services
- Public health services for children and young people aged 5-19 (in longer term all public health services for children and young people)
- Interventions to tackle obesity such as community lifestyle and weight management services
- Locally-led nutrition initiatives
- Increasing levels of physical activity in the local population
- Public mental health services

---

2 Public Health in Local Government: Commissioning responsibilities, DH 2012
• Dental public health services
• Accident injury prevention
• Local initiatives on workplace health
• Local initiatives to reduce excess deaths as a result of seasonal mortality
• Population level interventions to reduce and prevent birth defects
• Behavioural and lifestyle campaigns to prevent cancer and long-term conditions
• Supporting, reviewing and challenging delivery of key public health funded and NHS delivered services such as immunisation and screening programmes
• Local authority role in dealing with health protection incidents, outbreaks and emergencies
• Public health aspects of promotion of community safety, violence prevention and response
• Public health aspects of local initiatives to tackle social exclusion
• Local initiatives that reduce public health impacts of environmental risks

17. Information on the impact of the Council’s public health activity since responsibility moved to the local authority in April 2013 can be found at Appendix A.

The Public Health Budget

18. The public health budget is ring fenced until at least the end of 2015/2016. 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. A copy of the latest statement was provided to the working group following its meeting on 15 December 2014.

19. The following chart itemises budget allocations against each programme area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>2014/15 Budget Allocation</th>
<th>Spend Commitments 2014/15*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Health Services: STI Testing &amp; Treatment</td>
<td>2,753,834</td>
<td>2,728,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Health Services: Contraception</td>
<td>3,902,467</td>
<td>3,933,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Health Services: Advice, Prevention &amp; Promotion (including HIV prevention)</td>
<td>480,500</td>
<td>480,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Health Check Programme</td>
<td>558,200</td>
<td>522,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Protection</td>
<td>288,586</td>
<td>259,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Child Measurement Programme</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>543,500</td>
<td>490,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promoting Healthy Weight &amp; Obesity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Physical Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obesity: Adults</td>
<td>297,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obesity: Children</td>
<td>504,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Activity: Adults</td>
<td>370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Activity: Children</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAAT-Adults Substance Misuse Service</td>
<td>3,580,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAAT-Alcohol Service</td>
<td>419,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAAT-Young Persons Substance Misuse</td>
<td>232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAAT-Drug Intervention Programme</td>
<td>369,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAAT-Adult Rehab Placements</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop Smoking Service</td>
<td>706,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoking and Tobacco: Wider Tobacco</td>
<td>226,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control, including prevention of uptake,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tackling illegal sales and smoke free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>homes</td>
<td>116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children 5-19 PH Programmes</td>
<td>150,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Public Health Services:</td>
<td>822,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£104,200, Prescribing Costs £718,000,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Public Health Services - Reducing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Inequalities &amp; Addressing Wider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determinants of Health:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Based Initiatives - £90,000,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Services - £15,375,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham Refugee &amp; Migrant Network -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£21,500,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federation of Refugees from Vietnam in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham - £29,000,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Health Improvement Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- £1,065,941,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Lewisham Plan - £99,000;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warm Homes - £75,000;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Assessments for Housing Eligibility - £28,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money Advice (Citizens Advice Bureau)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- £148,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The expenditure is less than the budget due to efficiency savings being implemented in some areas within year 2014/15.*
Public Health at Lewisham

20. The current staffing structure of the Council’s public health department, including vacant posts, is shown in Appendix B. The total staff employed currently is 28, equating to 24.4 whole time equivalents. The total staff budget is £1.475m, but because of staff vacancies and secondments forecast expenditure for 2014/15 is £1,300,278. At its meeting on 15 December 2014, the working group considered the structure chart for the public health department, noting that the DPH worked for 2.5 days a week and line managed 13 people, something that would change post a restructure effective from April 2015. A restructure was thought necessary as it was clear that the role of the public health workforce within local government was continuing to evolve as councils’ understanding of their new responsibilities matured and as they become more adept at incorporating public health into the full range of their activities and commissioned services. Therefore the current staffing arrangement and functional responsibilities would be reviewed as part of a wider review of council arrangements.

21. In line with most other London boroughs, the DPH at Lewisham is line managed by the Executive Director for Community Services. He also has a ‘dotted line’ to the Chief Executive and Mayor in view of his advisory responsibilities. The reporting arrangements for public health in Lewisham reflect the most common arrangement across London boroughs. This in turn reflects the London-wide integration programme which is bringing synergies between acute health providers, community and primary care based services, adult social care and public health. It is usually the equivalent of the Community Services Directorate which carries the local authority role for liaison with health. However, nationally some local authorities have adopted alternative models, with the DPH reporting directly to the Chief Executive, or the DPH role being combined with other council responsibilities such as environmental health (e.g. Halton Borough Council), housing, and joint commissioning of health and social care services (e.g. West Sussex County Council).

22. In relation to the role that public health specialists play in discharging a council’s public health responsibilities, a few London councils have moved towards a model in which public health professionals provide an ‘expert-led’ advisory service with public health commissioning undertaken elsewhere (e.g. Lambeth and Newham). However, the majority have maintained or are increasing the commissioning remit of their public health specialist workforce. In Lewisham public health strategic commissioning is discharged by the appropriate commissioning unit, but overseen by the public health service.

23. The DPH manages the public health department and has budget management responsibilities for the ring fenced grant with the exception of the drugs and alcohol budget, which is managed by the head of crime reduction and supporting people. The current DPH works for 2.5 days a week as he is seconded half time to King’s College London Department of Primary Care and Public Health Sciences and to the School of Medical Education.
24. In addition to the DPH (0.5 WTE\(^3\)), there are 3.3 WTE Consultants in Public Health in the Public Health Division Senior Management Team. The Faculty of Public Health previously recommended an average consultant in public health complement of 4.3 WTE for a population of 270,000, with greater capacity for populations with greater health need such as Lewisham's. It was noted by the Working Group that, to assure themselves of the continuing competence of their Consultants in Public Health, local authorities should ensure that they are registered with the GMC or the UK Public Health Register; undertake a continuing professional development programme that meets the requirements of the Faculty of Public Health; maintain a programme of personal professional development to ensure competence in professional delivery; and undertake appropriate annual professional appraisal in order to ensure revalidation and fitness to practise.

25. The Consultants in Public Health have responsibility for key portfolios including Children and Young People, Sexual Health, Health Protection, Tobacco Control, Mental Health, Cardiovascular Disease, Cancer and Health Intelligence. They have also been given a lead responsibility for liaising with the four Council Directorates (Resources and Regeneration, Customer Services, Children and Young People and Community Services), and for providing public health advice to the Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The working group observed that a number of senior public health officers did not have line management responsibilities but were specialists managing specialist programmes of work.

**Recommendation 1:** The Working Group notes that the staffing arrangements in Public Health are due to be reviewed with a restructure effective from April 2015. The Working Group would like the Healthier Communities Select Committee to be updated on the new staffing structure once this is in place.

\(^3\) Whole Time Equivalent.
Findings

The Savings Proposals:

26. Lewisham Council has to make savings of £85m over the next 3 years. The public health budget is ring fenced until at least the end of 2015/2016. Where savings have been identified from the current ring fenced public health budget these will be used to support public health outcomes in other areas of the Council. The working group was informed that the guiding principle for the reinvestment would be to support areas where reductions in council spend would have an adverse impact on public health outcomes.

27. The approach to identifying savings has been:

1) To identify any duplication with aspects of other council roles which can therefore be combined or streamlined.

2) To identify any service which should more appropriately be carried out by other health partners.

3) To stop providing service level agreements or incentive payments to individual GP practices and develop those services more efficiently and equitably across the four GP neighbourhood clusters where appropriate.

4) To gain greater efficiency through contract pricing where applicable.

5) To integrate public health grants to the voluntary sector into the Council’s mainstream grant aid programme.

28. The working group was informed that the Public Health programmes which transferred to Lewisham Council in April 2013 had all been reviewed. The review identified an initial £1.5M of savings which could be delivered largely through efficiencies and using the uplift applied to the public health budget in 2014/15. A further disinvestment of £1.15M was also identified, although it was acknowledged that this was likely to have some negative impact unless the service delivery models were re-configured; subsequent savings identified in provider overheads and on costs; and there was a commitment from schools to both engage in health improvement programmes and contribute financially.

29. At its meeting held on 15 December 2014, the working group was informed by the Executive Director for Community Services that the first set of proposals (£1.5m) would have a minimal impact on outcomes; and whilst the second set of proposals (£1.15m) might have a more significant impact, this would be mitigated by a reconfiguration of services at a neighbourhood level, in alignment with the development of integrated services.

30. The programmes where savings 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.

31. The savings proposals are presented in the table below. The working group noted that the Council, as the commissioner of these services, would work closely with the provider of services on planned service re-configuration, in order to mitigate the impact of any service changes, maximise the efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery and to optimise value for money.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Programme Area</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Saving</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Service re-design where applicable</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sexual Health               | £7,158,727   | £321,600     | 1. Re-negotiation of costs for sexually transmitted infection testing with LGT in 2015/16, including application of a standard 1.5% deflator to the contract value as an efficiency saving, and inclusion of laboratory costs in the overall contract (£275.6k).  
2. Reduce sex and relationships (SRE) funding and develop a health improvement package that schools can purchase that includes SRE co-ordinated and supported by school nursing (£20k)  
3. Remove incentive funding for chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening in GP practices (£26k) | In the short to medium term the development of a neighbourhood model of sexual health provision will lead to improved services.  
In the longer term a London wide sexual health transformation programme is being developed in partnership with 20 boroughs, which is expected to deliver greater benefit at reduced costs. | The risk would be that LGT cannot deliver the same level of service within reduced funding, and GPs disengage with sexual health.  
Mitigation includes work with primary care to deliver sexual health services in pharmacy & GP practices, and free training given to GPs and practice nurses.  
The risk is that SRE is not delivered in schools.  
Mitigation includes developing a health improvement package that schools can purchase that includes SRE, and work with school nursing to support schools to provide quality SRE. |
| NHS Health checks           | £551,300     | £157,800     | 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  
5. Reduction in funding available to support IT infrastructure for NHS Health checks | An essential component of the NHS Healthchecks programme is delivered through the Community Health Improvement Service.  
See proposed re-commissioning and service re-design under ‘health inequalities’ | Missed opportunity to prevent diabetes and for early diagnosis of diabetes.  
IT system not able to deliver requirements of the programme.  
Future plans to align commissioning of NHS Health Checks with Neighbourhoods will help to optimise the efficiency and |
The effectiveness of resources and may identify more people at risk earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Protection</th>
<th>£35,300</th>
<th>£12,500</th>
<th>Stop sending the recall letter for childhood immunisations (as this is already done via GPs)</th>
<th>Minimal as impact of letter on uptake appears to be low. Uptake of childhood immunisations continues to be monitored.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Advice to CCG</td>
<td>£79,200</td>
<td>£19,200</td>
<td>Decommissioning diabetes and cancer GP champion posts.</td>
<td>These posts will be commissioned by the CCG in future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obesity/ physical activity | £650,000 | £173,400 | 1. Decommission Hoops4health (£27,400)  
2. Changing delivery of Let’s Get Moving GP & Community physical activity training (£5,000)  
3. Decommissioning Physical Activity in Primary Schools (£50,000)  
4. Reduce funding for community development nutritionist (£30k)  
5. Remove funding for obesity/ healthy eating resources (£10k)  
6. Withdraw of funding for clinical support to Downham Nutritional Project (£9k)  
7. Efficiency savings from child weight management programmes. (£12k)  
8. Reduce physical activity for health checks programme (£20k) | There is a risk of reduction of physical activity in schools. Mitigation includes Schools being encouraged to use their physical activity premium to continue programmes selected from a recommended menu of evidence based activities. The risk is a reduction in support to voluntary sector healthy eating and nutrition programmes. Mitigation includes organisations being encouraged to build delivery into their mainstream funding programme. |
<p>| Dental public health | £64,500 | £44,500 | Release funding from dental public health programmes | Dental public health services commissioned by NHS England | Sufficient resource retained to assure dental infection control function. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>£93,400</td>
<td>£59,200</td>
<td>1. Withdraw funding for clinical input to Sydenham Gardens.</td>
<td>The risk is that Sydenham Gardens is unable to sustain clinical input from grant funding, but it is agreed to direct them to alternative funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reduce funding available for mental health promotion and wellbeing initiatives (including training).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The risk is a reduction in mental health awareness training across the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation includes pooling resources with neighbouring boroughs for delivery of training, and work closely with voluntary sector and SLAM to deliver mental health awareness training and campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Improvement Training</td>
<td>£88,000</td>
<td>£58,000</td>
<td>1. Decommission Health Promotion library service.</td>
<td>The risk is reduced capacity to develop a workforce across partner organisations which contributes to public health outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Limit health improvement training offer to those areas which support mandatory public health services.</td>
<td>Mitigation includes working with CEL to develop new models of delivery for essential public health training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health inequalities</td>
<td>£1,460,019</td>
<td>£581,500</td>
<td>1. Reconfiguring LRMN Health Access services to deliver efficiencies (£21,500)</td>
<td>The risk is reduced capacity across the system to tackle health inequalities, and a reduction in service for the most vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Remove separate public health funding stream to VAL (£28,000)</td>
<td>Mitigation includes working with the Adult integrated Care Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Decommissioning FORVIL Vietnamese Health Project (£29,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking and Tobacco Control</td>
<td>£860,300</td>
<td>£348,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce contract value for stop smoking service at LGT by £250k (30%)</td>
<td>Well London) with the health and social care activities currently being developed in these neighbourhoods by the Community Connections team, District Nurses, Community Health Improvement Service, Social Workers and GPs. There is also a plan to develop a stronger partnership working with Registered Social Landlords as well as any local regeneration projects in each of these neighbourhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stop most schools and young people’s tobacco awareness programmes</td>
<td>to deliver a neighbourhood model for health inequalities work, and develop local capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decommission work to stop illegal sales</td>
<td>It is anticipated that basing these services directly in the community and with greater integration will accommodate the funding reduction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smoking and Tobacco Control</strong></td>
<td><strong>£860,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>£348,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Reducing funding for Area Based Programmes (£40,000)
5. Decommissioning CAB Money Advice in 12 GP surgeries (£148,000)
6. Reduce the contract value for community health improvement service with LGT by limiting service to support mandatory Public Health programmes such as NHS Health Checks only and reduce other health inequalities activity. (£270k)
7. Further reduce funding for area based public health initiatives which are focused on geographical areas of poor health with in the borough. (£20k)
8. Reduce funding for ‘warm homes’ (£25k)

Voluntary organisations will have an opportunity to continue some of this work in a different way through the grant aid programme.

There are proposals to re-configure the stop smoking service as part of the neighbourhood developments described under ‘health inequalities’ above.

There is a risk of a reduction in number of people able to access stop smoking support and an increase in young people starting smoking if services are not – reconfigured appropriately.

Mitigation includes optimising efficiencies in the delivery of the SSS and reducing the length of time smokers are supported from 12 to 6 weeks to release capacity. Schools will be able to fund some of the peer education non-smoking programmes as part of the menu of
programmes. The restructuring of enforcement services is likely to allow tackling illegal sales of tobacco in a more integrated way with the same outcomes and prevent young people having access to illegal tobacco.

Maternal and child health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£187,677</th>
<th>£68,400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Reducing sessional funding commitment for Designated Consultant for Child Death Review
2. Reduce capacity for child death review process by reducing sessional commitment of child death liaison nurse.
3. Removal of budget for school nursing input into TNG
4. Reduce capacity/funding for breast feeding peer support programme & breast feeding cafes.

There may be less opportunity to learn from and improve services for families which have been bereaved, but this is not the purpose of the panel and there will be no impact on prevention of child deaths.

The school nursing service received grant funding of £250k in 2014/15 which has not been reduced, and the service will be able to accommodate input into TNG.

There is a risk that women will be less well supported to breast feed and Lewisham may not achieve UNICEF/WHO Baby Friendly status in 2015.

Mitigation will include re-negotiating support through the maternity services contract, although this may not be achievable in time for 2015 contracts. Baby café licences may be re-negotiated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department efficiencies</th>
<th>£262,200</th>
<th>To be identified through a staff restructure in 2015. At this point public health staff terms and conditions and pay scales are to be harmonised with council staff terms and conditions and pay scales.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015 Uplift (uncommitted)</td>
<td>£547,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£14,995,000</td>
<td>£2,653,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation

32. One of the aims of the working group in relation to the savings being proposed, was to consider any alternative services that existed or would be put in place to replace reduced or stopped services. The working group considered the table above and the column listing the risks and mitigation associated with each element of the savings proposals. In response to questions from Members of the group, the following points were noted:

- Savings proposals relating to breastfeeding services had the potential to affect the achievement of UNICEF/WHO baby friendly status in 2015, so steps would be taken to ensure the renegotiation of contracts relating to breastfeeding cafes would not jeopardise the Council’s chances of achieving the status.

- The new neighbourhood model was largely in place in terms of management infrastructure, although geographic co-location was still to be achieved. Further integration was also required in terms of integrating more services and extending networks (with mental health, the voluntary and community sector, pharmacies etc.). However, the Community Connections programme was now firmly established in the neighbourhoods.

- South East London had chosen to retain infection control nurses rather than devolve the relevant budgets to NHS England and this had given the boroughs an advantage in terms of ensuring adequate health protection activity.

- In terms of work with specific communities, such communities would now only receive specific targeted interventions if there was clinical need (e.g. if a particular illness was prevalent in a certain community); and that in terms of access to services, a broader picture would be considered and efforts made to ensure everyone had access to services.

Recommendation 2: The Working Group supports the concerns raised by the Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group that the achievement of UNICEF/WHO baby friendly status in 2015 might be put at risk by the renegotiation of contracts relating to breastfeeding cafes. Mayor and Cabinet should be provided with a list of the steps that will be taken by officers to ensure that this does not happen.

Recommendation 3: The integration of services via the neighbourhood model is crucial to achieving the required savings and further integration is clearly required. The Healthier Communities Select Committee should continue to receive updates on the integration programme including information on the savings being achieved via the programme.
Recommendation 4: The Health and Wellbeing Board will need to satisfy itself that the approach being taken in relation to the neighbourhood model involves a high degree of risk management and continuous review.

33. The working group was reassured to hear that the impact of a cut in funding of 50% to the national HIV prevention programme in England would not be that significant in Lewisham as the borough had never relied on the national programme but had done a lot of locally based work. However, it was accepted that late diagnosis was an issue in the borough and officers were working with Lewisham CCG to address this within the existing budget. A further area for improvement was the local sexual health clinics. Financing improvement was difficult because central Genito-Urinary Medicine (GUM) services (that were more expensive than local services) were taking a lot of the available budget by re-charging the borough for working with Lewisham patients. However, officers were trying to drive down costs, working at a London level.

34. Rachel Braverman, the Co-Chief Executive of Lewisham Citizens Advice Bureau addressed the working group at its meeting on 15 December 2014. She made the point that advisory services had a huge impact and were income-generating and that, in short, cuts here would not deliver required savings. She also spoke of the links between debt and mental health and how good debt advice would reduce health expenditure. The Executive Director for Community Services made the following points in response:

- The importance of the advice sector was recognised, the borough funded the advice sector very heavily and the main grants programme had a specific strand relating to advice and information.

- Lewisham Citizens Advice Bureau was providing advice in 12 GP surgeries and the intention was to provide access to advice for vulnerable people, via referrals, at every surgery via the neighbourhood model.

- A health and social care information and advice website was being developed to ensure compliance with the Care Act and it was expected that the voluntary and community sector would contribute content to this.

- Library staff would be providing non-specialist advice from next year.

- Specialist debt advice would be commissioned.

35. The working group considered whether a one off transitional fund might help advice organisations manage the reduction in funding and identify alternative sources of funding.

36. At the meeting held on 13 January 2015, the Working Group was informed that the Grant Aid programme would not be administered until July 2015 and that organisations would be told by the end of March 2015 what the new level
of funding was and what the expectations attached to it were, so they had, in effect, three months of transitional funding.

**Recommendation 5:** The impact of the reduction in funding on VCS organisations needs to be monitored and it is suggested that the Safer Stronger Select Committee reviews this at the end of September 2015.

### Measuring impact

37. The working group was keen to consider how the impact of services could be measured to help it assess the impact of the cuts and the impact that alternative service provision might have. The DPH outlined the difficulties in quantifying benefits and reported that academic research indicated that the most sensible way of measuring the success of services was probably to list the different types of benefits they brought in words (and numbers where possible), compare these to the costs and make a value judgement. It was noted that in the case of the savings proposals that had been put forward, officers had made a value judgement about the benefits provided by the services under consideration for savings, versus their costs. It was accepted that, ideally, the options for spending the money saved would be considered at the same time but it was noted that this would not be done until the summer of 2015. However, the assumption was that the new areas of spend would produce the same level, or increased, public health benefits and there was every indication that using the money to reduce the level of required cuts next year would produce increased public health benefits.

### Reinvesting savings

38. One of the aims of the working group was to consider options for redirecting the savings that would result from the proposals to other activities with a public health outcome. However, as specific options would not be considered until the summer of 2015, scrutiny of the options for spending any savings made could not yet take place. The working group noted that the savings resulting from the proposals would be put towards next years’ savings requirement and used to maintain activity in areas where cuts were proposed, where the activity had a positive public health outcome. It was further noted that, in addition to using the funding to mitigate 2016/17 savings proposals, the savings could be used, if appropriate, to assist with any 2015/16 savings proposals that were not delivered. However, any re-allocation in other areas of council spend must have an equal or greater public health impact.

39. The working group considered which areas of council spend might benefit from the re-allocation and the following areas were mentioned: Supporting People; housing and environmental services. The DPH commented that scrutiny could assist in the prioritisation process and in helping him come to an assessment about the cost effectiveness of budget spend for the annual submission to Public Health England.
**Recommendation 6:** The Healthier Communities Select Committee should have the opportunity to comment on and scrutinise the proposed use of the savings resulting from the implementation of the 2015/16 public health savings proposals. A full breakdown of the use of the savings resulting from the proposals should be provided to the Healthier Communities Select Committee once this has been agreed.
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Appendix A: The impact of public health activity

1. A dynamic Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), supported by a Public Health data portal, has been developed and is accessible online (www.lewishmjsna.org.uk). The Health and Well Being Board is established and a ten year Health and Well Being Strategy has been developed.

2. The activity of the Health and Wellbeing Board is focused on delivering the strategic vision for Lewisham as established in Shaping our Future – Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy, and in Lewisham’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Lewisham’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy was published in 2013.

3. Using the JSNA evidence and focusing on improving health, care and efficiency, the Health and Well Being Strategy was informed by the following considerations:

   1) Analysis of those areas which collectively are able to make the biggest difference to health and wellbeing at all levels of our health and social care system, from empowering people to make healthy choices to prevent ill health, through early intervention to prevent deterioration in health and wellbeing, to targeted care and support, right through to complex care for people with long term health problems;

   2) listening to the voice of Lewisham people and local communities, the voluntary and community sector, about the issues that affect their health and wellbeing;

   3) Analysis and prioritisation of those areas and actions that will enable transformative system level change and integration across social care, primary and community care, and hospital care;

   4) Identification of those areas where early action now, for example by addressing the ‘causes of the causes’ of ill health and inequalities, particularly in the early years, or intervening to prevent dependency, will improve quality and length of life in the future, and reduce the need for additional health and social care interventions later on.

4. Contributing to the objectives of Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy to reduce inequality and informed by the Marmot Review⁴, the strategy has identified nine priority areas for action over the next ten years.

   - Achieving a Healthy Weight
   - Increasing the number of people who survive colorectal, breast and lung cancer for 1 and 5 years
   - Improving Immunisation Uptake

• Reducing Alcohol Harm
• Preventing the uptake of smoking among children and young people and reducing the numbers of people smoking
• Improving mental health and wellbeing
• Improving sexual health
• Delaying and reducing the need for long term care and support
• Reducing the number of emergency admissions for people with long term conditions

5. The diagram below illustrates the scale of the health improvement challenge. It is estimated that in South East London, only around 16% of the population are not adversely affected by inequalities and do not put their health at significant risk. This emphasizes the need to ensure that all organizations and partners across the borough take a holistic approach to promoting the health and wellbeing of their residents, clients, patients and their own staff, so that ‘every contact counts’.

6. In order to maximise the impact of public health in making every contact count and supporting the delivery of the health and wellbeing strategy priorities, effort and resources have been focused on delivering those public health functions which are mandatory or that have been identified as a priority in the strategy.

7. The following section describes the programmes, performance and challenges in relation to these key public health functions:

- National Child Measurement Programme
- NHS Health Checks assessments
- Comprehensive sexual health services
- Tobacco Control and smoking cessation services
- Alcohol and drug misuse services
- Public health services for children and young people aged 5-19
- Interventions to tackle obesity such as community lifestyle and weight management services
- Locally-led nutrition initiatives
- Increasing levels of physical activity in the local population
- Local initiatives to reduce excess deaths as a result of seasonal mortality
- Public mental health services
- Behavioural and lifestyle campaigns to prevent cancer and long-term conditions
- Supporting, reviewing and challenging delivery of key public health funded and NHS delivered services such as immunisation and screening programmes
- Local authority role in dealing with health protection incidents, outbreaks and emergencies
- Public health advice and support to clinical commissioners

**National Child Measurement Programme**

8. The school nursing team of Lewisham and Greenwich NHS Trust (LGT) is commissioned to deliver the National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP). The National Child Measurement programme involves the annual height and weight measurement of all children in reception year and Year 6 in schools. The School Nursing Service has recently been expanded to enable it to increase its focus on health improvement including promoting healthy weight.

9. In 2012/13 over 6,000 children were measured (3,565 in Reception and 2,442 in Year 6). The participation rate in Lewisham of 92% (national target 85%) means that robust data are collected.

10. In Lewisham childhood obesity rates remain significantly higher than the England rate. In 2012/13 Lewisham remains in the top quintile of Local Authority obesity prevalence rates for Year 6. Reception year performance has improved and Lewisham is now in the second quintile. In 2012/13, 10.7% of Reception children were at risk of obesity and this rose to 23.3% in Year 6. The target set for the school year 2012/13 for obesity in Reception (12.2%) and Year 6 (24%) was achieved.

11. There is a small increase in obesity rates in both reception year and Year 6. This is similar to the national picture that shows that the proportion of children who were either overweight and obese or obese was higher for both Reception and Year 6 in 2013/14 compared to the previous year.

12. By deprivation: Results for Lewisham show obesity levels similar or lower to those seen in the most deprived decile. (The obesity prevalence among reception year children attending schools in areas in the most
deprived decile was 12.0% compared with 6.6% among those attending schools in areas in the least deprived decile and 24.7% compared to 13.1% in Year 6.)

13. The most significant challenges are to support families with young children and pregnant mothers to reduce their dietary intake of sugars, energy rich and processed foods in order to achieve a healthy weight for babies and children that will persist through the life course. This is especially challenging in the face of an obesogenic environment that normalises and encourages excessive consumption.

NHS Health Check assessments

14. This service aims to improve health outcomes and quality of life amongst Lewisham residents by identifying individuals at an earlier stage of vascular change, and to provide opportunities to empower them to substantially reduce their risk of cardiovascular morbidity or mortality. A NHS Health Check is offered to 20% of the eligible population every year as part of a 5 year rolling programme with an uptake level of 50-75%.

15. The 30 minute risk assessment involves a series of simple questions about lifestyle (smoking, alcohol, diet and physical activity) and family history, measuring blood pressure and cholesterol and recording weight, height and waist measurements in order to assess someone’s risk of developing cardiovascular disease. This large programme is co-ordinated and commissioned by LBL Public Health and provided by GPs, pharmacists and an outreach team, currently based with the Community Health Improvement Service, within Lewisham and Greenwich Health Trust.

16. A new Lifestyle Referral Hub service has been launched offering a “one-stop shop” for people who have received a NHS Health Check, have been identified as at high risk, and are referred to local lifestyle services.

17. The London Borough of Lewisham NHS Health Check team won “Team of the Year” at the Heart UK national awards in November 2014.

Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>April- Sep 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of health checks offered</td>
<td>18,543 people</td>
<td>9,271 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% eligible population</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of health checks received</td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>3,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% uptake</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% identified with high or very high risk | 8% | 7%
---|---|---

18. Referrals to lifestyle services have steadily increased as a result of the establishment of the Lifestyle Hub, apart from smokers to the Stop smoking Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrals</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>April – Sept 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral to Stop Smoking Service</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Management services</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Services</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. The most significant challenge is to increase the proportion of those people identified as having a high (>20%) risk of a cardiovascular event in the next ten years who are successfully referred for treatment or public health intervention and whose risk is reduced. A recent audit showed that only 11% of those identified by the health checks programme as at high risk had received any further GP follow up. A further audit of community outreach Healthchecks found 21% of people were at very high risk of Diabetes.

Comprehensive sexual health services (including testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, contraception outside of the GP contract and sexual health promotion and disease prevention)

20. Lewisham experiences very high levels of abortion, teenage pregnancy, HIV infection and chlamydia and gonorrhoea infection. Sexual health is worse in young people, men who have sex with men and in some BME groups.

21. Lewisham Council entered into a partnership agreement with Lambeth and Southwark Councils in April 2013 to oversee the commissioning of sexual health services across the 3 boroughs. This commissioning function is provided by Lambeth.

22. Sexual health services are delivered through specialist genito-urinary clinics (GUM), community contraception and sexual health clinics (provided by Lewisham and Greenwich NHS Trust), GPs, pharmacists, voluntary sector organisations and an online laboratory service.
23. In 2014 a new Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham Sexual Health strategy (see appendix 2) was developed, following extensive stakeholder consultation and an updated public health needs assessment.

24. Lewisham had an increase in the teenage pregnancy in 2012 compared to the previous year. This was the worst rate in London and made it one of the few boroughs nationally not to see a sustained decrease in rates. Chlamydia screening rates have remained high (4th highest detection rate in London). Late diagnosis of HIV remains a problem in Lewisham with 47% of all diagnoses made “late” as defined in the public health outcomes indicators. Lewisham has the 3rd highest rate of repeat abortion in under 25 year olds in London with 36.9% of all abortions in this age group being repeats.

25. Lewisham services see around 30,000 people a year, and a further 8,000 patients choose to access services outside of the borough. Demand for sexual health services has been increasing across London, with many clinics often having to close early to manage demand for services.

26. Lewisham’s growing “young” population will further increase the demand for sexual health services. Currently around 44% of diagnosed STIs are in the under 25s. A critical challenge for the future will be to better support individuals to self manage their sexual health through prevention of poor sexual health and improving access to services by delivering care in alternative settings such as pharmacies, GP practices and online screening and using longer acting contraception methods which require fewer visits to clinics. There is also a challenge to meet the needs of those who may have difficulty accessing services due to cultural or language barriers, a lack of awareness about sexual health more broadly and available services. These are addressed in the LSL Sexual Strategy and will form the basis of the implementation plan and future commissioning intentions.

Tobacco control and smoking cessation services

27. Key elements of the Lewisham Smokefree Future Delivery plan are:

- Preventing the uptake of smoking among young people through a peer education programme in schools with pupils from Year 8 and a targeted approach to reducing the supply of illegal and illicit tobacco.

- Motivating and assisting smokers to quit through commissioning a Stop Smoking Service (people trying to stop smoking are 4 times more likely to succeed with treatment which combines behavioural support and medication than if they ‘go it alone’). This service currently costs £670,000, includes: targeting smokers most at risk from smoking for intensive and specialist support to stop (including one-to-one and group support); recruiting smokers proactively into
the service; managing service level agreements with GP practices and pharmacies to provide services in primary care; training all stop smoking advisors to provide evidence-based interventions.

- Promoting smoke free environments, including homes and cars.

28. A dedicated enforcement post, with the support of a sniffer dog, has enabled increased focus on illegal and underage sales and large quantities of illegal tobacco seized, including the biggest UK local authority seizure.

29. More than 2000 young people aged 12 to 13 were reached through a Tobacco Control Peer Education Programme to prevent the uptake of smoking by young people and 61 pupils (selected by their peers) trained as peer educators.

30. The number of smoking quitters (1712) in 2013/14 was lower than previous years and not meeting the target of 1800, but the rate per 100,000 is higher than London and England. 461 smokers quit with the Stop Smoking Service from April to September 2014.

31. The Stop Smoking Service is very successful in reaching heavily addicted smokers such as pregnant women and people with mental health problems, with an increasing number of smokers quitting from more deprived wards.

32. A key achievement has been embedding very brief smoking interventions and the automatic referral of smokers to the Stop Smoking Service in all Lewisham Hospital services.

33. The biggest challenge is to ensure that, as part of the integration of health and social care and the transformation of community based care through the development of new neighbourhood teams, supporting people to quit smoking becomes everybody’s business as part of ‘Every Contact Counts’.

Alcohol and drug misuse services

34. The council commissions a large integrated service which delivers interventions for adults aged 18 and over. It provides support, treatment and rehabilitation programmes that promote recovery and encourage individuals to maintain their recovery through engagement in positive activities such as employment and training.

35. The service provides: prescriptions for substitute medications such as Methadone; community alcohol detoxification; and manages the interface with all health services including GPs, hospitals, and pharmacies, and with the Criminal Justice System; interventions for young people aged 10-21, with much of the work carried out in satellite
sites around the borough including schools, colleges, youth centres, housing providers and clients’ homes.

36. The Director of Public Health has recently become a Responsible Authority for health, to help the licensing authority exercise its functions regarding licensing policy.

37. Lewisham’s Drug and Alcohol services performed well in 2013/14 and continue to do so this year. A benchmarking exercise for the first three quarters of 2013/14 showed the services out performed comparator boroughs. Lewisham had the highest percentage of successful completions across all drug types. Successful completion means that clients have left treatment free from their drug(s) of dependency and have no requirement for any substitute prescribing. This is the main PHE performance indicator for treatment services. These results have been achieved despite lower investment per head.

38. Following the benchmarking period the services have continued to perform well with the latest performance figures showing that Lewisham continues to see growth in opiate users who successfully complete treatment and do not represent (9.9%) ahead of the national average (7.7%). Rates for non-opiate users have fallen slightly (47.8%), but remain ahead of national average (38.4%) and within top quartile.

39. There has been a rise in the number of dependent drinkers successfully completing treatment since 2013/14 (40.8%), ahead of the national average (39.53%).

40. More than 250 front line workers from were trained to deliver identification and brief advice on alcohol and 8,152 people have been screened for alcohol risk through the health check programme, with 1,032 identified with excess alcohol intake.

41. Despite a generally positive picture drug and alcohol services continue to face challenges. An in-depth services review in 2014 highlighted a number of groups that do not access/benefit from services as well as others. These include individuals who:

- have an alcohol problem
- have a long term opiate addiction
- do not wish to enter a large treatment service and would prefer to access service in primary care or other community settings
- are under 25
- are in contact the criminal justice system

42. It is also expected that demand for alcohol services will rise over the coming years as awareness regarding the harms caused by drinking increases and there is likely to be a need for greater focus of so called ‘legal highs’ that are increasingly used by young people.
43. The implementation of a new model of provision as part of a re-commissioning exercise will require careful management if the anticipated improvements in performance are to be achieved.

Public health services for children and young people aged 5-19

44. The Promoting Healthy Weight in Children and Families strategy encompasses prevention and treatment of overweight and obesity for children and families based on the triangle of need. To deliver the strategy there are two action plans:

- Universal Action Plans (promotion of healthy weight for all children) which are multi-component, involve partnership working and takes a life-course approach.

- A Delivery Plan for the local obesity care pathway for children and young people (targeted and specialist services).

45. The London Borough of Lewisham and its partners were successful in bidding for £500,000 from the Big Lottery Fund to improve emotional wellbeing and increase resilience in 10-14 year olds as part of the Head Start programme.

46. The existing School Aged Nursing Service (SANS) in Lewisham is well-established, fully recruited and has a high level of advanced skills; many of the nurses are qualified Public Health Practitioners and hold additional qualifications in sexual and reproductive health allowing them to deliver on the following priorities:

- Developing school based Healthy Child teams
- Developing early intervention support for emotional health and well-being.
- Support for children and young people with increased vulnerability around healthy lifestyle and ensuring access to health checks, immunisations etc.
- Increasing access to support (in school)
- Increasing access to support (out of school)

47. Performance in tackling childhood obesity is described elsewhere (see National Child Measurement Programme above and Interventions to tackle obesity such as community lifestyle and weight management services below).

48. Lewisham SANS has faced significant challenges since April 2013, particularly in relation to an increasing workload relating to Safeguarding and because of the introduction of a major new immunisation programme in schools.
49. The biggest challenge in addressing the public health needs of this age group is to develop a more holistic 'menu', of quality assured and evidence based public health interventions across a range of health issues including sex and relationships, healthy weight, physical activity, smoking and mental health that can be commissioned on behalf of schools and purchased by schools.

**Interventions to tackle obesity such as community lifestyle and weight management services**

50. An improved range of weight management programmes and support is now available for both children and adults. These include Weight Watchers, Shape-Up and dietetic support for adults and New Mum New You, Mend and Boost programmes for families. All services are accessible in a variety of venues across the borough.

51. Since the services have become fully operational 840 families have accessed the services. Nearly 300 families have completed the programmes, with positive outcomes on weight, physical activity and dietary behaviours. All services continue to offer on-going support for families for 12 months to help sustain lifestyle changes.

52. In 2013 there were over 1800 referrals to the adult weight management services with the majority of those completing the programmes achieving a weight loss, with 50% achieving at least a 5% weight loss.

53. The same challenges described under the National Child Measurement Programme above - namely to reduce their dietary intake of sugars, energy rich and processed foods in the face of an obesogenic environment that normalises and encourages excessive consumption - applies equally to all adults.

**Locally-led nutrition initiatives**

54. Increasing breastfeeding rates and the proportion exclusively breastfeeding at 6-8 weeks is a key priority for Lewisham, working towards achieving UNICEF Baby Friendly accreditation.

55. Universal Vitamin D provision for women and infants was launched in partnership with the Clinical Commissioning Group in November 2013 to help prevent the growing number of cases of vitamin D deficiency and rickets in children. The scheme enables all pregnant and postnatal women (for 12 months) and children under 4 to be eligible for Healthy Start vitamins. The vitamins are now easily accessible with over 60 distribution points including 46 community pharmacies, health centres and children’s centres.

56. Since November 2013, a borough-wide cooking & eating programme, *Easy Quick & Tasty* (a 5 week cookery club) has been successfully running at different venues across Lewisham (total of 22 cookery clubs
to date), providing healthy eating recipes and knowledge when cooking on a budget for targeted families / individuals on low income and /or with poor cooking skills.

57. Lewisham recently adopted a Planning Policy on hot food take-away shops to prevent the establishment of new hot food takeaway shops, as part of the Development Management Local Plan. Lewisham is one of the local authorities with the most hot food take-aways per head of population (13th).

58. The stage two UNICEF Baby Friendly community award was achieved in February 2014 and the maternity award in August 2014. Both services are working towards the stage 3 assessment, planned for July 2015, achieving this will result in full accreditation.

59. Since the launch of the vitamin D scheme, over 6,700 bottles of women’s tablets and nearly 11,500 bottles of children’s drops have been issued. The scheme is reaching 20-30% of eligible women and 50% of infants.

60. The Easy, Quick & Tasty initiative has had a high response with over 80% beneficiaries completing the courses and with over 200 individuals taking part. Post course evaluation shows that 77% of participants have reported other changes to their lifestyle apart from diet as a result of coming to cookery clubs. Some participants have successfully completed accredited training and some are now employed in delivering some of the Easy Quick & Tasty cookery clubs.

61. The Planning Inspector, at a recent examination of the Lewisham Development Local Plan, found the policy ‘sound’. The GLA wish to include this as a Case Study in their forthcoming Social Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Guidance for the London Plan.

62. The most significant challenges are in finding ways to deliver locally-led nutrition initiatives such as the baby friendly and the community cooking programmes to scale, so that they achieve a population level impact. The new planning policy will not reduce the number of existing unhealthy fast food take aways, and the challenge will be to encourage these existing outlets to adopt healthier catering commitments, and to encourage new, healthier retailers to enter the market.

Increasing levels of physical activity in the local population

63. Public Health commissions specific programmes to promote the increase of physical activity including: The Get Moving physical activity programme, part of the NHS Health Check, which provides free and discounted exercise sessions to people who are identified as inactive at their NHS Health Check; A Healthy Walks programme; a Let’s Get Moving Physical Activity Pathway training programme; and a road safety/cycling training programme.
64. The Council also provides free swimming to all residents under 16 and over 60 years of age.

65. Four hundred and twenty people attended the Get Moving activity sessions between October 2013 – March 2014. From April – November 2014 there have been two Get Moving programmes and 274 participants have attended the activity sessions so date.

66. In 2013/14 the total numbers of those aged under 16 who accessed free swimming was 9,487. They made a total of 28,930 visits, an average of three visits per user per year. For the same period there were 2,293 people aged 60 and over who access free swimming. They made a total of 26,068 visits, an average of 11 visits per user per year.

67. In 2013 – 14 2,434 adults participated in regular walks (on average one walk per week). There were 237 new walkers recorded and 87% of those subsequently reported doing more physical activity.

68. In 2013 -14, 152 primary care staff were trained to deliver physical activity brief advice. From April – November 2014 225 staff received the motivational training. This included primary care staff and community groups in North Lewisham and Well London Bellingham.

69. The road safety/cycling training programme is being delivered to 40 schools and has booked 1877 primary school age children in years 5 and 6 to attend the training.

70. The challenge is to increase awareness of the benefits of physical activity and the independent risks of inactivity and the need to address this through incorporating increased physical activity in the daily routine. Promoting physical activity will also need to become everybody’s business as part of every contact counts.

Local initiatives to reduce excess deaths as a result of seasonal mortality

71. Lewisham’s Warm Homes Healthy People (WHHP) project is now in its 3rd year and continues to provide help to residents vulnerable to the effects of living in cold housing. In 2013/14 & 14/15 has been funded by Public Health, led by the Council’s Sustainable Resources Group and delivered in partnership with a range of public, private and community sector organisations. The main focus of the project was to alleviate the negative impacts of cold weather, reduce hospital admissions and help the most vulnerable people in our borough stay warm and well and feel more comfortable in their homes over the coldest months of the year.

72. In 2013/14 495 Warm Homes referrals were received from 30 different organisations working with residents likely to be vulnerable to fuel poverty and cold weather. 437 vulnerable households received a home visit and winter warm pack. 4300 free measures were provided to
vulnerable households to keep warm and save money on their fuel bills. There were 710 onward referrals to other relevant related services. 89 vulnerable households received advice on switching energy tariff identifying savings of up to £17,800 a year1 (combined total). 199 referrals were made to the Warm Homes Discount which represents £25,870 a year benefit for Lewisham residents. 16 vulnerable households received heating improvements and/or insulation, bringing in £10,500 external funding and training was provided for 160 front line professionals on fuel poverty and health awareness.

73. A key challenge will be in implementing ‘Every Contact Counts’ systematically across the whole system to ensure that front line workers identify people at risk and ensure they are referred to the Warm Homes service.

Public mental health services

74. Public Mental Health is defined by the Chief Medical Officer as describing the 3 overlapping areas of mental health promotion, mental illness prevention and treatment and rehabilitation.

75. The Public Mental Health budget is very small, and generally has funded mental health awareness training and courses for front line workers in any public facing public or voluntary sector organisation to support them to manage clients who present with symptoms of mental illness (Mental Health First Aid).

76. Historically this budget has also funded projects and voluntary sector organisations with mental health outcomes. Most recently, some of this funding has been used to provide match funding for the Big Lottery “HeadStart” programme which is designed to improve resilience and emotional wellbeing in 10-14 year olds.

77. The main public health outcome measure of public mental health is self reported wellbeing. Lewisham ranks 31 of 33 London Boroughs for self reported wellbeing. The proportion of people with a low satisfaction with their life score increased from 7.2% to 8.7% between 2011/12 and 2012/13. When compared to other boroughs with a similar level of deprivation overall Lewisham has a worse outcome for this indicator.

78. Demand for mental illness services is high. Supporting people with mental illness to recover and access employment and secure housing is an important part of recovery but challenging in the current economic climate. The welfare reforms implemented as part of the austerity measures in response to the economic crisis are thought to have had a detrimental effect on mental health.

79. Lewisham has got through to the second stage of the Big Lottery’s HeadStart programme. It is anticipated that this programme will build
resilience in this population, but continuation and expansion of this will be dependent on being successful in the final stage of the process in 2015.

Behavioural and lifestyle campaigns to prevent cancer and long-term conditions

80. Public health has provided leadership and match funding to the Bellingham Well London Programme Phase 2, funded by the Big Lottery. It has effectively involved the community and enabled the delivery of lifestyle activities aimed at promoting healthy eating, physical activity and mental wellbeing.

81. The North Lewisham Health Improvement Programme (NLHIP) is a five-year plan that developed as part of the Health Inequalities Strategy for Lewisham, covering New Cross and Evelyn wards in the north of the Borough. The scope of the programme is wide-ranging and includes many inter-related projects and initiatives, such as community health projects; primary care interventions; health promotion initiatives; participatory budgeting and small grants to community groups; social marketing; needs assessments and health impact assessments.

82. The public health department delivers and commissions a programme of health improvement training to enhance the skills of those in Lewisham who have health promotion roles, whether paid or unpaid. The programme delivers across a range of topics selected to support delivery of the Health & Wellbeing Strategy.

83. Approximately 3,160 people participated in Bellingham Well London healthy lifestyle activities from April 2013 to April 2014. An external evaluation shows a 16% increase in respondents reporting that they do enough physical activity to keep fit, 13% reporting they feel very or quite happy with life in general, 14% increase in those that feel their eating habits are very or quite healthy. Bellingham has been cited by University of East London as one of the Well London areas that has demonstrated outstanding performance and has currently been named as one of three candidate areas for Phase 3 Well London scheduled to start in mid-2015.

84. The North Lewisham Health Improvement Programme has funded 53 community groups and 656 people accessed community health activities organised as a result of the Participatory Funding. 330 reported improved mental wellbeing, 129 reported eating more than 3 portions of fruit a day following attendance of healthy eating promotion activities compared with 175 participants reported eating less than 3 portions of fruit a day at the start and 219 participants reported that they had increased their levels of physical activity. In addition over 40 volunteers have been engaged. More than 400 people recently attended a community awareness event at Deptford Lounge including community lifestyle activities.
85. 407 front line workers across partner organisations have attended health improvement training courses since October 2013.

86. The main challenge is to ensure that these campaigns are successfully embedded within the new emerging neighbourhood teams and re-commissioning of the voluntary sector aligned to health and social care integration.

**Supporting, reviewing and challenging delivery of key public health funded and NHS delivered services such as immunisation and screening programmes**

87. Over the past two years, the public health team has worked with the CCG, Lewisham & Greenwich Healthcare NHS Trust, NHS England, PHE and with local general practitioners, to increase the uptake of childhood and flu immunisations in Lewisham, and to maximise the uptake of the national cancer screening programmes for example for breast, cervical and bowel cancer screening. The public health team has also worked closely with the school nursing service to encourage schools to support the Human Papilloma Virus immunisation Programme to protect girls against cervical cancer.

88. Despite continuing support at local level, and some improvement in uptake of vaccines as a result, significant challenges remain. Although significant improvement in the uptake of the first dose of MMR has been achieved (Lewisham’s performance increased by ten percentage points and the borough was identified as the most improved in London), this has been difficult to sustain. In addition, uptake of the second dose of MMR and the uptake of preschool booster remain at unacceptably low levels and amongst the worst in London.

89. After two very successful years in increasing and maintaining high levels of uptake of Human Papilloma Virus vaccine in schoolgirls, uptake of this vaccine has fallen backwards in the most recent school year; despite this fall, Lewisham remains in the top third of London Boroughs in relation to this vaccine.

90. Uptake of Flu vaccine increased in 2013/2104, and in some subgroups, uptake in Lewisham was amongst the best in SE London.

91. There has been little change in the coverage of breast screening in Lewisham over the past six years despite a range of initiatives to promote uptake. To support an increase in coverage of breast screening NHS England have negotiated with the screening provider the following: when a woman does not attend their appointment they will be sent another invitation with a timed appointment, reminder letters are sent to women and they will be sent a text of their appointment time.
92. The latest data for bowel screening uptake is for May 2014, uptake was 43.5% below that of the national target of 60%. To support an increase in uptake in bowel cancer screening the Health Promotion Specialist based at the screening centre held a range of promotion sessions in the community and attended the Lewisham GP Neighbourhood Forums to inform and promote bowel screening.

93. The coverage of the cervical screening programme in Lewisham improved in 2012-13, although Lewisham does not meet the national target of 80% coverage.

94. With the transfer of immunisation and screening responsibilities to NHS England, the challenge is to ensure effective partnership working and performance management, particularly in primary care where performance is variable, and to support the development of new co-commissioning arrangements between the CCG, NHS England and the council.

Local authority role in dealing with health protection incidents, outbreaks and emergencies

95. Local authorities have a new health protection duty to provide information and advice to certain persons and bodies, with a view to promoting the preparation of appropriate health protection arrangements. In practice this means that the DPH must ensure that NHS England (London) and PHE (London) have appropriate plans in place. NHS England will provide the assurance that NHS organisations have appropriate emergency plans in place. The assurance will be through the London Health Resilience Partnership. A Health Protection Committee, chaired by the DPH, reports to the Borough Resilience Forum and to the Health & Wellbeing Board.

96. Incidents and outbreaks are reported to or detected, and managed by the Health Protection Teams in Public Health England.

97. The Council’s public health function includes an infection control nurse who: facilitates Health Protection Committee meetings including the production of an annual health protection report for the Health & Wellbeing Board; promotes good antibiotic prescribing and infection control in primary care as part of the department’s support to the CCG; monitors MRSA bacteraemia and C. Difficile cases and investigates those that are community acquired, again as part of the support to the CCG.

98. Public Health has provided a lead role in ensuring that accurate and timely advice on Ebola has been communicated to all relevant partners in the borough, including GPs, schools and the Police.
99. Whilst health protection is an issue relevant to all working and living in the borough of Lewisham, issues such as TB and sexually transmitted infections disproportionately affect some local minority groups and higher rates of these infections exist in areas of higher deprivation.

100. Public Anxiety about Ebola has abated, but efforts to address such anxiety are likely to be necessary for some time. The rising incidence of community acquired C. Difficile infections is a challenge, as is the poor air quality in Lewisham.

Public health advice and support to clinical commissioners

101. Public Health has worked in partnership with Lewisham CCG and trained seventy pharmacy counter assistants as part of the Healthy Living Pharmacy initiative. A total of 70 pharmacy staff across Lewisham have now qualified as healthy living champions and are able to assist the people of Lewisham with stopping smoking, accessing vitamin D and treatment for minor illness helping to relieve pressure on other local services.

102. Since March 2013 Public Health worked in partnership with NHS Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group and Diabetes UK and recruited and trained 15 volunteers from the community to be Diabetes Community Champions. Their role is to raise awareness of diabetes in their communities and help prevent people developing the condition. To date the Diabetes Community Champions have organised a total of 16 diabetes awareness events in their communities. A diabetes JSNA has also been completed.

103. Through a bid led by a public health consultant, the CCG secured funding from Macmillan to fund a two year "An End of Life Transformation Programme" and has appointed a GP lead for cancer.

104. Neighbourhood Profiles of health need have been produced for the CCG Members Forum and will be used to inform the development of neighbourhood based primary care networks and integrated health and social care neighbourhood teams. In addition a borough wide needs analysis has informed the development of the CCG Commissioning Strategy 2013-2018.

105. The public health team also undertook an audit of childhood asthma admissions in Lewisham and made a number of recommendations for improvement in the pathway for the management of asthma in primary and secondary care.
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Appendix C

Results of the consultation with the Clinical Commissioning Group

1.1 The Working Group was updated on the response to the consultation with the LCCG on the public health savings proposals. The consultation was with Lewisham CCG and was not a public consultation. The CCG received the consultation document by email and was given 2 weeks to respond on the Public Health savings proposals.

1.2 The Working Group noted that the responses to the consultation were being reported to the Healthier Communities Select Committee which would oversee the consultation process, and to the Health & Wellbeing Board. Both the response to the consultation and subsequent responses by the Healthier Communities Select Committee and the Health & Wellbeing Board would then be considered by Mayor & Cabinet in February 2015.

Lewisham CCG Response with Commentary by the Director of Public Health

1.3 Lewisham CCG responded to the consultation on the Public Health savings proposals on 29th December 2014 (see Appendix 1). In doing so, the CCG considered the impact of the proposals on its own plans and against a number of overarching criteria:

- Commissioning that is population-based
- Equitable access
- Tackling health inequalities
- The aims or goals of our joint commissioning intentions
- Stronger communities for adult integrated care and for children and young people

1.4 The CCG highlighted a number of general issues and then commented specifically on each public health programme in relation to the savings proposals. Both the general and specific responses are reported below, with a commentary by the Director of Public Health on each response.

Highlighted Issues

1.5 The CCG responded - “Given the importance of health improvement and prevention, and its prominence in our local Health and Wellbeing Strategy and nationally in the NHS ‘Five Year Forward View’, we are concerned that money is being taken away from the current public health budget priorities without a comprehensive assessment of the implications on health outcomes and inequalities.”
1.6 DPH commentary – the proposed disinvestments in current public health initiatives were prioritised for disinvestment on the basis that these initiatives would result in the least loss of public health benefit per pound spent when compared across all current public health investments. In this way the likelihood that re-investment in other areas of current council spend will result in equal or greater public health outcome and reduction in inequalities is maximised; however, it is acknowledged that a full and comprehensive assessment of the implications of this re-allocation of funds cannot be undertaken until the areas for investment have been identified.

1.7 The CCG responded – “In reviewing the proposals our response on their impact is necessarily restricted by the absence of details from the council of how monies will be reinvested.”

1.8 DPH commentary – this is covered in the above DPH response.

1.9 The CCG responded – “Overall we would expect that the savings proposals are accompanied by redesign of services so that they will achieve positive health impacts, and that any changes are monitored accordingly to ensure that the expected benefits are realised.”

1.10 DPH commentary – Much of the mitigation of potential negative impacts on public health outcomes arising from the proposed savings is predicated on successful re-design and re-configuration of commissioned services. The council public health department intends to monitor closely the changes and fully expects to be asked to provide regular update reports to the relevant scrutiny committees and the Health & Wellbeing Board.

1.11 The CCG responded – “The need for voluntary organisations that previously accessed public health grants to be supported to access the council’s mainstream grant programme.”

1.12 DPH commentary – the council has already ensured that those voluntary organisations that previously accessed public health grants can now access the council’s mainstream grant programme.

1.13 The CCG responded – “The criteria that you will use to identify substantial development or variation in service should be made available as soon as possible.”

1.14 DPH commentary – the council agrees with this response.

1.15 The CCG responded – “Assessments of equalities implications should be carried out and made available at the outset of the savings programme.”

1.16 DPH commentary – the council has already undertaken an initial equalities assessment and these are described in the savings
proposal; however, as has been acknowledged above a comprehensive assessment can only be carried out once the re-investment plans and the impact of service re-configurations are known.

1.17 The CCG responded – “The areas of greatest concern are proposals that have negative impacts on smoking reduction and health inequalities.”

1.18 DPH commentary – the DPH shares these concerns. Smoking is still the single largest cause of health inequalities within Lewisham and between Lewisham and the England average for premature mortality. The proposals as they stand look to re-configure how smoking services are organised. They will essentially be integrated into the neighbourhood model of working which should give a more comprehensive use of staff resources and reduce the current level of overhead costs. If however, these proposals were not successfully implemented then consideration would need to be given to re-instating this level of funding. The DPH will be monitoring the progress of these proposals and will be able to provide a further progress report. The illegal tobacco sales work has been supported by public health funding and consideration will need to be given by the new enforcement service as to how this work should be continued. Smoking cessation will continue to be a priority for public health and new funding sources will be pursued to test new initiatives.

1.19 Lewisham’s Community Outreach NHS Checks team, commissioned from the Lewisham & Greenwich Trust Community Health Improvement Service, won the Heart UK Team of the Year award in 2014. It is envisaged that these services will be reconfigured with less overheads as part of the neighbourhood working but again this needs to be monitored.

1.20 Area based health improvement programmes have been shown locally to improve health outcomes and have been identified as an example of best practice by the GLA Well London Programme. The council has successfully leveraged extra resources, including from the GLA, to extend the work that has been shown to be effective in Bellingham and North Lewisham to Lewisham Central and Downham.

Service specific responses

1.21 Sexual Health: the CCG responded – “As the lead commissioner the CCG will advise the council as its agent in the proposed contract renegotiation with LGT. Public Health will be fully involved in the appropriate contracting forum. Further detail is required about how sexual health services will be delivered through a neighbourhood model. The CCG would seek assurance that the health improvement package will be taken up by schools if the SRE funding is reduced. Where some services have been provided on a limited pilot basis we
support the move to enable a wider population coverage. Where incentive funding is withdrawn from GP practices we need to take into account the total impact from all the proposed changes. The CCG Medicines Management team can provide professional advice in the further development of pharmacy needs assessment.”

1.22 DPH commentary – the council acknowledges and appreciates the CCG’s role as lead commissioner with LGT, and its desire to involve public health fully in the contracting process. The CCG will be kept fully appraised of sexual health service re-configuration within the neighbourhood model as plans emerge. The council would welcome the CCG’s help and support to influence and persuade schools of the benefits of taking up the health improvement packages, in particular SRE. The council would also welcome the CCG’s support in jointly assessing the impact of any funding withdrawal from GP practices, and the continued support of the Medicines Management Team in the pharmacy needs assessment.

1.23 NHS Health Checks: the CCG responded – “We agree with the highlighted risks concerning the pre-diabetes intervention. This may have an impact on the CCG’s plans for long-term conditions, for risk stratification and around variation in primary care. The removal of the Health Checks facilitator post and reduction of GP advisor time may mean that the focus is on maintenance rather than the continuing development of the programme. We support the continuing integration of the pharmacy into the neighbourhood resources to deliver the health checks programme. Further detail is required about how health checks will be delivered through a neighbourhood model to achieve efficiency and effectiveness.”

1.24 DPH commentary – the council would welcome the CCG’s financial support to invest in diabetes prevention alongside public health investment in the NHS Health Checks programme in line with NHS England’s recently published five year forward view operational plan for 2015-16. The CCG will be kept fully appraised of the NHS Health Checks service re-configuration within the neighbourhood model as plans emerge.

1.25 Health Protection: the CCG responded – “We acknowledge that this service has not been proven to be a cost effective intervention. “

1.26 DPH commentary – the council welcomes the CCG’s acknowledgement.

1.27 Public Health Advice to CCG: the CCG responded – “We will adopt responsibility for the Diabetes and cancer GP champion posts from April 2015.”

1.28 DPH commentary – the council welcomes the CCG’s adoption of this responsibility.
1.29 **Obesity / Physical Activity:** the CCG responded – “This area is a Health & Wellbeing Board priority. As with the reduced SRE funding, we would seek assurance that the health improvement package will be taken up by schools, and where some services have been provided on a limited pilot basis we support the move to enable a wider population coverage. The reduction in funding for the community nutritionist and withdrawal of clinical support may mean that the focus is on maintenance rather than the continuing development of the programme. This is an area that should be part of a whole programme approach to neighbourhood development.”

1.30 **DPH commentary** – please see 6.3.6 and 6.4.2 above.

1.31 **Dental Public Health:** the CCG responded – “This may represent a missed developmental opportunity to improve dental health particularly for children and young people.”

1.32 **DPH commentary** – the DPH shares this concern, but the reality is that this budget has not been spent for several years prior to the transfer of public health to the local authority, and there has been no expenditure in 2013-14 or 2014-15. The number of decayed, missing and filled teeth at the age of five is one of the few measures of children’s health on which Lewisham has done consistently well. The council will continue to monitor this performance indicator which is based on a national survey.

1.33 **Mental Health:** the CCG responded – “We recognise the potential benefits of pooling resources with other neighbourhoods but need to highlight the potential difficulties inherent in working across multiple organisations and sectors that may make this difficult to achieve.”

1.34 **DPH commentary** – the council also recognises the potential difficulties and challenges of working with other boroughs and organisations but also recognises the need to overcome these challenges.

1.35 **Health Improvement Training:** the CCG responded – “This area has a potential impact on achievement of the ‘Every Contact Counts’ strategy. This will need to be mitigated further through additional development via HESL resourcing, development of neighbourhood teams, and SEL Workforce Supporting Strategy.”

1.36 **DPH commentary** – the council welcomes these suggestions for further mitigation of potential impact on achieving ‘Every Contact Counts’ and would welcome the CCG’s support in leveraging resources from HESL and from the SEL workforce supporting strategy.

1.37 **Health Inequalities:** the CCG responded – “We support the neighbourhood model as an integral part of the integration programme. But investment and implementation requirements should be defined
that support the development of the four hub approach, in particular how they will address health inequalities where services are decommissioned, such as the money advice service which can be an important enabling factor in supporting health improvement. We support changes to a whole neighbourhood approach away from specific groups, and building community capacity to tackle inequalities; again, this may require further resources to ensure continuing support to vulnerable population groups. Where there are proposed changes to the LGT contract these must be assessed for their impact and likely success for linking to the neighbourhood model. We recognise the mitigation in respect of the ‘warm homes’ funding but seek assurance that this will be strong enough.”

1.38 DPH commentary – please see 6.3.6, 6.3.8, 6.3.15, and 6.3.16 above.

1.39 Smoking & Tobacco Control: the CCG responded – “Both the local and SEL JSNAs identify the impact of smoking on mortality rates, inequalities and QALYs. The CCG has identified smoking quitters as one of its local quality premium outcomes. This is therefore an area of considerable importance for local population health and the CCG. As with other aspects of the LGT contract, the CCG will advise the council as its lead commissioner in the proposed contract renegotiation. Public Health will be fully involved in the appropriate contracting forum. Further detail is required about how efficiencies in the stop smoking service will be achieved without reducing its effectiveness.”

1.40 DPH commentary – please see 6.3.14 above.

1.41 Maternal & Child Health: the CCG responded – “Recognising that change to the sessional commitments of the child death liaison nurse will not prevent its delivery of the main purpose of the role, there may be an impact on support for bereaved families which may need to be provided or commissioned differently. We have significant concerns about the reduction in support to breastfeeding cafés and peer support and the possible impact on our UNICEF status. This is an identified priority for the CCG and for SEL. While the peer support proposal is actually a reduction in the supporting infrastructure so should not have an impact, the support for the cafés could. But if this can be maintained for a further 6 months and alternative can be put in place this may avoid a negative impact.”

1.42 DPH commentary – the council welcomes the CCG’s view that support for bereaved families may need to be provided or commissioned differently. The DPH also shares the CCG’s concerns that disinvestment in breastfeeding peer support and breast feeding cafes may jeopardise Lewisham’s final stage submission to achieve the highly prestigious UNICEF baby friendly status, after successfully completing stages one and two. The council may wish to consider extending funding for these initiatives for at least 6 months, but this
would mean that the level of anticipated savings would not be achieved in 2015-16.

1.43 **Department Efficiencies:** the CCG responded – “We would seek assurance that any revised structures or functions can deliver our agreed memorandum of understanding (MOU) of PH support to the CCG, for instance by freeing up time for PH consultants and intelligence support, and working with us around the commissioning cycle. A clear, agreed work plan will be essential to realise delivery of this service. “

1.44 **DPH commentary** – the council can provide reassurance that any revised structures or functions will be designed to deliver the council’s mandatory responsibilities to provide public health support to CCG commissioning. The council has already advertised for a public health intelligence officer at a higher grade and salary than the equivalent NHS grade and salary of the previous post holder. A clear work plan will be agreed with the CCG for 2015-16.
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Chair’s Introduction

Youth work is not just about playing table tennis and kicking a ball. Youth work aims for the social and personal development of young people. It achieves these outcomes through structured, non-formal educational activities that combine challenge and learning and enjoyment. It is a methodology that draws on behavioural and learning theory, psychology, art and creativity, sport and physical education and development and cultural and sociological theory. It is more than just a generic skill and while youth work embraces a specialist skill approach it is by no means rigid. It is about the face to face interaction, individual dialogue, group work and relationship building that focuses directly on the needs and interests of young people. In Lewisham we provide this in partnership with commissioned providers from the private, voluntary and independent sector.

Given the very high budget reductions that the authority is having to find we are now facing a proposal of a £1.4m reduction to the Youth Service delivery across the authority in 2015-16 with a remaining £1.7m being at risk for an even further reduction in future years. In essence we could be faced with no provision except the statutory minimum of providing a database of what activities are on offer for young people in the borough and the tracking of young people who are not in education, employment or training, known as NEET. With an estimated 20,355 children and young people aged between 0-18 living in poverty in Lewisham we cannot lose a vital provision. The Working Group does recognise that as an authority we need to continue to provide a vibrant and relevant service for our young people within these very tight financial parameters.

The Youth Service Working Group was set up to look at the 4 options presented by officers .We met 3 times with input from various senior officers to try to recommend what would be the best option for the youth service’s future. Working Group members debated intensely about what would be the most suitable way forward and came to a conclusion that the recommendations would be to further explore all the options including that of a detailed business plan to mutualise the Youth Service but with a proviso not to exclude other options for the future of the Youth Service should the Employee Led Mutual not be viable. Members highlighted the levels of risk in going down the route of an Employee Led Mutual particularly in relation to asset lock, budget availability and pension costs and the importance of the governance model that includes representation from young people, youth work staff, the voluntary sector and the council. The issue of ensuring that the needs and aspirations of our young people and addressing disadvantage and inequality are built into the aims of a possible mutual were discussed at length in order that these objectives would continue throughout the existence of any possible mutual.

I would like to thank officers, Working Group members, the chair of Lewisham’s Children & Young People’s Forum and colleagues for their attendance, commitment and contributions in how we can continue to provide a Youth Service for our young people in these very difficult financial times.

Councillor Liz Johnston-Franklin
Chair of the Youth Service Working Group
Executive summary

The Lewisham Future Programme is the Council’s approach to making the transformational changes necessary to reposition itself strongly for the future, whilst living within the financial resources at its disposal. The savings proposals relating to the Youth Service that have been put forward as part of this programme, are significant, and it was agreed by Council that a working group should be set up to look at these proposals and their implications in more depth.

In terms of the Youth Service savings proposed for 2015/16, the Working Group welcomed the steps being taken by officers to mitigate some of the negative effects of the proposals, and in particular, ensure that alternative provision was provided where council provision was being removed. The Working Group was keen that the relevant ward members be kept updated on progress in terms of finding alternative providers for youth provision at Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne Youth Centre.

In terms of the Youth Service savings proposals relating to future years, the Working Group felt that a key outcome of their work should be making recommendations in relation to the development of a detailed plan to mutualise the Youth Service that the Mayor was being asked to authorise. In particular, the Working Group felt that staff and young people must be democratically represented in any mutual; that the plan should investigate achieving the necessary asset locks; and that risks relating to potential LGPS and redundancy liabilities, VAT and Corporation Tax liabilities and funding from the Council being viewed as state aid, should be thoroughly considered.
Recommendations

The Committee would like to make the following recommendations:

2015/16 Base Savings

1. Should the base savings be agreed by Mayor and Cabinet, the Working Group recommends that the ward members for Ladywell and Perry Vale be kept updated on progress in terms of finding alternative providers for youth provision at Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne Youth Centre.

2016/17 Onwards

2. Should Mayor and Cabinet agree that a detailed plan to mutualise the Youth Service be developed within the next financial year, the Working Group recommends that this plan includes a governance framework that aims to ensure that:

   - The local voluntary sector is involved and represented, possibly via the Voluntary Action Lewisham CYP Forum, in the governance arrangements of the ELM.
   - The governing body of the ELM is represented as a stakeholder in public services, possibly through representation on the CYP Strategic Partnership Board.
   - Staff, Young People and the Council are democratically represented in the ELM.

3. The plan should also cover:

   - Achieving the necessary asset locks.
   - Completing the business planning / preparation of a business case that will be required for a single tender action.
   - Ensuring that the ELM, throughout its existence, serves to meet the needs and aspirations of young people in the London Borough of Lewisham, in particular addressing disadvantage and inequality.

4. The following risks should be fully investigated:

   - Potential LGPS and redundancy liabilities.
   - The ELM’s liability for VAT.
   - The ELM’s liability for Corporation Tax.
   - Funding from the Council being viewed as state aid.

5. The Working Group notes that the development of a detailed plan to mutualise the Youth Service does not exclude other options for the future of the Youth Service being considered, should the ELM option not prove viable.
Purpose and structure of review

1. As part of the Council’s 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings, savings proposals relating to the Youth Service was put forward. The Revenue Budget Savings proposals were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 29 September 2014 and each of the Select Committees in October and early November, before being submitted to Mayor and Cabinet on 12 November 2014. The Mayor authorised officers to carry out consultation on base savings of £1.4m in relation to the current youth service, including:

- A reduction to youth worker capacity and removal of Council staff from two youth sites
- A reduction to commissioned provision
- A reduction to management and business support staff and further efficiency savings
- A reshaping of youth re-engagement services by re-specifying the specialist 1:1 service and funding it from other sources
- Re-specifying the Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) Programme in accordance with Raising the Participation Age (RPA) and alternatively funding the programme.

2. The Mayor was also asked to consider options for the future of the Youth Service to allow planning to proceed into future years. The options included, but were not limited to: (a) the potential creation of an Employee Led Mutual (ELM) for the Youth Service, and (b) reducing the service to a statutory service only model.

3. The Overview & Scrutiny Business Panel requested that a working group on the Youth Service proposals be established to allow the broadest participation in consideration of the implications of the proposals.

4. At its meeting on 26 November 2014, Council agreed to set up a time limited Youth Service Working Group to operate until the end of February 2015 to consider the proposals with terms of reference as set out below.

Terms of reference

5. Scrutiny of the Youth Service falls within the remit of the Children and Young People Select Committee. The establishment of the Working Group did not remove this function from that Select Committee. The purpose of the Working Group was to assist with deliberations of the savings proposals and ensure that detailed analysis of the Council wide implications of the proposals were taken into account.

6. The terms of reference agreed for the Youth Service Working Group were:

- Without prejudice to the remit of the Children and Young People Select Committee, to explore any proposals for the future of the Council’s Youth Service to be considered in the course of the Council’s budget process for 2015/16.
● To make any comments it considers appropriate about those proposals to the Council’s Public Accounts Committee (PAC) prior to any submissions PAC may decide to make to the Mayor in February 2015 in relation to budget proposals for 2015/16.

● The Working Group will consist of 10 members (11 if the councillor outside the majority party wishes to sit on the Group) and will cease to exist at the end of February 2015.

Scope

7. The Working Group had three formal meetings to consider the following:

First meeting: 9 December 2014

(1) To receive a “scene-setting” report; agree the timetable for the Working Group; discuss the Youth Service savings proposal considered at Mayor and Cabinet on 12 November 2014; and discuss the related consultation process.

(2) To question officers on the information received.

Second meeting: 17 December 2014

(1) To receive a report providing more detailed information on:

The 2015/16 savings: The base savings of £1.4m including (a) information on the impact the reduction in commissioning funding will have on the organisations currently commissioned and the services they provide; (b) proposals for where young people will access youth provision as an alternative to Rockbourne and Ladywell including any proposed alternative provision from those sites; and (c) relevant attendance data for the youth service.

Options for the Youth Service for 2016-17 onwards: including information on:

● The advantages and disadvantages of ELMs.
● The different types of governance structures and funding agreements for ELMs and their particular advantages and disadvantages for all stakeholders including the Council and young people.
● The potential savings and costs generated by an ELM to the Youth Service Controllable budget and other budgets.
● The likely level of annual council funding for an ELM for the first three years.
● The options for income generation under an ELM model and how such a model might become self-sustaining.
● A timetable for, an outline of, the work that would be undertaken over the course of the next year to develop a plan for the potential mutualisation of the service, if this option was agreed.

(2) To question officers on the written report.
(3) To receive detailed financial and legal advice on the options available in relation to the potential employee mutualisation of the service, including Implications in relation to TUPE, pension and redundancy liabilities, the transfer of assets etc.

[The presentation from the Head of Law on some of the legal issues surrounding the options for the future of the Youth Service is attached at Appendix A].

Third meeting: 20 January 2015

(1) To receive and comment on the draft Mayor and Cabinet report (scheduled for the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on 11 February 2015), providing a full options appraisal and a summary of the youth service consultation results.

(2) To consider and agree a final report presenting all the evidence taken and to agree recommendations for submission to PAC on 5 February 2015 (and then to Mayor & Cabinet on 11 February 2015).

8. David French, the elected chair of Lewisham’s Children & Young People’s Forum, attended meetings of the Working Group and contributed to the discussions held.

Background information

9. At its second meeting on 17 December 2014, the working group received the following background papers:

- Various briefing papers on mutuals, including: Developing a mutual for local authority service delivery (Geldards law firm); The next stage for public service spin outs (Pioneers Post); and Information from the Cabinet Office
- Lewisham Youth Service Needs Analysis
- Commissioned Youth Provision 2014-15 – Area profiles (Youth Service)

10. Prior to its final meeting on 20 January 2015 the following background paper was provided to give the working group an understanding of the picture across London:

- A review of London Boroughs’ Youth Provision

An update on youth service provision across London was also provided at this meeting, following a survey of the London boroughs undertaken by officers.
The context

The National and local policy context

National policy context

11. 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.

12. 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. 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. The 2013/14 Youth service restructure was aligned to this strategy (see local policy context below).

14. 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. 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.

Local policy context

15. In 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.

16. The restructure created a leaner, more efficient service more capable of responding to young people’s needs. It also introduced a significantly larger commissioning fund from which voluntary sector and other providers could bid to deliver youth
provision. In the first year post-restructure, the Service has been embedding performance management, income generation and contract management capabilities.

17. 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 focused on developing young people’s life skills, as agreed in the previous reorganisation of the service.

18. 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.

19. 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, there is a not in education, employment or training (NEET) Programme. As a part of the 2013/14 restructure this scheme changed to become a 12 week Government-recognised traineeship, in partnership with Bromley College. The programme runs 3 times a year in line with school terms.

20. 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.

The Vision

21. The Working Group was informed that the 2013/14 restructure had established a vision for the Youth Service that was currently being embedded throughout the service.

The Youth Service maintains the following aims:

- To encourage the Council and other organisations 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.
- 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 bring about the following outcomes for young people:
• Improved life skills
• Increased involvement in education, employment or training
• Staying safe and well, and preventing needs from escalating.

22. The Working Group was informed that the Service’s agreed aims and outcomes were not going to change and that the savings proposals put forward related to the model of delivery and how the vision could be achieved within the resources available, not changing the vision. It was suggested, however, that the reduced commissioning fund would require prioritisation to take place; and that this would be based on needs, but also on ensuring the right balance of provision in terms of activities, geography and timing; and taking into account other available provision.
Findings

A: The 2015-16 Base Savings Proposals

23. The current Youth Service budget is £3.46m and the Service employs approximately 85 people. The Working Group heard evidence that the 2015-16 base savings proposals would result in a saving of £1.4m and:

- A reduction in staffing (the deletion of two manager posts and one business officer post; and a reduction in frontline staff including the removal of youth service staff from 2 youth centres – the Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne Youth Centre) and a consequent reduction in street-based capacity (although the capability would be retained)
- A reduction in the commissioning fund of approximately 31%
- The generation of £100k income
- The bringing together of the NEET Traineeship and Specialist 1:1 service to form a re-engagement service.

24. Members were told that the general scope of the Service would remain intact with staffing levels reduced to the minimum level believed necessary to operate an ELM (see next section) in the future. The reduction in staff would be equivalent to 10.5 full time equivalents. The redundancy payments that the Council would be liable for would not exceed £154k but the precise figure for this one off payment would not be known until after the proposals had been implemented.

25. The following points were made to the Working Group in relation to the base savings proposals:

- The Service would be required to generate income by renting space to private and community sector users and bidding for relevant, available grants. Based on current projections and the retention of at least 5 youth centres and 5 adventure playgrounds, it was feasible that the Service would generate £100k by the end of 2015/2016.\(^1\)
- The recommendation as to which two centres would be offered to the voluntary sector or closed was based on factors including location; the potential for the private and voluntary sector to deliver provision from the sites; and the attractiveness of the remaining facilities to generate income.
- As such, it was proposed to close or find alternative providers for youth provision at Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne Youth Centre as both centres already had alternative non-Youth Service provision running from them. (Rockbourne offered short break provision on two weekday evenings and Saturdays, and Ladywell offered short break provision on Saturdays. Rockbourne also hosted a scout group, whilst Ladywell operated as an adult day care centre the majority of the time).

\(^1\) Following the meeting, the Working Group was informed that the £100k would come almost entirely via space rental and was provided with the following breakdown based on contracts already agreed, expressed interest and estimates of new income: TNG: £30,000; Bellingham: £22,00; Riverside: £20,000; Honor Oak: £22,000; Woodpecker: £8,500; All APGs: £3,000.
- Officers were actively engaging with private and voluntary sector organisations and agencies to see how the sessions vacated by the youth service at Ladywell and Rockbourne might be filled.
- The savings proposals did not in any way relate to building costs. The possibility of reducing building costs via divestments was not being examined as officers did not want to jeopardise non-youth service provision at these sites. In particular, the short break provision at Rockbourne was considered very valuable and the building was one of only a few able to provide such provision. In addition, the Ladywell Village building was a Community Services Directorate asset and not a Children and Young People Directorate building.
- Officers were looking at changing the opening hours of the Ladywell adventure playground so that this provision could potentially fill the gap caused by the removal of youth service sessions from Ladywell village; and were consulting young people on this option.
- Alternatives for the Rockbourne youth service sessions were also being investigated and one organisation had already expressed an interest in taking over the slots.
- The Youth Service’s street-based outreach capacity was currently comprised of 3.4 FTE Support Youth Workers. Under the proposals this capacity would be removed in its entirety. Because of current support staff vacancies the outreach service was only operating a limited street-based outreach capacity at the moment and used to inform young people of what the service offers and spur their participation at youth sites. Some of the loss of street-based capacity could be mitigated by the communications work of the Participation and Engagement Officer.
- During the 2013/14 Youth Service restructure, commissioning funds were doubled. A reduction of 31% would still enable the Service to commission an amount greater than what was available in 2012/13.
- Initial appraisal of the impact of services provided through the commissioning fund suggested that 11 or 12 projects were showing some degree of non-performance. However, making required savings by simply not commissioning these services next year would not be possible as a good mix of provision (by type and location) needed to be provided.

The new re-engagement service

26. The Working Group was informed that it was proposed to bring together, more strategically, three elements of the current service to form a youth re-engagement service:
   - Specialist 1:1 Service
   - The NEET Programme
   - NEET tracking services

27. The Specialist 1:1 Service is an outreach service operated out of Baseline in Lewisham Town Centre. 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. Currently, the service
supports approximately 250 young people a year. The Working Group was informed that the proposal was to remove the Specialist Support Manager post, then consider the best means to continue delivery, probably re-commissioning the service with Targeted Family Support and funding it via the Troubled Families grant.

28. **The NEET Programme** currently operates out of The New Generation (TNG) and is a 12 week programme that runs 3 times a year with 16 young people on each programme. The Working Group was informed that the Specialist Group Work Coordinator post would be removed and programming costs further reduced. The reduced service would then be re-specified in accordance with Raising the Participation Age requirements and funded via alternative monies from schools, colleges and the Education Funding Agency.

29. The Council has a statutory responsibility to **monitor and track NEETs** and to support vulnerable NEETs. The Working Group was informed that this element of the Youth Service would remain intact, with only minor reductions to the communications budget.

30. The total cost of the re-engagement service would be £705k:

- £390k for specialist 1:1 support services
- £115k for NEET Programme
- £200k for tracking young people who are NEET.

**Consultation**

31. The Working Group was informed that consultation with young people on the savings proposals (both the base savings and the future savings – see next section) involved (a) providing a summary of the proposals; (b) having ‘family meal’ type events at youth clubs to explain the proposals; (c) consulting the young mayor and his advisers; and (d) using youth workers to explain the proposals to young people in detail and record feedback.

**Recommendation 1:** Should the base savings be agreed by Mayor and Cabinet, the Working Group recommends that the ward members for Ladywell and Perry Vale be kept updated on progress in terms of finding alternative providers for youth provision at Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne Youth Centre.
32. Officers informed the Working Group that it was important strategically to set out an end option for the Youth Service as further Council funding reductions were required in subsequent years. Annual reductions to the Service would have a detrimental effect on young people, and the frontline staff who served 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. There were a number of options that could forestall these and other negative implications, although the Mayor had indicated that he did not wish to consult on the first:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reducing the service to providing the statutory minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Council would continue to fulfil its statutory obligation and make significant savings that would contribute to the broader £85m figure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Service staff and young people would not be subjected to destabilising year-on-year cuts to the Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Council-run youth provision would end, and the Service would no longer commission the voluntary sector to run youth provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Putting a Youth Service contract out to tender and commissioning from the private or voluntary sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A reduced version of the current capabilities and outcomes delivered by the Youth Service would remain in the Borough for at least the duration of a commissioned contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market testing had suggested that providers were not interested in such a large scale contract – interest is confined to partnering with a future mutual or charity, not in bidding for a whole service contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full cost recovery might reduce the savings generated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dividing the youth centres and adventure playgrounds, incorporating each individually as a charity and trust, mutual and/or social enterprise and commissioning these separately</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Each independent youth site could avail itself of alternative funding (e.g. philanthropy, grants, corporate giving) to supplement council funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All economies of scale would be lost, and the sustainability prospects of individual sites could be put at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery would potentially be piecemeal and disjointed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retaining a full council-run service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This wouldn’t deliver any savings for 2015/16, necessitating savings in future years - this would reduce Council-run and commissioned youth provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | This option would prevent the additional fundraising open only to
non-council entities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Spinning out the Youth Service, establishing a young person and employee-led mutual (ELM), and legally incorporating the enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This would sustain the youth service with fewer resources but posed a number of risks (see below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. An officer appraisal of the options outlined above favoured the mutual option, although the Working Group was informed that the results of the consultation on the proposals could change the appraisal. It was also noted that, whilst the mutual was currently the preferred option, a full options appraisal would be presented to Mayor and Cabinet on 11 February 2015.

34. At its meeting on 17 December 2014, the Working Group received a presentation from officers from the Children and Young People Directorate which outlined the vision for the mutual. Members were informed that, as an ELM, the organisation would continue to uphold the Council’s vision for youth provision, but would aim to go further – to create an organisational model that could deliver the Council’s vision more effectively and at better value. It was argued that staff would be naturally empowered to own outcomes and deliver best value because they would have a tangible stake in a real social business. The ELM would be an organisation where:

- Young people have a greater voice is designing the services they use.
- An entrepreneurial ethos underpins the organisation, with a culture where staff know what is expected of them and have the freedom to find the best ways to achieve success.
- The service-user is at the heart of the organisation and the organisation relies on the ingenuity of young people and staff.
- The “arc of mediocrity” is broken by giving staff the freedom to hone their strengths.
- Financial surpluses are sought and reinvested in the business to further the mission.

35. The Working Group was informed that officers felt that the benefits of mutualising the Youth Service included:

- A greater opportunity for the involvement of young people by allowing them to become part owners of the ELM and have an elected place on its board.
- Greater flexibility to strategise, innovate and better meet the needs of end users and stakeholders.
- As an ELM, staff could access grant funding streams, sponsorships and income generation opportunities currently unavailable to local authorities (such as Children In Need funding).
- Maintaining a good level of youth provision in the Borough with reduced or potentially no funding from the Council.
• Influencing positively organisational behaviour, particularly with regard to creating a shared sentiment of staff ownership, minimising sick days and increasing influence over future decisions.
• Allowing staff to play to their strengths.
• Potential ‘back office’ savings such as ICT.
• Retaining a relationship with a staff group that maintains already-established relationships with young people and community members in the Borough.
• Reducing long-term liabilities to the Council.

Planning for a mutual

36. The Working Group was told that if the ELM option was 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. It was noted that some preparatory work on the ELM proposal had already been carried out (staff had attended Cabinet Office workshops and discussions with staff around the proposal had been held) but there remained a lot of business planning activity to take place if this proposal were to be taken forward. Some staff were cautiously excited about the prospect of a youth and employee led mutual, could see the potential it offered for carrying out work that was not possible at present, but were aware of the risks.

37. The Working Group heard that the Council would need to be clear in the funding agreement setting up the ELM what its core requirements were whilst it continued to provide funds (it was anticipated that funds would need to be provided for three years). However, officers argued that it would be important to secure for the ELM as much freedom as possible during and after the planning stages. Whilst the Council would need to be clear on its expectations over the three years it funded a mutual, the head of the mutual would need to be given the entrepreneurial freedom required to make it self-financing after those three years. At the meeting of the Working Group held on 17 December 2014, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People commented that a key decision for the Council was whether or not it wanted a self-funding option. If it did, the requirements it could impose would be limited.

38. The Working Group was informed that any remaining staff at the point of transfer to an ELM would be transferred in accordance with TUPE to the ELM. Consideration would need to be given as to 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 (see below), the relevant local authorities had kept the liabilities for transferred staff.

39. The Working Group heard that there were 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 Lewisham’s Youth Service mutualise, there would be lessons to learn from both organisations at they had gone through the process and were now
operating as independent entities. There would also be learning from other areas of the Council that had followed similar strategies, including Wide Horizons, Education Business Partnerships, Libraries and housing.

40. However, Members were also informed that the two ELMs in operation were still fairly new and it was unclear as to whether they would be able to become completely self-supporting organisations with no funding from “their” Council. Whilst it would be the intention that Lewisham’s ELM would become self-supporting after 3 years, and that the Council could then realise full savings, there was a risk that it would not achieve that aim. In that case, a decision would need to be made as to whether the Council continued to support the ELM financially or not.

The legal context

41. The Head of Law gave a detailed presentation to the Working Group on the potential legal models for an ELM at its meeting held on 17 December 2014. This is attached at Appendix 1.

42. The following key points were made:

- The various mutual models could be differentiated from each other by considering (a) who controlled them; (b) what legal form they took; and (c) their status.
- The four key features of a mutual were a shared purpose, ownership by members, control by membership (one member, one vote) and stakeholder representation.
- Models for the delivery of mutual included:
  - Companies limited by shares – where members would own the company
  - Companies limited by guarantee - a common form for mutuals, members would not own the company
  - Community Interest Companies (CICs) – designed for social enterprises, organisation must meet the community interest test, seen as a ‘badge of commendation’
  - Industrial and Provident Societies (IPSs) – very flexible with light touch regulation, which could take the form of a co-operative society or a community benefit society (which might help attract grant funding)
  - Unincorporated Associations – very flexible but very little protection (members would have personal liability).
- All of these models could have charitable status but any asset transfers to charities were usually irreversible.
- Having limited liability status was important.
- Asset locks could be applied to CICs and community benefit societies.
- Unless the Council retained the service a contract would need to be entered into following contract law.
- EU law should not be an issue as draft regulations exempting mutuals were likely to be in force by the time Lewisham’s mutual was
established. The contract, under the Council’s constitution, would be a Category A contract, but a single tender action might be possible.

- TUPE would apply to staff transferring to the mutual, staff would keep their terms and conditions and pensions would need to be fully funded at the point of transfer.

43. It was further noted that:

- A mutual would be managed in the same way as any other contract with monitoring, penalties for non-performance, default provisions and exit plans.
- A really clear specification might improve staff performance as everyone would know exactly what they needed to provide.
- Officers would advise against ring-fencing part of the mutual’s budget for the voluntary and community sector (VCS) to allow the head of the mutual the entrepreneurial headroom to start an income generating business. That said, it was inconceivable that the mutual would not work solidly with the VCS and commission some provision through them, including specialist provision.

44. The following points were made by members of the Working Group in relation to the ELM option:

- There were lots of risks inherent in forming a mutual but officers were only tending to describe this option in positive terms.
- If the mutual option was to be explored further, a “pull-back” option should also be investigated.
- The impact on the 35 organisations currently commissioned to provide 37 youth projects needed to be considered.

Recommendations:
Should Mayor and Cabinet agree that a detailed plan to mutualise the Youth Service be developed within the next financial year, the Working Group recommends that this plan includes a governance framework that aims to ensure that:

- The local voluntary sector is involved and represented, possibly via the Voluntary Action Lewisham CYP Forum, in the governance arrangements of the ELM.
- The governing body of the ELM is represented as a stakeholder in public services, possibly through representation on the CYP Strategic Partnership Board.
- Staff, Young People and the Council are democratically represented in the ELM.

The plan should also cover:

- Achieving the necessary asset locks.
- Completing the business planning / preparation of a business case that
will be required for a single tender action.

- Ensuring that the ELM, throughout its existence, serves to meet the needs and aspirations of young people in the London Borough of Lewisham, in particular addressing disadvantage and inequality.

The following risks should be fully investigated:

- Potential LGPS and redundancy liabilities.
- The ELM’s liability for VAT.
- The ELM’s liability for Corporation Tax.
- Funding from the Council being viewed as state aid.

The Working Group notes that the development of a detailed plan to mutualise the Youth Service does not exclude other options for the future of the Youth Service being considered, should the ELM option not prove viable.
The draft Mayor and Cabinet report

45. At its meeting held on 17 December 2014, the Working Group discussed the tight timetable for commenting on the savings proposals before the Public Accounts Select Committee on 5 February. It was agreed that the draft Mayor and Cabinet report (scheduled for the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on 11 February 2015), providing a full options appraisal and a summary of the consultation results, would be provided to working group at its third meeting on 20 January 2015.

46. The Working Group discussed the draft report at its meeting on 20 December 2014 prior to making the recommendations contained in this report.
Appendices

Appendix A: Presentation by the Head of Law
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Models for mutuals
Kath Nicholson
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Confusion about types of employee led organisations

- Who controls?
- Legal form?
- Status?
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Mutuals – key features

- Shared purpose - for either closed community or more altruistic
- Ownership – by members. Held in common. No one entitled to share of assets
- Control – One member one vote. No majority shareholder
- Stakeholder representation – e.g. staff, users, external participants
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Social enterprise

- A type of venture, not a legal form for delivery vehicle
- Business/service
- Primarily social objectives
- Surpluses ploughed back in
- For community good not profit distribution
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Overlap

Community and vol org
Mutual
Social enterprise
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Models for delivery of mutual

- Company ltd by shares/guarantee
- Community interest company
- IPS – Co-operative models
- Unincorporated associations
- May have charitable status
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Choosing the right legal model

• Legal entity needed to hold manage and protect assets, enter contracts, leases etc
• Protection from individual liability for participants
• What degree of flexibility is needed in organisational structure?
• Credibility with well defined purpose and structure
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Limited companies

• Corporate body, limited liability, can own assets, contract, borrow money etc in own right
• Types
  Cos ltd by guarantee
  Cos ltd by shares
• Regulated by Cos House
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Companies limited by guarantee

• Liability limited on dissolution to value of guarantee usually nominal up to £10
• Good for most non profit making activities
• Often charities
• No share capital
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Companies ltd by guarantee

- Protect members from personal liability
- Can make profit but must plough back...
- Company law regulatory framework
- Transparency – annual accounts, directors' report etc
- Common for mutuals so long as mutual principles in Articles of Association

---
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Shares/guarantee?

Guarantors make company decisions but do not own it.

- Generally, companies limited by shares are owned by shareholders who receive dividends based on any profit. Liability limited to value of shareholding

---
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Community interest companies

- CICs – 2005 – custom made for social enterprise
- Ltd by shares or guarantee
- If ltd by shares – dividend cap
- Bound to use resources, income, profits for good of community served
- "Community Interest Test" – would a reasonable person perceive its activities as in the interests of community
- Community must be sufficiently broad and the company not politically motivated
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CICs

- "A badge of commendation"
- More regulation – Cos House and CIC Regulator
- Suitable for mutuals
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CICs

- Established like any other company but with Community Interest Statement and must pass Community Interest Test on formation and throughout
- Asset lock – assets (and profits/income) can only be used for good of community so….
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Asset lock

- Asset must stay in CIC, or
- Be used for community purposes for which CIC formed, or
- Transfer only if one of the following requirements is satisfied
  - Full consideration
  - To another asset locked body (e.g. CIC, charity) specified in Articles
  - To another asset locked body with consent of Regulator
  - Otherwise for the benefit of community
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Industrial and Provident Societies

- IPS origins in co-op movement
- HA's
- Separate legal identity
- Ltd liability for participants
- 2 types
  - Co-operative Society and Community Benefit Society
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IPS

- Flexibility
- Members actively control org and agree its policies and make its decisions by OMOV.
- Shares - nominal value (£1)
- Members agree rules in constitution registered with FSA
- Duties and powers of board/members highly flexible and matter for IPS rules, so can be tailored
- Light touch regulation
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Co-operative Society

- Formed for the benefit of its members rather than society at large
- Can distribute profits to members
- No asset lock
- May not be suitable for PSM.
- Could restrict membership to employees
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Com Ben Society

- Pursues wider public good rather than members' interests
- Can't distribute profits to members
- Can't distribute assets to members on dissolution
- May qualify for “exempt” charitable status if meets criteria for charitable status
- Same tax benefits as charity without same regulatory scrutiny
- Can apply asset lock
- Can raise funds by issuing shares without FCA sponsor
- Insolvency procedures aimed at rescue available now
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LLP

- LLP – Limited liability partnership – halfway house between incorporation and simple partnership.
- Corporate identity and ltd liability
- Advantages of Co with freedom to agree workings.
- Taxed as partnership
- Must be established to make profit
- Not usual for mutual but possible
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Unincorporated association

- Most flexibility, least protection
- Simple, easy to set up
- No regulators
- Personal liability, no corporate status
- Not suitable where employees engaged or assets held or contracts entered into
Charitable status

- Must be established for public benefit;
  and
- All purposes must be charitable

Charitable status

- Can be complex to set up
- Exempt from income and corporation tax, but not VAT
- Can hive off revenue making activities to non-charitable subsidiary
- Constraints on use of charitable funds and assets make earlier transfers virtually irreversible
- Effect on funding

Charitable purposes

- Relief of poverty
- Advancement of education, religion, health or saving of lives, citizenship or community development, arts, culture, heritage or science, amateur sport, human rights, conflict resolution or promotion of religious or racial harmony or equality/diversity
Charitable purpose

- Environmental protection or improvement
- Relief of those in need because of youth, ill health, age, disability, financial hardship or other disadvantage
- Advancement of animal welfare
- Promote efficiency of armed forces, police, fire, ambulance
- Other similar purposes

So what now?

- How to provide best possible YS with decreasing funds
- What sort of service do we want
- What are the delivery options, once that is agreed

Options

1) Do statutory minimum and none else
2) Do more than minimum - do all in house
3) Do some in house and some under 1 large contract
4) Do some in house and commission several contracts
5) Externalise all in one contract
6) Externalise all in several contracts
7) If 5 or 6, how to identify contractor
Some considerations

Best value duty – to ensure continuing improvement and economy, efficiency and effectiveness – can take into account social value considerations

Procurement process is usual method to demonstrate best value

Contract worth £1.6 million – procurement rules

EU law

• EU current position
• Part B – only requirements are non-discriminatory terms and award notice
• EU directive changing soon to require everything to go out to tender in EU but
• Draft Directive carves out mutuals from requirement to advertise in Europe – not in force yet
• Draft Regulations to translate into domestic law for contracts < 3 years (Art/Reg 77) – not in force yet. Expected 2015
• EU requirements unlikely to present difficulty

Procurement

• Council’s procedure rules
• Category A contract, over £500,000
• Public advert and competitive tender unless exemption applies
• Exemption applies only in exceptional or unforeseen circumstances approved by ED R&R, if
**Slide 31**

**Procurement**

- Nature of the market has been investigated and the departure is reasonable; or
- Extreme urgency; or
- Circs are otherwise genuinely exceptional
- And departure allowable in law.
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**The Question**

- “Do these circumstances apply to justify the Council pursuing an exclusive deal without being satisfied on the basis of a normal tender process and evaluation?”
- If so, Council will need to be satisfied it has best value from any contractual arrangement
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**Powers**

Section 1 Localism Act would allow local authority to establish mutual, provided properly applied
- specific outcomes to promote economic environmental and social wellbeing are identified
- not highly speculative
- not just about saving money.
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Contract letting rules still apply

- Even to local authority established mutual
- Level playing field if tendered
- Separation of client and potential contractor role in letting contract to avoid conflict
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TUPE

- Employees wholly or mainly engaged in transferring entity transfer to new contractor
- Terms and conditions intact
- Same or broadly similar pensions
- Heavy burden on contractor reflected in contract price
- Additional Council cost to fully fund pension liability at point of transfer
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Assets

- Council assets may be made available to contractor usually on lease or licence tied to duration of contract
- If in competition, at market rent reflected in contract price
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Some mutual issues

• National political commitment
• Assistance from Cab office etc re establishment
• May be highly motivated provider
• Experience of staff can be taken into account on award of contract
• Year on year reduction in price
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Some mutual issues

• Clear specification for any contract
• Satisfied as to ability of a newly founded mutual without track record outside the public sector
• Do mutual managers have commercial acumen?
• Sufficient financial backing from start?
• Long term viability of mutual? May look to Council if in financial trouble
• Exit strategy at end or if fails?
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Conclusion

• Establishment of a mutual by the Council is a legal possibility.
• The issue is, in letting a contract for YS, what is the best way to do that to achieve the best possible outcome for the youth of Lewisham?
ADDENDUM

1. Purpose

1.1 To provide an explanation of the Blue Badge reforms and to recommend the introduction of a £10 administration fee.

2. Summary

2.1 The Disabled Persons’ Parking Badge Scheme was introduced in 1971, under Section 21 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 (‘the 1970 Act’). The Scheme provides a national arrangement of on-street parking concessions for severely disabled people who are unable, or find it difficult, to use public transport.

2.2 In 2011 the Blue Badge scheme was reformed in order to crackdown on drivers who abuse the scheme and to introduce other changes to make it more sustainable for the future. In order to deliver efficiency savings and improve customer services it was decided to develop a blue badge improvement service which would be self funding and deliver efficiency savings of between £6.5 and £20 million per year nationally. It would improve customer services and establish an on-line application facility.

2.3 The changes also aimed to prevent abuse of the scheme and improve enforcement. A new badge was designed which is hard to copy, forge and alter. All badge production and printing is done centrally by Payne Security.

2.4 Another change related to the administration fee. Prior to the reforms we were able to charge £2 per successful application but the Council chose not to. This fee increased to £10 so that it covered the cost of the new badge design and postage fees. The savings proposal is to introduce the £10 fee.

2.5 The are 7,200 Blue Badges in use and these are renewed every 3 years on an annual cycle (i.e. approximately 2,400 each year).
3. Cost of Blue Badge administration

3.1 The production cost of 2,400 Blue Badges is £11,040 p.a.

3.2 The assessment, maintenance, issue and review costs for 2,400 Blue Badges is £22,500 p.a. (75% of a Scale 5 post) making a total annual cost of the service of £33,540.

3.3 The proposed introduction of a £10 administration fee would generate an income of £24,000 p.a.

3.4 The introduction of the £10 fee does not cover the full cost of the Blue Badge service. The Council would continue to fund the remaining £9,540.

4. Recommendation

4.1 It is recommended that a £10 administration fee be introduced for new and replacement blue badge applications in order to recoup the money spent on the scheme.

5. Financial Implications

5.1 The Council already has an electronic payment system so there would be no set up or training costs. The time spent taking the payments is referred to in (3) above.

5.2 For customers who cannot make a card payment we can use the Councils new invoicing facility. As this is available Council wide there will be no set up costs.
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report sets out the range of budget assumptions which Council is required to agree to enable it to set a balanced budget for 2015/16. These include the following:

- The proposed Capital Programme (General Fund and Housing Revenue Account) budget for 2015/16 to 2018/19 of £424.3m, of which £132.7m is for 2015/16;

- The proposed rent increase of 2.61% (an average of £2.51 per week) in respect of dwelling rents, 2.2% (average £1.50 per week) in respect of hostels, and a range of other proposed changes to service charges. The proposed annual expenditure for the Housing Revenue Account is £130.9m for 2015/16;

- The provisional Dedicated Schools Grant allocation of £275.8m and a separate Pupil Premium allocation of £18.2m for 2015/16.

- In respect of the General Fund, the assumed net revenue expenditure budget of £245.5m. This is made up of provisional Settlement Funding from government of £159.3m (grant and business rates), forecast Council Tax receipts, and a surplus on collection of Council Tax in previous years from the Collection Fund.

- The changes to the prior year General Fund position to meet the 2015/16 net revenue budget of £245.5m are proposed on the basis of the following assumptions:
  - £26.9m of revenue budget savings are proposed for 2015/16;
  - £1.5m of revenue budget savings have been previously agreed for 2015/16;
  - £7.5m is provided for budget pressures in 2015/16 of which it is being recommended that £4.3m of specific identified budget pressures be funded now and £3.2m be set aside for identified, but as yet un-quantified risks;
  - £5.0m use of the New Homes Bonus reserve for revenue purposes for one year with the position to be reviewed for 2016/17;
  - An assumed 0% increase in Council Tax for Lewisham’s services for 2015/16 and in so doing, receive the Government’s freeze grant of £1.0m; and
  - A combination of once-off reserves and provisions be used to fund the current savings shortfall of £5.4m for 2015/16 to balance the budget, pending further proposals from the Lewisham Future Programme in 2016/17 to make this up.
1.2 The report also looks to the medium term financial outlook and notes the prospects for the budget in 2016/17, savings required, and work of the Lewisham Future Programme to meet identified potential budget shortfalls in future years.

1.3 In addition, the report updates the Council’s Treasury Management strategy for both borrowing and investments. No fundamental changes are proposed to the approach or levels of risk the Council takes in its treasury functions.

2. PURPOSE

2.1 The purpose of this report is to set out the overall financial position of the Council in relation to 2014/15 and to set the Budget for 2015/16. This report allows for the Council Tax to be agreed and housing rents to be set for 2015/16. It sets the Capital Programme for the next four years and the Council's Treasury Strategy.

2.2 The report also provides summary information on the revenue budget savings proposals that were presented at Mayor & Cabinet on 12 November 2014. The approval and successful delivery of these savings are required in order to help balance the budget for 2015/16 and to address the budget requirement for 2016/17.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 It is recommended that the Mayor considers the comments of the Public Accounts Select Committee of 5 February 2015, which incorporate the views of the respective select committees on the revenue budget savings proposals for 2015/16.

3.2 That, having considered the views of those consulted on the budget, and subject to consideration of the outcome of consultation with business ratepayers, and subject to proper process and consultation, as required, the Mayor:

Capital Programme

3.3 notes the 2014/15 Quarter 3 Capital Programme monitoring position as set out in section 5 of this report;

3.4 recommends that Council approves the 2015/16 to 2018/19 Capital Programme of £424.3m, there are two new proposed major capital projects for 2015/16 and it includes an allocation of £90,000 of capital to Phoenix Housing in respect of their proposals for developing the Fellowship Inn, as set out in section 5 of this report and attached at Appendices W1 and W2;

Housing Revenue Account

3.5 notes and asks that the Council note the consultation report on service charges to tenants’ and leaseholders in the Brockley area, presented to area panel members on 11th December 2014, as attached at Appendix X3;

3.6 notes and asks that the Council note the consultation report on service charges to tenants’ and leaseholders and the Lewisham Homes budget strategy presented to area panel members on 15th December 2014, as attached at Appendix X4;
3.7 recommends that Council sets an increase in dwelling rents of 2.61% (an average of £2.51 per week) – option B as presented in section 6 of this report, in accordance with current Housing Revenue Account financial strategy;

3.8 recommends that Council sets an increase in the hostels accommodation charge by 2.20% (or £1.50 per week), in accordance with the Rent Restructuring formula;

3.9 recommends that Council approves the following average weekly increases for dwellings for:

3.9.1 service charges to non-Lewisham Homes managed dwellings (Brockley);

- caretaking 2.20% (£0.07)
- grounds 2.20% (£0.04)
- communal lighting 2.20% (£0.01)
- bulk waste collection 2.20% (£0.02)
- window cleaning 0.00% (£0.00)
- tenants’ levy No increase

3.9.2 service charges to Lewisham Homes managed dwellings:

- caretaking No increase
- grounds No increase
- window cleaning No increase
- communal lighting 40.70% (£0.35)
- block pest control 5.16% (£0.08)
- waste collection No change
- heating & hot water -18.93% (-£1.87) decrease
- tenants’ levy No increase

3.10 recommends that Council approves the following average weekly percentage increases for hostels and shared temporary units for;

- service charges (hostels) – caretaking etc.; 4.08% (£2.77)
- no energy cost increases for heat, light & power; 0.0% (£0.00)
- water charges increase; 5.88% (£0.01)

3.11 recommends that Council approves an increase in garage rents by Retail Price Inflation (RPI) of 2.3% (£0.20 per week) for Brockley residents and 2.3% (£0.27 per week) for Lewisham Homes residents;

3.12 notes and asks Council to note that the budgeted expenditure for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2015/16 is £130.9m;

3.13 agrees and asks Council to endorse the HRA budget strategy savings proposals in order to achieve a balanced budget in 2015/16, as attached at Appendix X1;

3.14 agrees to write off 20 cases of Former Tenants’ Arrears as set out in section 6 and Appendix X6, totalling £265,843.81;
Dedicated Schools Grant and Pupil Premium

3.15 agrees to recommend to Council, subject to final confirmation of the allocation, that the provisional Dedicated Schools Grant allocation of £275.8m be the Schools’ Budget for 2015/16; and

- Agree the changes to the funding arrangements for High Needs Pupils as set out in paragraph 7.12;

- Note the level of pupil premium anticipated for 2015/16 of £18.2m

General Fund Revenue Budget

3.16 notes and asks Council to note the projected overall variance against the agreed 2014/15 revenue budget as set out in section 8 of this report and that any year-end overspend will have to be met from reserves;

3.17 endorses and asks Council to endorse the previously approved revenue budget savings of £1.48m for 2015/16 and delegated budget savings proposals as per the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of the 12 November 2014, as set out in section 8 of the report and summarised in Appendix Y1;

3.18 notes that the revenue budget savings presented at this meeting under a separate report and as summarised in Appendices Y1 and Y2 will be used to balance the budget;

3.19 agrees and asks Council to agree the transfer of £5.0m in 2015/16 from the New Homes Bonus reserve to the General Fund for one year to meet funding shortfalls and that the position be reviewed again for 2016/17;

3.20 agrees the use of £5.4m reserves to fill the budget gap in 2015/16;

3.21 recommends to Council that it agrees to create a fund in respect of quantified revenue budget pressures in the sum of £4.3m in 2015/16, allowing the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration to hold these resources corporately until such time that these pressures emerge during the year, and authorises the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to allocate these funds to meet pressures when satisfied that those pressures cannot be contained within the Directorates’ cash limits;

3.22 recommends to Council that it agrees to create a fund in respect of as yet un-quantified revenue budget risks in the sum of £3.2m in 2015/16, allowing the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration to hold these resources corporately in case these pressures emerge during the year, and authorises the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to allocate these funds to meet such pressures when satisfied that those pressures cannot be contained within the Directorates’ cash limits;

3.23 agrees to recommend to Council that a General Fund Budget Requirement of £245.5m for 2015/16 be approved, based on a 0% increase in Lewisham’s Council Tax element and the 1% Council Tax freeze grant of £1.0m being accepted. This will result in a Band D equivalent Council Tax level of £1,060.35 for Lewisham’s services and £1,355.35 overall. This represents an overall decrease in Council Tax for 2014/15 of 0.3% and is subject to the GLA precept for 2014/15 being reduced by 1.3% from its existing 2014/15 level, in line with the GLA’s draft proposal;
3.24 notes the Council Tax Ready Reckoner which for illustrative purposes sets out the Band D equivalent Council Tax at various levels of increase. This is explained in section 8 of the report and set out in more detail in Appendix Y3;

3.25 asks that the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration issues cash limits to all Directorates once the 2015/16 Revenue Budget is agreed;

3.26 agrees to recommend to Council the draft Chief Financial Officer’s Section 25 Statement, as attached at Appendix Y4;

3.27 agrees the draft statutory calculations for 2015/16 as set out at Appendix Y5;

3.28 notes the prospects for the revenue budget for 2016/17 and future years as set out in section 9;

3.29 agrees that officers continue to develop firm proposals as part of the Lewisham Future Programme to help meet the forecast budget shortfalls in 2015/16 and for future years;

**Other Grants (within the General Fund)**

3.30 notes the adjustments to and impact of various specific grants for 2015/16 on the General Fund as set out in section 8 of this report;

**Treasury Management Strategy**

3.31 recommends that Council approves the prudential indicators and treasury limits, as set out in section 10 of this report;

3.32 recommends that Council approve the 2015/16 treasury strategy, including the investment strategy and the credit worthiness policy, as set out at Appendix Z3;

3.33 recommends that Council agrees to delegate to the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration authority during 2015/16 to make amendments to borrowing and investment strategies provided there is no change to the Council’s authorised limit for borrowing;

3.34 recommends that Council agrees the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy as set out in section 10 of this report.

3.35 recommends that Council agrees the credit and counterparty risk management criteria, as set out at Appendix Z3, the proposed countries for investment at Appendix Z4, and that it formally delegates responsibility for managing transactions with those institutions which meet the criteria to the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration;

3.36 recommends that Council agrees to decrease the maximum deposit limits with the part nationalised banks from £65m to £40m for each of Lloyds Banking Group and Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) Group;

3.37 notes that there was one incidence of a breach of the investment policy in November 2014 when an investment with an approved counter party was made for 12 months which should have been limited to 6 months; and
notes the development of the Municipal Bond Agency

4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT, POLICY CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

4.1 The 2015/16 Budget Report is structured as follows:
Section 1 Executive Summary
Section 2 Purpose
Section 3 Recommendations
Section 4 Structure of the Report, Policy Context and Background
Section 5 Capital Programme
Section 6 Housing Revenue Account
Section 7 Dedicated Schools Grant and Pupil Premium
Section 8 General Fund Revenue Budget and Council Tax
Section 9 Other Grants and Future Years' Budget Strategy
Section 10 Treasury Management Strategy
Section 11 Consultation on the Budget
Section 12 Financial Implications
Section 13 Legal Implications
Section 14 Human Resources Implications
Section 15 Crime and Disorder Implications
Section 16 Equalities Implications
Section 17 Environmental Implications
Section 18 Conclusion
Section 19 Background Documents and Further Information
Section 20 Appendices

POLICY CONTEXT

4.2 The Council’s strategy and priorities drive the Budget with changes in resource allocation determined in accordance with policies and strategy. The Council’s vision “together, we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn” was adopted by the Lewisham Strategic Partnership as part of the Sustainable Community Strategy, along with six over-arching priorities:

Sustainable Community Strategy

- **Ambitious and achieving**: where people are inspired and supported to their potential.
- **Safer**: where people feel safe and live free from crime, antisocial behaviour and abuse.
- **Empowered and responsible**: where people are actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities.
- **Clean, green and liveable**: where people live in high quality housing and can care for and enjoy their environment.
• Healthy, active and enjoyable: where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being.

• Dynamic and prosperous: where people are part of vibrant communities and town centres, well connected to London and beyond.

Corporate Priorities
The Council’s ten ‘enduring’ priorities were agreed by full Council and are the principal mechanism through which the Council’s performance is reported and through which the impact of saving and spending decisions are assessed. The Council’s priorities also describe the Council’s contribution to the delivery of Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy priorities.

• Community Leadership and Empowerment: developing opportunities for the active participation and engagement of people in the life of the community.

• Young people’s achievement and involvement: raising educational attainment and improving facilities for young people through partnership working.

• Clean, green and liveable: improving environmental management, the cleanliness and care for roads and pavements, and promoting a sustainable environment.

• Safety, security and a visible presence: partnership working with the police and others to further reduce crime levels and using Council powers to combat anti-social behaviour.

• Strengthening the local economy: gaining resources to regenerate key localities, strengthen employment skills and promote public transport.

• Decent Homes for all: investment in social and affordable housing to achieve the decent homes standard, tackle homelessness and supply key worker housing.

• Protection of children: better safeguarding and joined up services for children at risk.

• Caring for adults and older people: working with health services to support older people and adults in need of care.

• Active, healthy citizens: leisure, sporting, learning and creative activities for everyone.

• Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity: ensuring efficiency and equity in the delivery of excellent services to meet the needs of the community.

Values
Values are critical to the Council’s role as an employer, regulator, securer of services and steward of public funds. The council’s values shape interactions and behaviours across the organisational hierarchy, between officers, and members, between the council and partners and between the council and citizens. In taking forward the Council's Budget Strategy, we are guided by the Council's four core values:

• We put service to the public first.

• We respect all people and all communities.

• We invest in employees.

• We are open, honest and fair in all we do.
4.3 A strong and resilient framework for prioritising action has served the organisation well in the face of austerity and on-going cuts to local government spending. This has meant, that even in the face of the most daunting financial challenges facing the Council and its partners, we continue to work alongside our communities to achieve more than we could by simply working alone. This joint endeavour continues to secure massive investment in the borough: new homes, school improvements, regenerating town centres, new and renewed leisure opportunities and improvement in the wider environment, including award winning work on our river corridors. This work has done much to improve life chances and life opportunities across the borough through improved education opportunities, skills development and employment. And there is still much more that can be done to realise our ambitions for the future of the borough, ranging from our work to bring the Bakerloo Line extension here, with other transport improvements through to our nationally recognised programmes of care and support to some of our most vulnerable and troubled families.

4.4 However, it is clear that the Council cannot do all that it once did, nor meet all those expectations that might once have been met, for we are in a very different financial position than just a few years ago. Very severe financial constraints have been imposed on Council services, with cuts to be made year on year on year, and this on-going pressure is addressed here in this report, proposing further budget savings for 2015/16.

BACKGROUND

4.5 The requirement to rebalance the public finances and the financial outlook for the Council and the public sector as a whole remains extremely challenging.

4.6 The Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) provides independent analysis of the UK’s public finances. The most recent forecasts, released in December 2014, are for the period to 2018/19. They show that the UK economy has grown more in 2014 than originally predicted in March 2014. This has resulted in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) being revised up to 3.0% from 2.7% and forecasts for 2015 also being revised upwards from 2.3% to 2.4%. Inflation forecasts have been revised downwards due to lower than expected outturns in recent data and the effects of lower oil and food prices. It is expected that Consumer Price Index (CPI) inflation will remain below the Bank of England’s 2% target until 2017.

4.7 The OBR expect Public Sector net borrowing to fall by 0.6% of GDP in 2014/15, reaching 5.0% of GDP – half the peak it reached in 2009/10. Looking further ahead, the OBR expects the deficit to fall each year and to reach a small surplus by 2018/19.

4.8 In the Autumn Statement, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced further efficiency savings of £10bn for the public sector. It is expected that this will have a further detrimental effect on the Council’s funding in the years to come.

4.9 The Council has already made savings of £93m to meet its revenue budget requirements since May 2010 and is proposing further savings of £28.9m (£26.9m of new proposals, £0.5m of additional Council Tax collected, and £1.5m of previously agreed savings) for 2015/16.

4.10 The Medium Term Financial Strategy was reported to Mayor & Cabinet in July 2014. This set out that an estimated £85m of savings are required from 2015/16 to 2017/18.
The Lewisham Future Programme Board was established to progress cross-cutting and thematic reviews to deliver these savings.

4.11 The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement was announced on 18 December 2014, with the final settlement expected in early February 2014. Leaving all other previous assumptions unchanged, the provisional estimate is that the forecast savings required in 2015/16 remains at £40m.

4.12 This report sets out the position of the financial settlements as they impact on the Council’s overall resources:

- Capital Programme for 2015/16 to 2018/19;
- Housing Revenue Account and level of rents for 2015/16;
- Dedicated Schools Grant for 2015/16;
- General Fund Revenue Budget for 2015/16;
- Other Grants for 2015/16;
- Council Tax level for 2015/16; and

5 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

5.1 In considering the Council’s overall financial position, the Capital Programme is considered first. This is to ensure that any revenue implications of capital decisions are taken into account. The Capital Programme budget for 2015/16 to 2018/19 is proposed at £424.3m, of which £132.7m is for 2015/16.

5.2 This section of the report is structured as follows:

- Update on 2014/15 Capital Programme
- Proposed Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19

Update on 2014/15 Capital Programme

5.3 Progress in delivering the 2014/15 Capital Programme has been reported to Mayor & Cabinet and the Public Accounts Select Committee regularly throughout the year. The latest forecast projection is that £137.3m (93%) of the revised budget allocated for the year of £147.4m, and reported to Mayor and Cabinet on 12th November 2014, will be delivered this year. At this stage, the slippage of £10.1m has been re-phased to 2015/16.

5.4 The capital programme for 2014/15 has seen a number of schemes progress well with the main areas of capital spend involving the provision of school places and housing.

5.5 The Council has pursued an ambitious programme to transform the borough's schools and create state-of-the art facilities which would have a positive impact on children's education. Over £300m - a combination of central government and council money - has been spend on rebuilding or refurbishing schools over the last ten years. Drumbeat is a brand new school over two sites, catering specifically for children identified as having Autistic Spectrum Disorder. Brent Knoll School and Sydenham School are the last two schools being either rebuilt or refurbished as part of the Building Schools for the Future programme, with ongoing works due for completion in 2015/16.
5.6 The school places programme has resulted in an additional 645 Reception places being provided enabling the Council to offer a school place to all children whose families requested one and the Schools Minor Works Programme has successfully delivered building improvements to the primary schools estate. Delivered across 11 schools with a £1.5m budget, the programme has led to improvements to the building fabric, roof structures and heating systems. These works will improve the energy efficiency of the schools and help reduce on-going maintenance issues.

5.7 The borough’s first council housing development in 30 years was completed in January 2015. These homes are the first of 500 new council homes that are pledged to be built by 2018. These properties are part of the New Homes, Better Places programme that includes investment in social housing and housing for older people and working with developers to build more homes for Lewisham people at affordable prices. Six new homes near Mercator Road in Lee are now being advertised so prospective tenants can bid for them. As part of this programme, Lewisham Homes and Rooff will also seek to provide high quality employment, training and business opportunities.

5.8 In terms of housing the “New Homes, Better Places Programme” has led to six new homes that are nearing completion with 74 awaiting planning permission and a further 124 homes in process. In addition the hostels acquisition & conversion programme is also in progress with the acquisition of Hamilton Lodge and Canonbie Road now completed. When ready these will help alleviate some of the pressure on nightly paid accommodation. In addition, the proposed construction of the Ladywell pop-up village will also enable the Council to provide accommodation on a temporary basis as an alternative to nightly paid accommodation. Significant expenditure has also been incurred as part of the ongoing decent homes programme of works.

5.9 Other notable areas of capital project management and expenditure include:

- **Lewisham Gateway** - the largest regeneration scheme within Lewisham Town Centre, incorporating homes, retail space, Confluence Park, new pedestrian routes to Lewisham Station and revised a road layout.

- **Catford Stadium** - comprising 589 residential units, commercial floor space, a community centre, plus landscaping, including river naturalisation and creation of a public plaza between Catford and Catford Bridge Stations. Construction is now underway, and expected to continue through to June 2018.

- **Catford Broadway** - a £2.1 million makeover is complete, including a brand new level 'shared' surface to improve accessibility, new lighting and seating, plus better facilities for the market and means of attracting new market traders.

- **Marine Wharf West** - delivering new homes, shops and businesses and landscaping along the 30m wide former route of the Surrey Canal. Construction is nearing completion on the second and third phases, which include 78 units provided as an 'extra care' facility.

- **Cannon Wharf** - including a purpose-built business centre which is expected to create at least 80 new jobs on the site (25% more than previously), a children's nursery, and landscaping along the former route of the Surrey Canal. The first Business Centre and first tranche of commercial units will be ready for occupation in June 2015.

- **Beckenham Place Park** - awarded around £300k from the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) and the Big Lottery to further develop proposals to restore many of heritage features and make it more attractive to a wide range of local and regional visitors. Further HLF/Big Lottery funding, totalling £4.6 million, has been ring-fenced for the
delivery of the finalised plans. As this funding can be used for park-wide restoration works, gardens, visitor centres or recreational features, it is likely to see the reinstatement of the original lake and the introduction of numerous play features and an events space.

**Proposed Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19**

5.10 The Council’s proposed Capital Programme for 2015/16 to 2018/19 is currently £424.3m, as set out in Table A1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A1: Proposed Capital Programme for 2015/16 to 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Schools for the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools – Primary Places and other Capital Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways, Footways and Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Regeneration Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centres and High Street Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Revenue Account</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programme</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11 The resources available to finance the proposed Capital Programme are as set out in Table A2 below:
5.12 Members will note that the General Fund resources available to finance capital projects decrease over the term of the Programme. This reflects the Council’s prudent approach to long-term planning, with grants for later years not taken into account until they have been confirmed, and capital receipts only being taken into account when they have been received or are reasonably certain of being received. The Council prudently avoids entering into long-term expenditure commitments until there is more certainty as to how they can be financed.

5.13 The Highways and Footways programme of £3.5m per year, agreed by Mayor & Cabinet, has been included. A full list of changes to the Programme is shown in Appendix W2.

5.14 The two larger additions to the programme for 2015/16, both in the General Fund, are the agreement to loan up to £20m to Lewisham Homes to acquire street properties to help address the on-going nightly paid accommodation pressures and an anticipated £1.9m of borrowing for works to provide additional primary school places.

5.15 No changes are proposed at this stage to the existing General Fund revenue contributions to capital (CERA) of £2.0m per year from General Fund and £1.2m per year contribution from schools. The revenue funding line also includes amounts transferred to reserves in previous years for schemes which at that time, had not been delivered.

5.16 The Capital Programme will be further updated to include future grants, once these are known and will also include the year-end outturn expenditure and resourcing. This is expected to be reported to Members before the summer recess and will not impact on delivery of the Programme for 2015/16.
5.17 A significant amount of the future planned prudential borrowing is within the Housing Revenue Account, which is the available headroom within the self-financing settlements.

Summary

5.18 The proposed 2015/16 to 2018/19 Capital Programme totals £424.3m (General Fund £120.6m and HRA £303.7m) and includes all the Council’s capital projects. It sets out the key priorities for the Council over the four year period and will be reviewed regularly. The Capital Programme is set out in more detail in Appendices W1 and W2.

6. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

6.1 This section of the report considers the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). The budgeted expenditure for the HRA in 2015/16 is £130.9m

6.2 It is structured as follows:

- Update on the HRA financial position for 2014/15
- Update on the HRA Business Plan
- Future Years’ Forecast

Update on the HRA financial position for 2014/15

6.3 The HRA is budgeted to spend £104.0m in 2014/15. The latest forecast on the HRA for 2014/15, is that net expenditure can be contained within budget by the year end. There are currently minimal reported pressures, which can, if necessary, be mitigated by the use of once off contingencies, reserves and revenue working balances. Expenditure against repairs & maintenance budgets is expected to be contained within the sums allocated.

Update on the HRA Business Plan

6.4 The Housing self-financing system was implemented on 1 April 2012 when the HRA subsidy scheme was abolished. A 30 year financial model has been developed based on current management arrangements, updated for efficiency savings and cost pressures. In addition, policy objectives such as sheltered housing and new build plans are incorporated into the modelling.

6.5 The plan is due to have a major revision following the undertaking of detailed stock surveys to complete Decent Homes and other investment programmes over the next few years. This includes assumptions on future liabilities, programmes, savings and other requirements. These assumptions will be used to inform the resource need and identify potential gaps in funding and opportunities for additional income and grants.

6.6 In addition, the Council received in January the results of the bidding process to the GLA for additional Decent Homes backlog grant funding. This confirmed that the Council is one of two boroughs not to receive any additional Decent Homes monies.

6.7 The plan has also been recently updated with costs associated with new build units and a target of 500 additional units by the end of the Mayor’s current term.
6.8 The Council continually considers how best to respond to the challenges and opportunities of the HRA self-financing system. The combination of the new system and the significant housing pressures may, in due course, cause the Council to adopt new management arrangements in order to optimise delivery of policy objectives.

**Future Years’ Forecast**

6.9 The key purpose of the proposed HRA budget is to ensure that there are sufficient resources to support lifecycle works, repairs and maintenance, the Decent Homes programme and delivery of new homes in the borough. The reduction in management costs is also expected to continue.

6.10 The HRA is budgeted to spend £130.9m in 2015/16. Officers have examined budgets to identify savings opportunities to deliver services for improved value for money. These savings are included in the proposed budget for 2015/16. Overall Savings of £0.346m for 2015/16 were identified and put before Tenants Panels in December 2014. An explanation of the savings and options to achieve them are set out in more detail in Appendix X1. The feedback from the consultation is set out in Appendix X2. Should all of these proposals be agreed for 2015/16, they could be used for investment needs currently identified by the HRA Business Plan, or to off-set reductions in the proposed rent increase.

6.11 Under these proposals, the Lewisham Homes management fee would move from its current level of £18.676m in 2014/15 to £18.673m in 2015/16. This is after inflation allowances increases and a reduction for stock loss. However, this represents an overall increase of 1.52% in the fee per property compared to 2014/15.

6.12 Separate reports which set out in detail the proposals relating to service charges for Brockley and Lewisham Homes residents are attached at Appendix X3 and Appendix X4, respectively.

**Rental Income and allowances**

6.13 The average weekly rent is currently £95.97 in 2014/15.

6.14 In October 2013, Government consulted with Local Authorities on the implementation of a new social rent policy, proposing to move from annual increases of RPI + 0.5% (+£2 convergence where necessary) to CPI + 1%. This policy was confirmed by Government in May 2014 as its preferred method for rent increases for a 10 year period from 2015/16. In addition, the Government also assumed that the majority, if not all, Local Authority stock would or should be at its formula level as there had ‘been more than enough time’ to have moved rents to this level.

6.15 However, this is not the case in Lewisham as approximately 29% of stock has not yet reached its rent convergence level. The majority of London boroughs have also reported that their stock is not yet at the rent convergence levels.

6.16 The forecast increase in actual tenants’ rents, using the Government’s rent policy guidance of limiting actual increases to CPI at September 2014 of 1.20% + 1.0% is 2.20%, which equates to an average rise of £2.10pw. However, this would leave the HRA with an annual shortfall in rent of £693k against the business plan assumptions. In addition, the loss over the remaining life of the 30 year plan, assuming increases only in line with CPI + 1%, would be £26.3m.
6.17 In view of the change in policy, and the potential rental income shortfall against the HRA business plan assumptions, officers provided four illustrations of potential 2015/16 rent rises for consideration by residents and Mayor & Cabinet. These include following: A) Government guidance; B) continuation of Rent convergence until all units have reached their formula rent; and C) capped D) uncapped increases.

6.18 The table below provides the illustrations of various rent increases consulted on, and its impact on moving units to it’s formula or target level and the shortfall in income compared to the business planning assumptions for the HRA. It should be noted that illustration A assumes that convergence will not continue, whilst illustration’s B to D will continue with convergence. For example, a rise in line with the previous convergence formula will generate £1.89m in additional rental income. A rent rise lower than this is likely to result in additional lost resources in the HRA. For example, a rent rise of CPI plus 1% would generate £1.58m in additional rental income, a reduction of £311k or £0.41 per dwelling per week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>A CPI + 1%</th>
<th>B RPI + 0.5% + £2</th>
<th>C Overall 3% increase capped to £10pw</th>
<th>D Overall 3% Increase not capped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Limit Rent *</td>
<td><strong>£98.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>£98.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>£98.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>£98.92</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Convergence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Rise £</td>
<td><strong>£2.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2.87</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Rise %</td>
<td><strong>2.20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.61%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.88%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Average rent</td>
<td><strong>£98.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>£98.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>£98.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>£98.78</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units On Formula</td>
<td>10,264</td>
<td>13,031</td>
<td>14,079</td>
<td>14,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units not on Formula</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Rise £</td>
<td><strong>£3.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>£6.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>£10.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>£20.92</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest rise %</td>
<td><strong>2.20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.49%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.71%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Rise £</td>
<td><strong>£1.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1.44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest rise %</td>
<td><strong>2.20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent rise value</td>
<td><strong>£1,583,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,894,761</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,089,886</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,170,690</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional rent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>£310,791</strong></td>
<td><strong>£505,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>£586,720</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall against business plan</td>
<td>-£613k</td>
<td>-£302k</td>
<td>-£107k</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term shortfall</td>
<td><strong>£24.6m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£0.90m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£0.107m</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence (Yr’s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.19 The table also shows the impact of the various increases in terms of new average rent and average increases. It also shows the effect on the number of units not currently at its convergence or formula rent.

6.20 The illustrated proposals all show a reduction against the assumptions in the current HRA financial model, with fewer resources available to the HRA business plan. It would therefore be likely that additional savings/efficiencies would be required to make up for any lost resources.

6.21 A rent rise higher than the limit rent calculation will result in additional recharges to the HRA via the Housing Benefit (HB) subsidy limitation charges. Any rise above this level will be lost through additional limitation recharges and therefore result in no benefit to the HRA.

6.22 The table below shows increased proposed or being consulted on by other providers in London:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councils</th>
<th>Indicative average increase</th>
<th>Proposed increase Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>Convergence in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td></td>
<td>CPI+1%+£2 (2.2% + £2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham/Havering</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td></td>
<td>RPI + 0.5% + £2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.23 Tenants were asked to provide comments and feedback on the illustrations for inclusion in the Mayor & Cabinet budget report at meetings held with Brockley PFI and Lewisham Homes tenants. There was a strong expression of concern raised relating to options B, C and D. The greatest concern was for the impact of the rent rise on working tenants, particularly in the cases of options C and D, as the proposals were significantly higher than pay awards over the last five years. The comment was made that last year’s rise was also significantly higher than increases in pay.

6.24 Tenants of both Brockley and Lewisham Homes overwhelmingly favoured option A, although some sympathy was shown to option B. Options C and D were considered unacceptable by all tenants in attendance.
6.25 The three responses received from Excalibur tenants expressed a consistent stance that the rents on that estate should not be increased due to the poor standards of the properties and the lack of Council investment in the estate.

6.26 Further details of the consultation results can be found in appendix X2.

6.27 Details of the options for the rent rise for 2015/16 were presented to the Housing Select Committee on 17th December 2014. Members indicated that they favoured option B, allowing the council to stick to its current plans.

6.28 Having regard to the consultation held in December 2014, the Mayor is asked to make a recommendation to full Council that a rent increase be agreed to accord with one of the options A, B, C or D. The range of new average rents are between £98.01 to £98.78 with officers proposed option being option B with an average rent of £98.42.

Other Associated Charges

6.29 There are a range of other associated charges. These include: garage rents, tenants levy, hostels, linkline, private sector leasing, heating and hot water. These charges and any proposed changes to them for 2015/16 have been set out in detail in Appendix X5.

Summary

6.30 The gross budgeted expenditure for the HRA in 2015/16 is £130.9m. The Mayor is asked to make a recommendation to full Council for a rent increase having considered tenants feedback following consultation on rent illustrations A to D, held in December 2014. The current average weekly rent is £95.97 in 2014/15. The illustrations provided are within a band of average rents of between £98.01 to £98.78 with the officers proposed option being option B with an average rent of £98.42.

Former Tenants’ Arrears Write Offs

6.31 The HRA self-financing of 2012 means that the Council now has considerably greater control over the long term planning of its Housing Revenue Account, and this longer term focus has allowed excellent progress to be made in delivering investment into new Council homes for the first time in 30 years.

6.32 As part of the annual review of the HRA and the setting of associated budgets, this long term focus also requires officers to review both the assumptions that underpin long term plans and the operational performance of delivering that plan. In that regard it is important for officers to consider at this time the likelihood of recovering all of the income to which the Council is due.

6.33 Lewisham Homes has substantially improved the way its income collection processes work and has addressed the majority of historic arrears cases. The percentage of rent collected in 2013/14 was 97.86% and at the latest update, 99.65% had been collected in the current financial year. This high income collection rate strengthens the performance of the HRA and enables greater levels of investment for both existing residents and to build the new Council homes Lewisham so desperately needs.

6.34 However, there remains a limited number of historic bad debt cases in which Lewisham Homes, despite exhausting all possible options, has been unable to collect. In total there are 20 such cases, some of which date back nearly a decade, which in total
constitute outstanding arrears of £265,843.81. A summary of these cases is set out at Appendix X6.

6.35 Lewisham Homes advises officers that in all of these cases it has exhausted all possible recovery options and now as such these debts as unrecoverable. In order to remove unrecoverable debt from the Council’s portfolio, the Mayor is recommended to agree that for each of these cases the historic debt be written off off.

7. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT AND PUPIL PREMIUM

7.1 This section of the report considers the Dedicated Schools’ Grant (DSG) and level of Pupil Premium for 2015/16. This grant is formula based, calculated by the Government with the Council passing it onto schools. The respective budgets for 2015/16 are £275.8m and £18.2m.

7.2 It is structured as follows:

- Update on 2014/15 Dedicated Schools’ Grant
- Dedicated Schools’ Grant for 2015/16
- Pupil Premium

Update on 2014/15 Dedicated Schools’ Grant

7.3 The level of the Dedicated Schools’ Grant (DSG) for 2014/15 is £268.6m. This will be revised later to take account of the pupil count which for early years children is undertaken in January 2015.

7.4 The only current budget pressure in the DSG arises from children with SEN statements / Education, Care and Health plans within the High Needs block of the grant. As this can be met from a previous year carry forward, the grant is expected to be balanced at the year end.

Dedicated Schools’ Grant for 2015/16

7.5 The DSG for 2015/16 has provisionally been set by the Department for Education (DfE) at £275.8m, although this will change during the year to reflect updated pupil numbers. This is the first year that the DSG has been bigger than the Councils Net General Fund budget. It is now £30m larger than the Net General Fund for 2015/16.

7.6 In comparison with last year, there is a £7.2m increase (2.7%) in the DSG. This increase is due to the following:

- some £8.1m relates to the inclusion in the settlement for Academy schools not included previously. The funding will be recouped by the Education Funding Agency later in the year. All Academies are now included in the DSG. The inclusion of Academies in the DSG will demonstrate the base funding for all schools within the Borough is on a comparable basis. The EFA then provide additional funds to reflect Academies additional responsibilities.
- A funding adjustment for part recoupment academies that were included in the funding settlement for 2014/15. The extra funding is £0.7m
Although the amount per pupil has been frozen in cash terms there is an increase of £4.8m driven by the estimated increase in pupil numbers, largely in the primary age group.

The funding for two years olds has been excluded from the settlement. The funding for two year olds will be announced in June 2015. The funding excluded is estimated, based on current projections, at £6.7m.

A new pupil premium for early years children, £0.3m

7.7 Once inflation of 2.5% for the year is taken into account, this funding represents a real terms reduction in funding of 1.0%

7.8 Individual Schools’ Budgets (ISBs) vary year on year mainly due to changes to pupil numbers. The Schools’ Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) has been set at a negative figure of minus 1.5%, which relates to the funding level per pupil (i.e. the per pupil funding in a school cannot fall by more than 1.5%).

7.9 The Schools Forum considered the Dedicated Schools Budget on 11 December 2014. The Forum has legal responsibilities to decide some budgets, while for others their role is to take a view.

7.10 Under the regulations the Forum decides:

- Whether some elements of funding given to schools should no longer be delegated but instead managed centrally. This includes contingency funds, the administration of free meals, supply cover and insurance.

- The budget level of central spend which includes growth funds, early years expenditure, admissions and capital expenditure from revenue. The budget of the later, under the funding regulations, is capped at the 2013/14 level.

7.11 The Council has to consult the Schools Forum on arrangements for Special Educational Needs (SEN) children. The Forum’s powers extend to giving a view but the final decision lies with the Council.

7.12 The projection for 2015/16 is an overspend of £2.1m on the High Needs Block if no action is taken. The Schools Forum has agreed and recommended an approach to manage this shortfall in 2015/16 by reducing the top-up to schools budgets for High Needs Pupils (£1.8m) and reducing the funding given to school collaboratives (£0.3m). The task group set up by the Schools Forum to manage the High Needs Pupils costs in 2014/15 has agreed to continue to meet.

7.13 The Forum recommended that, as the Dedicated Schools Grant was cash frozen, the funding rates used to calculate ISBs should stay at the same level as 2014/15.

7.14 The Schools Forum on 25 September 2014 considered the proposed increase in charges in the Council services that are traded with them. The School Forum supported the proposal that the General Fund of the Council should not subsidise school activities and noted the increase in prices proposed. At their meeting of 11 December 2014 detailed consideration was given to the Public Health services that will be traded with schools in 2015/16 and asked that the Service Level Agreement offer be developed further.
Pupil Premium

7.15 In addition to the DSG, schools will continue to receive the pupil premium. The pupil premium in 2014/15 was allocated to schools on the basis of the number of children who were entitled to a free school meal in the past six years. At the start of each year, the DfE provide a forecast of the numbers of pupils on roll. This is subsequently revised to an actual number later in the year.

7.16 In 2014/15, the rate of funding was £1,300 per primary child, £935 per secondary child and £1,900 per child in Looked After Care. The only change for 2015/16 is to the primary rate which rises by £20 to £1,320k. The current overall estimated levels of funding for the pupil premium in Lewisham are summarised in Table B1.

Table B1 – Pupil Premium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Children</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>No. of Children</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>£11.2m</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>£12.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>£5.3m</td>
<td>5,369</td>
<td>£5.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after Children</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>£0.8m</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>£0.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted From Care</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>£0.2m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£17.3m</td>
<td></td>
<td>£18.2m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX

8.1 This section considers the General Fund revenue budget and Council Tax. The General Fund budget for 2015/16, assuming a Council Tax increase of 0%, is £245.5m. Details of the savings anticipated for 2015/16 are provided at Appendices Y1 and Y2.

8.2 It is structured as follows:

- Update on 2014/15 Revenue Budget
- The Budget Model
- Council Tax for 2015/16
- Overall Budget Position for 2015/16.

Update on 2014/15 Revenue Budget

8.3 The Council’s revenue budget for 2014/15 was agreed at Council on 29 February 2014. The budget requirement was set at £268.1m.

8.4 During the financial year, monthly monitoring is undertaken by officers and these monitoring reports have been presented quarterly to Mayor & Cabinet and scrutinised by the Public Accounts Select Committee. Significant attention continues to be directed towards volatile budget areas. Volatile areas are those where small changes in activity levels can drive large cost implications. These include, for example; Looked After Children, No Recourse to Public Funds; Nightly Paid Accommodation; and Adult Social Care. These areas of activity are also informed by risk assessments which are continually reviewed.
8.5 Budget holders have been challenged to maintain tight control on spending throughout the year through the continuation and strengthening of Directorate Expenditure Panels (DEPs). In addition to this, a Corporate Expenditure Panel (CEP) was introduced in late October 2014. The Chief Executive and the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration sit on this panel and it has served to provide an additional layer of scrutiny and challenge to existing DEPs.

8.6 The initial projected overspend of £11.2m was reported at the end of May 2014. Even since this position was first reported back in the spring, the scale of the projected overspend had suggested that the Council would be facing budget pressures of a different order to those of previous years. A series of measures and management actions have been employed over the course of the financial year and this has helped to alleviate some of the pressure with the latest projected forecast of £9.5m being reported to the end of December 2014. This is still a significant overspending projection and the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration will continue to work with directorate management teams across the council to effect the necessary continued actions to manage their service pressures.

8.7 The forecast variances by Directorate are set out in Table C1 below.

**Directordates**

8.8 Table C1 sets out the latest forecast budget variances on the General Fund by Directorate.

**Table C1: Forecast outturn for 2014/15 as at end of November 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Gross budgeted spend</th>
<th>Gross budgeted income</th>
<th>Net budget</th>
<th>Forecast over/ (under) spend Dec 2014</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
<td>74.3 (20.4)</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>168.0 (58.0)</td>
<td>110.0 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Services</td>
<td>100.3 (63.1)</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Regeneration</td>
<td>44.5 (12.2)</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorate Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>387.1 (153.7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>233.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Items</td>
<td>34.7 0.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>421.8 (153.7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>268.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate Financial Provisions**

8.9 Corporate Financial Provisions are budgets that are held centrally for corporate purposes, which do not form part of the controllable expenditure of the service directorates. They include Capital Expenditure charged to the Revenue Account (CERA), Treasury Management budgets such as Interest on Revenue Balances (IRB) and Debt Charges, Corporate Working Balances and various provisions for items such as early retirement and voluntary severance. The spend on Corporate Financial Provisions is expected to be contained within budget by the year-end.
8.10 Consideration is now being given to employing the use of corporate measures to balance the budget at year end. It is proposed to meet any 2014/15 budget overspend from reserves.

The Budget Model

8.11 This section of the report sets out the construction of the 2015/16 base budget. This section is structured as follows:

- Budget assumptions, including: Savings, Council Tax, and Inflation
- Budget pressures to be funded
- Risks and other potential budget pressures to be managed

Budget assumptions, including: Savings, Council Tax and Inflation

8.12 The Council has made substantial reductions to its expenditure over the last four years. On all credible economic forecasts, it will continue to need to make further reductions for at least the next three to five years. This section of the report summarises a series of proposals that would enable the Council to set a balanced budget for 2015/16 as part of a sustainable financial strategy to 2018/19.

Savings

8.13 On the 12 November the Mayor:
- Endorsed previously agreed savings proposals from the 2014/15 budget of £1.48m for 2015/16;
- Delegated £11.83m of savings proposals of which £8.56m were for 2015/16 to Executive Directors to agree and implement;
- Rejected the 2015/16 Option 2 savings proposal for the Youth Service of £1.75m;
- Agreed for consultation and further work to proceed on £26.75m of savings proposals, of which £18.87m are for 2015/16. The results of this work are presented in the separate savings report to accompany this report for the Mayor’s decision.

8.14 The Medium Term Financial Strategy in July 2014 identified the need for further work on the potential use of reserves and provisions. The proposals are to use:
- £5.0m of New Homes Bonus reserve in 2015/16 to cover part of the shortfall in revenue balances.

8.15 In total the above means a shortfall of £5.4m is required to balance the 2015/16 budget, if all the new savings proposals of £26.9m put forward for 2015/16 are agreed.

8.16 Following the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement in December 2014, the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration has been considering options to bridge the budget shortfall in order to balance the budget for 2015/16. The options include using of a mixture of on-going and once-off resources. This is explained in more detail towards the end of this section.

8.17 Estimates for 2016/17 to 2017/18 are less certain, particularly as the local government finance settlement only contains details up to 2015/16. In the Autumn statement, the Chancellor of the Exchequer implied further cuts in public spending of around £10bn. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that the Council will continue to need to make significant savings over the medium-term. It is estimated that further savings against the General Fund resources of between £40m to £50m will be required over the
course of 2016/17 to 2017/18. The prospects for future years’ budgets are set out in more detail in section 9 of this report.

Council Tax

8.18 The assumption used in the model for preparing the budget for 2015/16, subject to confirmation by Council, is for a 0% Council Tax increase and receipt of the 1% Council Tax freeze grant from Government. If Council choose to set a different Council Tax increase they will need to be mindful that any increase in Council Tax of 2% or more would require support in a local referendum. The limit being set by the Secretary of State. Further information on the options for Council when setting the Council Tax is set out towards the end of this section.

Inflation

8.19 The Government's inflation target for the United Kingdom is defined in terms of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) measure of inflation which excludes mortgage interest payments. Since April 2011, the CPI has also been used for the indexation of benefits, tax credits and public service pensions.

8.20 On 16 December 2014, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) reported that the rate of CPI inflation in the UK stood at 1.0% in November, down from 1.3% in October. This is a 12 year low, the last time the rate was as low as 1.0% was September 2002. It is well below the 2.0% target set by the Government, and is expected to fall below 1.0% in early 2015.

8.21 For financial planning purposes, the Council has previously assumed an average pay inflation of 1.0% per annum, which equates to approximately £1.1m. In November 2014, a pay award of 2.2% was agreed for 2015/16 by the National Joint Council for Local Government Services (NJC). This equates to approximately £2.6m to be provided for in 2015/16.

8.22 The Council currently applies a non-pay inflation rate of 2.5% per annum. This equates to approximately £2.5m per annum. This figure has been put forward as an efficiency saving for three years starting from 2015/16.

New Homes Bonus

8.23 The New Homes Bonus (NHB) sits alongside the Council’s planning system and is designed to create a fiscal incentive to encourage housing growth. The Department for Communities and Local Government is paying the NHB as an un-ringfenced grant to enable local authorities to decide how to spend the funding. The scheme design sets some guidance about the priorities that spend should be focused on, in that it is being provided to ‘help deliver the vision and objectives of the community and the spatial strategy for the area and in line with local community wishes’.

8.24 The NHB is paid each year for six years, with the last year being 2016/17. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new-build homes, conversions and long-term empty homes brought back into use. There is also an extra payment for providing affordable homes.

8.25 The provisional allocation for 2015/16 in Lewisham, including on-going payments, is £7.842m with the allocation for Year 5 (2015/16) delivery being £1.399m.

8.27 The Government has not yet confirmed the amounts each authority will contribute to the £70m London LEP top slice in 2015/16, however it has outlined how it intends to calculate this, and has published provisional allocations. Lewisham’s provisional contribution is £2.218m, which leaves a revised allocation of £5.624m for Lewisham’s own use.

8.28 The cumulative nature of the NHB is set out in summary in Table C6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C6 – New Homes Bonus Allocation Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less London LEP Top slice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.29 Officers have established a cross-departmental NHB working party. The group was initially formed in order to review the empty homes data and reduce long term empty properties in the Borough. Since the group formed, the number of empty properties within the borough has decreased.

8.30 The Council produces an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which assesses the level of development which has taken place and reviews the performance on plan making and related steps being undertaken to progress the regeneration of the borough.

8.31 The majority of planned growth for the borough is yet to come. The AMR provides an update on the progress of strategic sites within the regeneration and growth areas, including Deptford and New Cross, Lewisham Town Centre and Catford Town Centre. Overall, strategic sites are progressing well and are generally being constructed within anticipated timescales, with no significant barriers or major blockages to delay the development of these sites in the future. The AMR also provides a housing trajectory and identifies the anticipated amount of residential development over the next 14 years to 2028/29.

8.32 In view of the planned growth in housing and associated infrastructure in the borough in future years it was agreed to commit £0.65m of the NHB allocation per annum to provide delivery support for this. This represents a significant year-on-year commitment for the Council. Given the planned growth in the Lewisham over the next 14 years, the funding would be used to improve the borough’s town centres, increase the number of jobs in the borough, provide improved transport links to the rest of London and build upon the necessary infrastructure such as schools, health facilities and open spaces.
8.33 While initially being held with a view to funding future capital works, a review of the NHB has been conducted and, given the pressures on the overall budget, it is now proposed to use some of the NHB for revenue funding shortfalls. This will be effected by releasing £5.0m of the accumulated reserve balance from the NHB scheme to the General Fund in 2015/16 only. We have not projected to spend any NHB beyond that as there is some uncertainty around the future of the scheme beyond 2015/16. We will review the position again in 2016/17.

**Budget Pressures to be funded**

8.34 As in previous years, £7.5m of funds are set aside in the budget model to meet specific identified budget pressures and identified potential budget risks.

8.35 In addition, from 2014/15 the unallocated amount of risk fund was £3.9m. In respect of this budget as it is carried into 2015/16, it is now recommended that a number of specific identified pressures be funded now.

8.36 For 2015/16, this means the risk fund will be £11.4m (£7.5m + £3.9m). The budget pressures anticipated in 2015/16 have been reviewed by the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and it is recommended that a number of these specific identified pressures are funded now.

8.37 In terms of accounting for these, consistent with prior years, it is proposed that the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration hold these funds corporately until such time that these pressures emerge within Directorate budgets and it has been determined that they cannot be contained within Directorates’ cash limits during the year.

8.38 Table C2 provides a summary of the Corporate budget pressures that are being recommended to be funded.

**Table C2: Summary of 2015/16 budget pressures to be funded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressures set against 2014/15 unallocated budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No Recourse to Public Funds</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nightly Paid Accommodation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures to be set against 2015/16 risk budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actuarial Valuation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• London Living Wage &amp; Travel Time</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highways and footways pressure</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environment – Waste Disposal</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concessionary Fares</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - pressures recommended to be funded</strong></td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No Recourse to Public Funds – £2.90m*

8.39 These are families who have made an application to remain in the country and are waiting to be dealt with by the Home Office. These clients are not seeking asylum but are people to whom the local authority owes a duty of care. This has emerged as a
significant budget pressure since 2013/14 and reported to the Public Accounts Select Committee regularly as part of the financial monitoring report.

8.40 Action is being taken to manage this risk. In 2014/15 a dedicated pilot was run to look at the families concerned to ensure that they are entitled to payment. The impact of this work has been to reduce the number of cases accepted. In addition, with the support of a seconded officer from the Home Office Border Agency, work is underway to re-assess the support arrangements for those already accepted. The impact of this work is starting to see the level of spend in this area decline.

8.41 It is estimated that over time this work will reduce to an ongoing level of just over £3m. It is therefore proposed to allocate £2.9m to the existing base budget at this time and hold the remaining risk against the unallocated risk fund.

Housing Needs – £1.00m

8.42 An increase in the number of homelessness applications has lead to a significant increase in the number of people placed in nightly paid accommodation. The shortage of housing in London has also impacted on the situation. Limited new supply has meant that the movement in re-lets and new housing opportunities has reduced. The increase in demand for nightly paid accommodation has also meant that prices have increased faster than the benefit cap. A number of measures are being considered to ease the pressure but the impact will continue into the next financial year.

8.43 The annual cost pressure in this area is estimated at £2.0m in 2014/15 against an annual budget of £0.5m, with the effect of recent cost saving measures starting to be felt. For this reason it is proposed to set aside £1.0m in 2015/16 from the risk fund to address this anticipated continuing pressure.

Actuarial Valuation – £1.00m

8.44 An actuarial valuation of the Pension Fund was carried out as at 31 March 2013. This calculated the funding level at 71.4% and set employer’s contribution rates until 31 March 2017. This represents a deterioration of 5.3% from the position at the 2010 valuation which assessed the funding level at 75.4%. The deterioration is attributable to changes in the Fund’s portfolio along with other financial and demographic changes.

8.45 The actuary has applied a stabilisation mechanism which restricts movements in employers contributions within a 1% increase and 2% decrease range to recognise both affordability issues and the potential improvement in investment returns in the inter-valuation period from 2014 to 2017. Additional stablisation funding of £1.0m will be provided for 2015/16.

Adults’ Social Care – Care Provider Terms & Conditions, including the London Living Wage and Travel Time - £2.20m

8.46 Firstly, there has been an increase of almost 4% in London Living Wage (LLW) and the current domiciliary care contracts have just been extended. Providers have been offered 1% for an extension until October 2015 when new contracts will be in place. There is also a need to increase direct payment rates by a minimum of 3% to honour the LLW commitment. LLW has not been built into residential/nursing block contracts yet, but there is some pressure to do so. Requirement to enrol staff in pension schemes will be a further cost pressure.
8.47 Secondly, there is an expectation under the Care Act that Home Care workers are paid reasonably for travelling between visits. Current domiciliary care contracts are not clear on this so payment of travelling time would probably require increased funding from the Council.

8.48 To support the work to bring all the Council's care contracts in line with the above terms and conditions and wages it is proposed to provide additional funding of £2.2m from 2015/16.

**Highways and Footways pressure – £0.35m**

8.49 The ten year investment programme for the resurfacing of highways and footways in the Borough has come to an end and future funding arrangements need to be established. In 2014/15 it was agreed that an ongoing highways resurfacing budget of £3.0m be established over a ten year period. In the first year, this was funded by a combination of pressures funding, reserves and the release of existing prudential borrowing budgets as debt is repaid.

8.50 Corporate funding of £0.3m for 2015/16 will be provided with an additional £0.3m being added to the budget until 2020/21 and a balance of £0.1m in 2021/22. Therefore, the total allocation over the period is £2.2m, although this will eventually be offset by £0.8m of released budget arising from repaid prudential borrowing over the period 2024/25 to 2033/34.

8.51 It was also agreed in 2014/15 to create an ongoing budget of £0.5m for the replacement of footways over a ten year period 2014/15 until 2023/24. For 2015/16, a budget allocation of £0.05m will be needed with an additional £0.05m being added to the budget for each of the years to 2023/24.

8.52 As part of the Capital Programme set out in section five of this report, capital investment for highways and footways of £3.5m per year has been included for 2014/15 onwards.

**Environment Waste Disposal – £0.30m**

8.53 Disposal tonnages have been increasing during 2014/15. To date, the associated increased costs are being contained within the environment budget. There is a further risk on increases in gate fees for recycling and an above inflation increase in the SELCHP gate fee. If the tonnages stay at current levels or increase further and the fee increases materialise, there will be a pressure on the budget of approximately £0.3m in 2015/16.

**Concessionary Fares – £0.43m**

8.54 London Councils have advised of Lewisham's Freedom Pass costs for 2015/16. The figure is £0.43m higher than 2014/15.

**Risks and other potential budget pressures to be managed**

8.55 Following the review of budget pressures within Directorates, there are a number of other risks and issues which, although difficult to quantify with absolute certainty, could prove significant should they materialise.
8.56 Officers continue to undertake work to fully assess and monitor these risks. These risks and other potential budget pressures are discussed in more detail below:

- Demographic Pressures
- Looked After Children
- Business Rate appeals
- Child Sexual Exploitation
- Redundancy
- Unachieved savings

**Demographic pressures**

8.57 There is an increase in the transfer of high cost packages and placements for young people with a learning disability from the Children & Young People’s directorate to Adult Social Care. Increases in other client groups are lower, but the number of the most elderly in the borough appears to be increasing too along with their needs. Additional provision also has to be made for a few new physical disability placements a year (brain injuries and other accidents).

**Looked After Children**

8.58 The Looked after Children service provides social work support to all the children who are looked after by the London Borough of Lewisham. It performs all the statutory functions, including care planning and ensuring that their health and education needs are met. At the start of 2010, the number of Looked After Children peaked and then they started to decline. This continued until the summer of 2011 from when numbers were fairly stable. However, the numbers started to rise again in April 2013. Even though the budget pressure is being managed down in 2014/15 through effective and economic placement decisions, overall there remains a risk.

8.59 The current demographics indicate that the pupil population is growing by 2.5% which, all other things being equal, roughly projects to an increase in the Looked After Children of one a month creating a potential budget pressure.

**Business Rate appeals**

8.60 The Valuation Office continues to hear appeals on valuations from the 2010 list. Any of these that are upheld will require the Council to return the backdated overpayment and reduce the ongoing level of rates to be collected. This cost can be amortised over five years. At the same time new businesses may be starting and additional rates collected. Given these uncertainties it is not possible to fully evaluate the risk at this time.

**Child Sexual Exploitation**

8.61 This is a risk area across London which may, if the number of cases locally grows significantly, become a pressure in the future. At present the service is managing this risk by refocusing existing resources within their current budget and expect to be able to do through 2015/16. Given these uncertainties it is not possible to fully evaluate the risk at this time.
Redundancy

8.62 The Council will seek to minimise the impact of savings on services and jobs. However, a significant proportion of the Council’s budget goes on staff salaries and wages, so it will not be possible to make savings of £85m over the next three years without an impact on jobs. The cost of redundancy depends on age, seniority and length of service of the individuals affected, and it is not possible to calculate the overall financial impact at this stage.

Unachieved savings

8.63 For those savings agreed there is a risk, as the detailed work to implement them progresses, of delay or changes to the proposals in response to consultations or other factors. These changes may impact the value of the saving that can be achieved, either in total or more often in terms of achieving a full year’s financial impact.

8.64 Such pressures cannot be easily quantified at this stage, although it is estimated that it could be up to £4.0m on the current proposals of £26.9m for 2015/16. Should these pressures arise in the year and not be able to be contained with Directorate budgets, they could be met from the risk fund or become an additional call on reserves.

Summary of Budget Pressures

8.65 There are some pressures to be funded (paragraphs 8.34 to 8.54), which can be quantified within a reasonable range. There are also a number of other risks and potential budget pressures (paragraphs 8.55 to 8.63) to consider which are less easy to quantify with any certainty.

8.66 In conclusion, it is a matter of good budgeting to make a general allowance for risk and uncertainty, particularly at such a time of rapid change in the local government sector.

8.67 After allowing for allocations of £8.2m, as summarised in Table C2 above, an unallocated balance of £3.2m would remain. It is proposed that the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration hold this fund corporately. This fund would be used to allocate resources to fund emergent budget pressures during the year, which at this moment in time, cannot be quantified with any certainty.

Council Tax for 2015/16

8.68 In setting the Council’s annual budget, Members need to make decisions in respect of the Council Tax.

Collection Fund

8.69 Collection Fund surpluses or deficits reflect whether the Council over or under achieves its Council Tax collection targets. Therefore, this requires a calculation to be made of how much the Council has already received for the Council Tax in the current and past years and how much of the outstanding debt it expects to collect.

8.70 A calculation was carried out on 15 January 2015, which is the date prescribed by the relevant statutory instrument. This calculation showed there is an estimated surplus on the Collection Fund in respect of Council Tax, for the years 1993/94 to 2014/15 of £6.236m.
8.71 This surplus is shared with the precepting authority, the Greater London Authority (GLA), in proportion to relative shares of budgeted Council Tax income in the current financial year. This means that £4.864m of the £6.236m surplus has to be included in the calculation of Lewisham’s Council Tax. The remaining balance of £1.372m will be allocated to the GLA. Work continues on the continuation of the Council Tax collection improvement pilot scheme which commenced in 2013/14 which will require once off resources of £0.15m in 2015/16.

8.72 Members should note that Council agreed on the 21 January 2015 to pass on the percentage reduction in 2014/15 settlement funding assessment and reduce the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) accordingly. The impact of this for the Council, subject to collection and the contribution owing to the GLA, is estimated at £2.0m in 2015/16.

Council Tax Levels

8.73 The current position is that Council Tax may not be increased by 2% or more (inclusive of levies) without a referendum. A referendum cannot reasonably be held before the Council Tax is set for 2015/16. The Government has indicated that if an authority sets its basic amount of Council Tax (i.e. its Band D Council Tax) in 2015/16 at a level which is no more than its basic amount of Council Tax in 2014/15, it will receive a grant equivalent to a one per cent increase on the 2014/15 figure in 2015/16.

8.74 For the purposes of this report and understanding the long-term financial position, Members should be mindful that the impact of every 1% in Council Tax rise would be to reduce the savings requirement for that year and each subsequent year by approximately £0.8m.

8.75 In considering savings proposals and the level of Council Tax, Members make political judgements, balancing these with their specific legal responsibilities to set a balanced budget for 2015/16 and their general responsibilities to steward the Council’s finances over the medium term.

8.76 In 2014/15, the Band D Council Tax in Lewisham is £1,359.35 on a base of 75,526 Band D equivalent properties. Of this, £299 relates to the activities of the GLA which the Council pays over to them on collection. The GLA is consulting on a precept of £295 for 2015/16, a reduction of £4 or 1.3% and a final decision is expected from them after the 14 February 2015. Table C3 below shows, for illustrative purposes, the Council Tax payable by a resident in a Band D property in 2015/16 under a range of possible Council Tax increases, and the financial implications of this for the Council.

8.77 Whilst a freeze is recommended it should be noted that Council has the option to consider a decrease or increase in Council Tax should it so wish. A full Council Tax Ready Reckoner is attached at Appendix Y3.

Table C3 – Band D Council Tax Levels for 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Council Tax</th>
<th>Amounts payable by residents</th>
<th>Extra income *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham element</td>
<td>GLA element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Freeze</td>
<td>1,060.35</td>
<td>295.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 622
### Amounts payable by residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Council Tax</th>
<th>Lewisham element</th>
<th>GLA element</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Change in total</th>
<th>Extra income *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.50% increase</td>
<td>1,065.65</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,360.65</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00% increase</td>
<td>1,070.95</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,365.95</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50% increase</td>
<td>1,076.26</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,371.26</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75% increase</td>
<td>1,078.91</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,373.91</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - for a freeze the extra income is received as a one-off freeze grant; all other figures are shown as additional council tax income per year from 2015/16 onwards. The Government has indicated that the funding for 2014/15 freeze grant should be built into the spending review baseline. This is still subject to formal confirmation.

8.78 Were Council to agree a Council Tax freeze, the Council will gain the one-off freeze grant of £1.0m (£0.978m to be precise) for 2015/16. This figure of £1.0m is the indicative figure of the Council Tax freeze grant for 2015/16 provided in the provisional local government settlement 2015/16. It has been estimated by assuming the historic growth rate in the local authority tax base continues and that there is 100% take up of the grant.

8.79 The amount shown above for Council Tax Freeze grant is slightly higher than if the Council increased Council Tax by 1%. This is because the Council Tax base figure used to calculate the freeze grant is the taxbase before applying the CTRS.

### Overall Budget Position for 2015/16

8.80 For 2015/16, the overall budget position for the Council is an assumed General Fund Budget Requirement of £245.5m, as set out in Table C4 below.

#### Table C4 - Overall Budget Position for 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Expenditure/ (Income) £m</th>
<th>Expenditure/ (Income) £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) for 2015/16</td>
<td>(159.339)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax 2015/16 at 0% increase</td>
<td>(80.084)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA: Adjustment 2015/16*</td>
<td>(1.259)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus on Collection Fund</td>
<td>(4.864)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumed Budget Requirement for 2015/16</strong></td>
<td><strong>(245.546)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources available for 2015/16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget for 2014/15</td>
<td>268.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Reversal of reserves drawn in 14/15 (once off)</td>
<td><strong>3.000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Pay inflation</td>
<td><strong>1.503</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Non-pay Inflation</td>
<td><strong>3.417</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Grant adjustments for changes 14/15 to 15/16</td>
<td><strong>0.911</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Budget pressures to be funded from 15/16 fund</td>
<td><strong>4.280</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Risks and other potential budget pressures</td>
<td><strong>3.220</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: Previously agreed savings for 2015/16</td>
<td><strong>(1.480)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: New savings for 2015/16</td>
<td><strong>(26.929)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: Use of New Homes Bonus reserve for five yrs.</td>
<td><strong>(5.000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: Once off use of provisions and reserves</td>
<td><strong>(5.438)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>245.546</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of Provisions and Reserves

8.81 Should all the above proposals be agreed, then this would leave a remaining gap of some £5.4m to be funded by the once off use of reserves in 2015/16. This has been set out in the Table C4 above.

8.82 If the need should arise to balance the budget for any in-year pressures using reserves, the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration advises that ongoing measures should be identified to rectify this position as quickly as possible and in any event, by the following year. The use of once off resources is therefore just delaying the need to make an equivalent level of saving in the following year.

9 OTHER GRANTS AND FUTURE YEARS’ BUDGET STRATEGY

9.1 This section of the report considers three other funding streams which the Council currently receives. These are the Public Health Grant, the Better Care Fund and the New Homes Bonus. This section of the report is structured as follows:

- Better Care Fund 2015/16
- Various other grants 2015/16 – reduced with net impact £0.9m
- Future Years’ Budget Strategy 2015/16 onwards

Better Care Fund

9.2 The £3.8 billion national Better Care Fund (BCF) was announced by the Government in the June 2013 Spending Round, to support transformation and integration of health and social care services to ensure local people receive better care. The BCF is a pooled budget that shifts resources into social care and community services for the benefit of the NHS and local government. The Better Care Fund does not represent an increase in funding but rather a realignment of existing funding streams with new conditions attached/risks.

9.3 For Lewisham the value in 2015/16 is £21.842m. Our local plan has been approved by NHS England subject to the following standard conditions which apply to all BCF plans:

1) The Fund must be used in accordance with our final approved plan and through a section 75 pooled fund agreement which is being developed and will be operational by 1st April 2015; and
2) the full value of the element of the Fund linked to non-elective admissions reduction target will be paid over to Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) at the start of the financial year. However the CCG may only release the full value of this funding into the pool if the proposed admissions reduction target is met. If the target is not met, the CCG may only release into the pool a part of that funding proportionate to the partial achievement of the target. Any part of this funding that is not released into the pool due to the target not being met must be dealt with in accordance with NHS England requirements. We are developing contingency arrangements to address this risk.

Other Grants and Levies

9.4 Certain specific grants have been reduced or stopped in 2015/16 reducing funding by approximately £0.9m. The main change is in respect of the Education Support Grant
that has been reduced by 20% to £3.9m. The other various smaller changes include: Council Tax Scheme new burden funding, Adoption reform grant, and SEN reform grant.

9.5 From October 2015/16 the work of public health visitors for the 0-5 year old population will transfer to Local Authorities. The six month grant for their work will be £3.79m.

9.6 It is expected that, as the funding on specific grants reduces, the related cost of service provision will also reduce as the Directorates manage their activities within their allocated resources.

9.7 The Council is also required to levy monies totalling in the region of £1.6m for other bodies, in addition to the Council Tax collected on behalf of the GLA (see Collection Fund). These bodies are the London Pension Fund Agency, Lee Valley Regional Park, and Environment Agency. At present the final amounts for 2015/16 have yet to be confirmed and it is therefore assumed these will stay at their 2014/15 levels which are set out in Appendix Y5.

Future Years’ Budget Strategy 2015/16 onwards

Revenue Budget

9.8 The Medium Term Financial Strategy was reported to Mayor & Cabinet in July 2014. This set out that an estimated £85m of savings is required from 2015/16 to 2017/18 over and above savings already agreed. The profile for these savings is broadly;

- £40m for 2015/16,
- £25m for 2016/17, and
- £20m for 2017/18.

9.9 Since then we have received the provisional local settlement in December but for one year only – 2015/16. The estimate of overall savings required to 2017/18 remains at £85m with £40m for 2015/16. However, the back drop is one where the savings requirement may increase for the additional public spending cuts of £10 billion identified nationally to balance the budget by 2017/18.

9.10 The Lewisham Future Programme (LFP) was established to carry out cross-cutting and thematic reviews to deliver these savings. The savings report received by the Mayor in November 2014 and the separate savings report taken alongside this budget report presents the LFP work to date. This continues and further savings proposals will be bought forward in 2015/16.

10. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

10.1 This section sets out the Council’s Treasury Management Strategy for 2015/16 and is structured as follows:

- Capital Investment Plans
- Prudential Indicators
- Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy
- Borrowing Strategy including Treasury Indicators
- Debt Rescheduling
- Annual Investment Strategy
- Credit Worthiness Policy
- Prospects for Investment Returns
10.2 These elements cover the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, the CIPFA Prudential Code, the Department for Communities and Local Government guidance on Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) and Investments and the CIPFA Treasury Management Code. The Council uses Capita Asset Services as its external treasury management advisors. The Council recognises that responsibility for Treasury Management decisions remain with the Council at all times and will ensure that undue reliance is not placed upon external service providers.

**Current borrowing portfolio position**

**Capital Investment Plans**

10.3 The Treasury Management Strategy for 2014/15 incorporates the capital plans of the Council, as set out in section 5 of this report.

10.4 The Council’s cash position is organised in accordance with the relevant professional codes to ensure that sufficient funds are available to meet its obligations. This involves both the organisation of the cash flow and, where capital plans require, the arrangement of appropriate borrowing facilities.

10.5 The Council’s expected treasury portfolio position at 31 March 2015, with forward projections is summarised below. Table D1 compares the actual external debt against the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) which is the underlying capital borrowing need. This table illustrates over/(under) borrowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14 Actual £m</th>
<th>2014/15 Expected £m</th>
<th>2015/16 Forecast £m</th>
<th>2016/17 Forecast £m</th>
<th>2017/18 Forecast £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected External Debt at 1 April</strong></td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td>195.4</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>191.3</td>
<td>195.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Change in Ext Debt</strong></td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Long-Term Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>253.0</td>
<td>254.6</td>
<td>252.2</td>
<td>245.8</td>
<td>238.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Debt at 31 March</strong></td>
<td>448.4</td>
<td>445.0</td>
<td>443.5</td>
<td>446.7</td>
<td>460.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Financing Requirement</strong></td>
<td>488.8</td>
<td>487.8</td>
<td>487.3</td>
<td>486.7</td>
<td>501.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borrowing – over / (under)</strong></td>
<td>(40.4)</td>
<td>(42.8)</td>
<td>(43.8)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(41.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Capital Financing Requirement includes the prudential borrowing figures shown in Table A2 of Section 5 - Capital Programme.

**Prudential Indicators**

10.6 The prudential indicators comprise two parameters of external debt, the operational boundary and authorised limits, which ensure that the Council operates its activities within well defined limits. The Council needs to ensure that its gross debt does not exceed the total of the CFR in the preceding year, plus the estimates of any additional CFR for the current and following two financial years. This allows some flexibility for limited early borrowing for future years and ensures that borrowing is not undertaken for revenue purposes.

10.7 The Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration reports that the Council has
complied with this prudential indicator in the current year to date and does not envisage any difficulties for the future. This view takes into account current commitments, existing plans, and the proposals in this report. The operational boundary and the authorised limits for external debt are described in further detail in the following paragraphs.

The Operational Boundary for External debt

10.8 This is the limit which external debt is not normally expected to exceed. In most cases this would be a similar figure to the CFR, but may be lower depending on the levels of actual gross debt anticipated. The Council’s operational boundary is set out in Table D2.

Table D2: Operational Boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15 Expected £m</th>
<th>2015/16 Forecast £m</th>
<th>2016/17 Forecast £m</th>
<th>2017/18 Forecast £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum External Debt at 31 March</td>
<td>195.7</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>238.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Long-Term Liabilities</td>
<td>254.6</td>
<td>252.3</td>
<td>245.8</td>
<td>238.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Boundary for Year</td>
<td>450.3</td>
<td>456.8</td>
<td>459.9</td>
<td>476.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Authorised Limit for External Debt

10.9 This key prudential indicator represents a constraint on the maximum level of borrowing and is a statutory limit determined under Section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003. The Government retains the power to control either the total of all Councils’ plans, or those of a specific Council.

10.10 This is the limit beyond which external debt is prohibited and needs to be set by full Council. It represents the level of external debt which, while not desired, could be afforded in the short-term (i.e. up to one month), but is not sustainable in the longer term. The Council is asked to approve the following authorised limits as set out in Table D3.

Table D3 – Authorised Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15 Expected £m</th>
<th>2015/16 Estimate £m</th>
<th>2016/17 Estimate £m</th>
<th>2017/18 Estimate £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Boundary for Year</td>
<td>450.3</td>
<td>456.8</td>
<td>459.9</td>
<td>476.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Non Receipt of Expected Income</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Limit for Year</td>
<td>496.3</td>
<td>507.8</td>
<td>510.9</td>
<td>527.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.11 In addition, the Council is also limited to a maximum Housing Revenue Account (HRA) CFR by the DCLG through the self-financing regime. Table D4 sets out this limit:
Table D4 – HRA Debt Limit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15 Expected £m</th>
<th>2015/16 Estimate £m</th>
<th>2016/17 Estimate £m</th>
<th>2017/18 Estimate £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Debt Cap (Statutory)</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>127.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA Debt (CFR) at 31 March</td>
<td>(83.6)</td>
<td>(83.6)</td>
<td>(83.6)</td>
<td>(103.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA Headroom</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy

10.12 A proportion of the Council’s capital expenditure is not immediately financed from its own resources. This results in a debt liability which must be charged to the Council Tax over a period of time. This repayment, the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) must be determined by the Council as being a prudent provision having regard to the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance.

10.13 The MRP is the amount the Council charges to the revenue account and does not correspond to the actual amount of debt repaid, which is determined by treasury related issues. The Council applies a consistent MRP policy which comprises prudential borrowing being repaid over the useful life of the asset concerned and previous borrowing being repaid at the rate of 4% of the outstanding balance.

Borrowing Strategy

10.14 The Council’s external debt as at 31 March 2015, gross borrowing plus long term liabilities, is expected to be £445m. During 2014/15 the Council has repaid £5.9m of PWLB loans. The Council’s borrowing strategy is consistent with last year’s strategy. The Council is currently maintaining an under-borrowed position in that the CFR is not been fully funded with loan debt, as cash supporting the Council’s reserves, balances and cash flow has been used as an alternative funding measure. In the current economic climate, this strategy is considered prudent while investment returns are low, counterparty risk is higher than historic averages, and borrowing rates are still relatively high.

10.15 However, it is possible that in 2015/16 the Council may need to borrow £11m to fund the Housing Strategy. It is likely that this borrowing will be funded from Council balances, however the Council will seek advice before making a final decision.

10.16 The Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration will continue to monitor interest rates in the financial markets and adopt a pragmatic and cautious approach to changing circumstances. For instance, if it was felt that there was a significant risk of a sharp fall in medium to long-term interest rates (e.g. due to a marked increase of risks around a relapse into recession or risks of deflation in the economy), then long term borrowings will be postponed and potential rescheduling from fixed rate funding into short-term borrowing considered. Any such decisions would be reported to Mayor & Cabinet and subsequently Council, at the next available opportunity.

10.17 Alternatively, if it was felt that there was a significant risk of a sharp rise in medium to long-term interest rates than currently forecast (perhaps arising from a greater than expected increase in the anticipated rate to US tapering of asset purchases or in world economic activity driving inflation up), then the portfolio position will be re-appraised with the likely action that fixed rate funding will be drawn, whilst interest rates are still lower
than forecast. Once again, any such decisions would be reported to Mayor & Cabinet and subsequently Council, at the next available opportunity.

10.18 Members should note that the Council's policy is not to borrow more than or in advance of its needs purely in order to profit from the investment of the extra sums borrowed. Any decision to borrow in advance will be within the approved CFR estimates, and will be considered carefully to ensure that value for money can be demonstrated and that the Council can ensure the security of such funds.

**Treasury Indicators**

10.19 There are three debt related treasury activity limits which restrain the activity of the treasury function within certain limits. The purpose of these is to manage risk and reduce the impact of any adverse movement in interest rates. These limits need to be balanced against the requirement for the treasury function to retain some flexibility to enable it to respond quickly to opportunities to reduce costs and improve performance.

10.20 The debt related indicators are:

- Upper limits on variable interest rate exposure. This identifies a maximum limit for variable interest rates based upon the debt position net of investments.
- Upper limits on fixed interest rate exposure. This is similar to the previous indicator and covers a maximum limit on fixed interest rates;
- Maturity structure of borrowing. These gross limits are set to reduce the Council’s exposure to large fixed rate sums falling due for refinancing and are required for upper and lower limits.

10.21 Council is asked to approve the following treasury indicators and limits:

**Table D5: Treasury Indicators and Limits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest rate exposures</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limits on fixed interest rates:</strong></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt only</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments only</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limits on variable interest rates:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt only</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments only</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maturity structure of fixed interest rate borrowing 2014/15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 12 months</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months to 2 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years to 5 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to 10 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years to 20 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years to 30 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 years to 40 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years to 50 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interest rate exposures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity structure of variable interest rate borrowing 2014/15</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 12 months</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maturity structure guidance for Lender Option Borrower Option (LOBO) loan defines the maturity date as being the next call date.

Debt Rescheduling

10.22 In the current economic environment and for the foreseeable future, shorter term borrowing rates are expected to be lower than longer term fixed interest rates. As a result, there may be potential opportunities to generate savings by switching debt from long term to shorter term. However, any such savings need to be considered in the light of the current treasury position and the cost of debt repayment.

10.23 The Council has £112 m of LOBO loans (Lender’s Option Borrower’s Option) of which £65m will be in their call period in 2015/16. In the event that the lender exercises the option to change the rate or terms of the loan, the Council will consider the terms being provided and also the option of repayment of the loan without penalty.

10.24 Consideration will be given to the potential for making savings by running down investment balances to repay debt prematurely while short-term rates on investments are likely to be lower than the rates paid on current debt. Any proposed rescheduling of debt will be reported to Mayor & Cabinet and subsequently to Council at the earliest meeting following its action.

Annual Investment Strategy

Introduction: changes to credit rating methodology

10.25 The main rating agencies (Fitch, Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s) have, through much of the financial crisis, provided some institutions with a ratings “uplift” due to implied levels of sovereign support. More recently, in response to the evolving regulatory regime, the agencies have indicated they may remove these “uplifts”. This process may commence during 2014/15 and / or 2015/16. The actual timing of the changes is still subject to discussion, but this does mean immediate changes to the credit methodology are required.

10.26 It is important to stress that the rating agency changes do not reflect any changes in the underlying status of the institution or credit environment, merely the implied level of sovereign support that has been built into ratings through the financial crisis. The eventual removal of implied sovereign support will only take place when the regulatory and economic environments have ensured that financial institutions are much stronger and less prone to failure in a financial crisis.

10.27 Both Fitch and Moody’s provide “standalone” credit ratings for financial institutions. For Fitch, it is the Viability Rating, while Moody’s has the Financial Strength Rating. Due to the future removal of sovereign support from institution assessments, both agencies have suggested going forward that these will be in line with their respective Long Term ratings. As such, there is no point monitoring both Long Term and these “standalone” ratings.
Furthermore, Fitch has already begun assessing its Support ratings, with a clear expectation that these will be lowered to 5, which is defined as “A bank for which there is a possibility of external support, but it cannot be relied upon.” With all institutions likely to drop to these levels, there is little to no differentiation to be had by assessing Support ratings.

As a result of these rating agency changes, the credit element of our future methodology will focus solely on the Short and Long Term ratings of an institution. Rating Watch and Outlook information will continue to be assessed where it relates to these categories. This is the same process for Standard & Poor’s that we have always taken, but a change to the use of Fitch and Moody’s ratings. Furthermore, we will continue to utilise Certificate of Deposit (CD) prices as an overlay to ratings in our new methodology.

The Council’s investment priorities will be security first, liquidity second, and then return. Investment instruments identified for use in the financial year are listed in Appendix Z3, under the ‘specified’ and ‘non-specified’ investments categories. The proposed counterparty limits for 2015/16 are presented to Council for approval in this same appendix.

In accordance with guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government and CIPFA, and in order to minimise the risk to investments, officers have clearly stipulated the minimum acceptable credit quality of counterparties for inclusion on the lending list. This has been set out at Appendix Z3. The creditworthiness methodology used to create the counterparty list fully accounts for the ratings, watches and outlooks published information by all three ratings agencies with a full understanding of what these reflect in the eyes of each agency.

Continuing regulatory changes in the banking sector are designed to see greater stability, lower risk and the removal of expectations of Government financial support should an institution fail. This withdrawal of implied sovereign support is anticipated to have an effect on ratings applied to institutions. This will result in the key ratings used to monitor counterparties being the Short Term and Long Term ratings only. Viability, Financial Strength and Support Ratings previously applied will effectively become redundant. This change does not reflect deterioration in the credit environment but rather a change of method in response to regulatory changes.

Furthermore, officers recognise that ratings should not be the sole determinant of the quality of an institution and that it is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets. Officers continue to engage with the Council’s treasury management advisors to maintain a monitor on market pricing such as “credit default swaps” and overlay that information on top of the credit ratings. This is fully integrated into the credit methodology provided by the advisors in producing its colour codings which show the varying degrees of suggested institution creditworthiness. This has been set out in more detail at Appendix Z3.

Other information sources used include the financial press, share price and other such information pertaining to the banking sector in order to establish the most robust scrutiny process on the suitability of potential investment counterparties.

The aim of the strategy is to generate a list of highly creditworthy counterparties which...
will also enable diversification and thus avoid a concentration of risk.

**Creditworthiness policy**

10.36 The Council’s Treasury Management Team applies the creditworthiness service provided by its treasury management advisors Capita Asset Services. This service employs a sophisticated modelling approach utilising credit ratings from the three main credit rating agencies, Fitch, Moody’s and Standard and Poor’s. The credit ratings of counterparties are supplemented with the following overlays:

- credit watches and credit outlooks from credit rating agencies;
- CDS spreads to give early warning of likely changes in credit ratings;
- sovereign ratings to select counterparties from only the most creditworthy countries.

10.37 This modelling approach combines credit ratings, credit watches and credit outlooks in a weighted scoring system which is then combined with an overlay of CDS spreads for which the end product is a series of colour coded bands which indicate the relative creditworthiness of counterparties. These colour codes are used by the Council to determine the suggested duration for investments. The Council will therefore use counterparties within the following durational bands:

- Yellow 1 year
- Pink 1 year
- Purple 1 year
- Blue 1 year (only applies to nationalised or semi nationalised UK Banks)
- Orange 1 year
- Red 6 months
- Green 100 days
- No colour not to be used

The Council’s creditworthiness policy has been set out at Appendix Z3.

**Country limits**

10.38 The Council has determined that it will only use approved counterparties from countries with a minimum sovereign credit rating of AA from Fitch (or equivalent). The list of countries that qualify using this credit criteria as at the date of this report are shown in Appendix Z4. This list will be added to, or deducted from, by officers should country ratings change in accordance with this policy.

**Part nationalised banks**

10.39 In the 2013/14 mid year strategy it was agreed that the maximum deposit limits with part nationalised banks be increased to £65m from £50m. It is now proposed that from April 2015, the Council’s maximum deposit limits with part nationalised banks is decreased to £40m for each of the Lloyds Banking Group and Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) Group.

10.40 This scale back is as a result of the following recent events:

- The results of the 2014 Bank of England (BoE) Stress tests
- The Government’s intention to sell more of its shareholding in Lloyds Banking Group.

10.41 Banks are required to have a core capital ratio of at least 4.5% as part of the BoE stress test. The results showed that the British banks with the “lowest pass” came from The
Royal Bank of Scotland (at 5.2%) and Lloyds plc (at 5.3%). The report judged that both bank’s capital position needed to be strengthened further. The results demonstrated that they remain susceptible to a severe economic downturn. However, the report also acknowledges the measures being taken by the banks to augment capital and the BoE did not request the banks to submit a revised capital plan.

10.42 On 17th December 2014, UKFI announced that it intended to sell part of Her Majesty’s Treasury’s shareholding in Lloyds Banking Group plc over the next six months through a pre-arranged trading plan. The trading plan will terminate no later than 30 June 2015. A maximum of 15% of the share holding will be sold. If the maximum amount of shareholding is sold, this will result in a Government shareholding of 9.9%. There are no immediate intentions to sell shareholding in RBS, but they will be embarking on a further period of restructuring.

10.43 The Council feels that although both banks are showing very good improvements; are still state backed; and have positive feedback from our Treasury Management advisors; it would be beneficial to take a more prudent approach. Therefore the Council will begin to reduce the deposit limits for the part nationalised banks.

Investment Policy

10.44 Investments will be made with reference to the core balances and cashflow requirements and the outlook for short-term interest rates (i.e. rates for investments up to 12 months). In order to maintain sufficient liquidity, the Council will seek to utilise its instant access call accounts, money market funds and short-dated deposits (overnight to three months) in order to benefit from the compounding of interest. The remainder of its investments will be placed in fixed term deposits of up to 12 months to generate maximum return. The Council will not invest in any fixed term deposit facility exceeding 365 days. This policy is set with regard to the Council’s liquidity requirements and to reduce the risk of a forced sub-optimal early sale of an investment.

10.45 The Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration reports one occasion in 2014/15 where approved limits set out in the Annual Investment Strategy was breached. This breach was with regards to the duration of an investment. The Counterparty was an approved counterparty and the value of the investment was also within the set limits. However, the investment was taken out for one year as opposed to the six months limit as set out in the Annual Investment Strategy. Tighter review and approval procedures have been put into place to mitigate the risk of such an incident occurring in the future.

Municipal Bond Agency

10.46 Members should also note it is likely that the Municipal Bond Agency currently in the process of being set up, will be offering loans to local authorities in the near future. It is also hoped that the borrowing rates will be lower than those offered by the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB). This Authority is a shareholder of the MBA and may make use of this new source of borrowing as and when appropriate.

Prospects for Investment Returns

10.47 The Bank of England base rate is currently forecast to remain unchanged at 0.5% before starting to rise from quarter four of 2015. The rate forecasts for financial year-ends are:

- 2015/16  0.75%
There are downside risks to these forecasts (i.e. start of increases in Bank Rate occurs later) if economic growth weakens. However, should the pace of growth quicken, there could be an upside risk.

The suggested budgeted investment earnings rates for returns on investments placed for periods of up to 100 days during each financial year for the next eight years are as follows:

- 2015/16  0.60%
- 2016/17  1.25%
- 2017/18  1.75%
- 2018/19  2.25%
- 2019/20  2.75%
- 2020/21  3.00%
- 2021/22  3.25%
- 2022/23  3.25%
- Later years 3.50%

A more extensive table of interest rate forecasts for 2015/16, including Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing rate forecasts is set out in Appendix Z1.

Summary

At the end of the financial year, the officers will report to the Council on investment activity for the year as part of its Annual Treasury Report (included in the Council’s outturn report).

11 CONSULTATION ON THE BUDGET

In setting the various budgets, it is important to have extensive engagement with citizens to consider the overarching challenge facing public services in Lewisham over the next few years. To this end, the Council has undertaken a range of engagement and specific consultation exercises. The specific consultation exercises were:

Rent Setting and Housing Panel

As in previous years, tenants’ consultation was in line with Residents’ Compact arrangements. This provided tenant representatives of Lewisham Homes with an opportunity in December 2014 at the joint Housing Panel meeting to consider the positions and to feedback any views to Mayor & Cabinet. Tenant representative of Brockley convened their Brockley Residents’ Board in December 2014 to hear the proposals and fed back.

Business Ratepayers

Representatives of business ratepayers were consulted online on Council’s outline budget between 19 January and 2 February 2015. The results of this consultation will
be made available in the Budget Report Update presented to Mayor & Cabinet on 18 February 2015.

12. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

12.1 This entire report deals with the Council’s Budget. Therefore, the financial implications are explained throughout.

13. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 Many legal implications are referred to in the body of the report. Particular attention is drawn to the following:

Capital Programme

13.2 Generally, only expenditure relating to tangible assets (e.g. roads, buildings or other structures, plant, machinery, apparatus and vehicles) can be regarded as capital expenditure. (Section 16 Local Government Act 2003 and regulations made under it).

13.3 The Local Government Act 2003 introduced a prudential system of financial control, replacing a system of credit approvals with a system whereby local authorities are free to borrow or invest so long as their capital spending plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable. Authorities are required to determine and keep under review how much they can afford to borrow having regard to CIPFA’s Prudential Code of Capital Finance in Local Authorities. The Code requires that in making borrowing and investment decisions, the Council is to take account of affordability, prudence and sustainability, value for money, stewardship of assets, service objectives and practicality.

13.4 Section 11 Local Government Act 2003 allows for regulations to be made requiring an amount equal to the whole or any part of a capital receipt to be paid to the Secretary of State. Since April 2013 there has been no requirement to set aside capital receipts on housing land (SI2013/476). For right to buy receipts, the Council can retain 25% of the net receipt (after taking off transaction costs) and is then entitled to enter an agreement with the Secretary of State to fund replacement homes with the balance. Conditions on the use of the balance of the receipts are that spending has to happen within three years and that 70% of the funding needs to come from Council revenue or borrowing. If the funding is not used within three years, it has to be paid to the Department for Communities for Local Government, with interest.

Housing Revenue Account

13.5 Section 24 of the Housing Act 1985 provides that a local authority may make such reasonable charges as they determine for the tenancy or occupation of their houses. The Council must review rents from time to time and make such charges as circumstances require.

13.6 Under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the Council is obliged to maintain a separate HRA (Section 74) and by Section 76 must prevent a debit balance on that account. Rents must therefore be set to avoid such a debit.

13.7 By Schedule 4 of the same Act where benefits or amenities arising out of a housing authority functions are provided for persons housed by the authority but are shared by
the community, the Authority must make such contribution to the HRA from their other revenues to properly reflect the community’s share of the benefits/amenities.

13.8 The process for varying the terms of a secure tenancy is set out in Sections 102 and 103 of the Housing Act 1985. It requires the Council to serve notice of variation at least 4 weeks before the effective date; the provision of sufficient information to explain the variation; and an opportunity for the tenant to serve a Notice to Quit ending their tenancy.

13.9 Where the outcome of the rent setting process involves significant changes to housing management practice or policy, further consultation may be required with the tenants’ affected in accordance with section 105 of the Housing Act 1985.

13.10 Part 7 of the Localism Act 2011 abolished HRA subsidy and moved to a system of self financing in which Councils are allowed to keep the rents received locally to support their housing stock. Section 174 of the same Act provides for agreements between the Secretary of State and Councils to allow Councils not to have to pay a proportion of their capital receipts to the Secretary of State if he/she approves the purpose to which it would be put.

Balanced Budget

13.11 Members have a duty to ensure that the Council acts lawfully. It must set and maintain a balanced budget each year. The Council must take steps to deal with any projected overspends and identify savings or other measures to bring the budget under control. If the Capital Programme is overspending, this may be brought back into line through savings, slippage or contributions from revenue. The proposals in this report are designed to produce a balanced budget in 2015/16.

13.12 In this context, Members are reminded of their fiduciary duty to the Council Tax payer, effectively to act as trustee of the Council’s resources and to ensure proper custodianship of Council funds.

An annual budget

13.13 By law, the setting of the Council’s budget is an annual process. However, to enable meaningful planning, a number of savings proposals for this year, 2015/16, were anticipated in the course of the budget process. They were the subject of full report at that time and they are now listed in Appendix Y1. Members are asked now to approve and endorse those reductions for this year. This report is predicated on taking all of the agreed and proposed savings. If not, any shortfall will have to be met through adjustments to the annual budget in this report.

13.14 The body of the report refers to the various consultation (for example with tenants’ and business) which the Council has carried out/is carrying out in accordance with statutory requirements relating to this budget process. The Mayor must consider the outcome of that consultation with an open mind before reaching a decision about his final proposals to Council. It is noted that the outcome of consultation with business rate payers will only be available from the 3 February 2015 and any decisions about the Mayor’s proposals on the budget are subject to consideration of that consultation response.
Referendum

13.15 Sections 72 of the Localism Act 2011 and Schedules 5 to 7 amended the provisions governing the calculation of Council Tax. They provide that if a Council seeks to impose a Council Tax increase in excess of limits fixed by the Secretary of State, then a Council Tax referendum must be held, the results of which are binding. The Council may not implement an increase which exceeds the Secretary of State’s limits without holding the referendum. Were the Council to seek to exceed the threshold, substitute calculations which do not exceed the threshold would also have to be drawn up. These would apply in the event that the result of the referendum is not to approve the “excessive” rise in Council Tax.

13.16 In relation to each year the Council, as billing authority, must calculate the Council Tax requirement and basic amount of tax as set out in Section 31A and 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. These statutory calculations appear Appendix Y5.

Robustness of estimates and adequacy of reserves

13.17 Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 requires, when the authority is making its calculations under s32 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the Chief Finance Officer to report to it on:
(a) the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of the Calculations; and
(b) the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves.

13.18 The Chief Financial Officer’s section 25 statement will be appended to the Budget Report update to Mayor & Cabinet on 18 February 2015.

Treasury Strategy

13.19 Authorities are also required to produce and keep under review for the forthcoming year a range of indicators based on actual figures. These are set out in the report. The CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice says that movement may be made between the various indicators during the year by an Authority’s Chief Finance Officer as long as the indicators for the total Authorised Limit and the total Operational Boundary for external debt remain unchanged. Any such changes are to be reported to the next meeting of the Council.

13.20 Under Section 5 of the 2003 Act, the prudential indicator for the total Authorised Limit for external debt is deemed to be increased by an amount of any unforeseen payment which becomes due to the Authority within the period to which the limit relates which would include for example additional external funding becoming available but not taken into account by the Authority when determining the Authorised Limit. Where Section 5 of the Act is relied upon to borrow above the Authorised Limit, the Code requires that this fact is reported to the next meeting of the Council.

13.21 Authority is delegated to the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration to make amendments to the limits on the Council’s counterparty list and to undertake Treasury Management in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice and the Council's Treasury Policy Statement.
Constitutional provisions

13.22 Legislation provides that it is the responsibility of the full Council to set the Council’s budget. Once the budget has been set, save for those decisions which he is precluded from, it is for the Mayor to make decisions in accordance with the statutory policy framework and that are not wholly inconsistent with the budget. It is for the Mayor to have overall responsibility for preparing the draft budget for submission to the Council to consider. If the Council does not accept the Mayor’s proposals it may object to them and ask him to reconsider. The Mayor must then reconsider and submit proposals (amended or unamended) back to the Council which may only overturn them by a two-thirds majority.

13.23 For these purposes the term “budget” means the “budget requirement (as provided for in the Local Government Finance Act 1992) all the components of the budgetary allocations to different services and projects, proposed taxation levels, contingency funds (reserves and balances) and any plan or strategy for the control of the local authority’s borrowing or capital expenditure.” (Chapter 2 statutory guidance).

13.24 Authorities are advised by the statutory guidance to adopt an inclusive approach to preparing the draft budget, to ensure that councillors in general have the opportunity to be involved in the process. However it is clear that it is for the Mayor to take the lead in that process and proposals to be considered should come from him. The preparation of the proposals in this report has involved the Council’s select committees and the Public Accounts Select Committee in particular, thereby complying with the statutory guidance.

Statutory duties and powers

13.25 The Council has a number of statutory duties which it must fulfil by law. It cannot lawfully decide not to carry out those duties. However, even where there is a statutory duty, the Council often has discretion about the level of service provision. Where a service is provided by virtue of a Council power rather than a duty, the Council is not bound to carry out those activities, though decisions about them must be taken in accordance with the decision making requirements of administrative law. In so far as this report deals with reductions in service provision in relation to a specific service, this has been dealt with in the separate savings report that accompanies this budget report.

Reasonableness and proper process

13.26 Decisions must be made reasonably taking into account all relevant considerations and ignoring irrelevancies. Members will see that in relation to the proposed savings there is a separate report and a summary at Appendix Y2. If the Mayor decides that the budget for that service must be reduced, the Council’s reorganisation procedure applies. Staff consultation in accordance with that procedure will be conducted and in accordance with normal Council practice, the final decision would be made by the relevant Executive Director under delegated authority.

Staff consultation

13.27 Where proposals, if accepted, would result in 100 redundancies or more within a 90 day period, an employer is required by Section 188 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 as amended, to consult with the representatives of those who may be affected by the proposals. The consultation period is at least 45 days. Where the number is 20 or more, but 99 or less the consultation period is 30 days. This
requirement is in addition to the consultation with individuals affected by redundancy and/or reorganisation under the Council’s own procedure.

**Equalities**

13.28 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.

13.29 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.

13.30 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. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which the Council can demonstrate that they have had ‘due regard’.

13.31 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/](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/)

13.32 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

13.33 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
13.34 The EHRC has also issued Guidance entitled “Making Fair Financial Decisions”. It appears at Appendix Y6 and attention is drawn to its contents.

13.35 Assessing impact on equality is not an end to itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision being made. Whether it is proportionate for the Council to conduct an Equalities Analysis 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 protected groups, including staff.

13.36 Where savings proposals are anticipated to have an impact on staffing levels, it will be subject to consultation as stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies, and services will be required to undertake an Equalities Analysis Assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process.

13.37 It is also important to note that the Council is subject to the Human Rights Act, and should therefore, also consider the potential impact their particular decisions could have on human rights. Where particular savings have such implications, they are dealt with in relation to those particular reports.

Crime and Disorder

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

13.39 There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

Best Value

13.40 Under section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999, the Council is under a best value duty 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 relation to this report.

Environmental Implications

13.41 Section 40 of the 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 relation to the reductions proposals.

13.42 There are no specific environmental implications arising from this report.

Integration with health

13.43 Members are reminded that provisions under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 require local authorities in the exercise of their functions to have regard to the need to integrate their services with health.
14. **HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 There are no specific human resources implications arising from this report. Any such implications were considered as part of the revenue budget savings proposals presented to Mayor & Cabinet on 12 November 2014 and the accompanying savings report to Mayor & Cabinet on the 11 February. A summary of the savings proposals are attached at Appendix Y2 to this report.

15. **CONCLUSION**

18.1 This report sets out the information necessary for the Council to set the 2015/16 budget. Updates will be made to this report at Mayor & Cabinet on 18 February 2015. Final decisions will be taken at the meeting of full Council on 25 February 2015.

16. **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title of</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Financial Strategy</td>
<td>16 July 2014 (M&amp;C)</td>
<td>5th Floor Laurence House</td>
<td>David Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Proposals for 2015/16</td>
<td>12 November 2014 (M&amp;C) 11 February 2015 (M&amp;C)</td>
<td>5th Floor Laurence House</td>
<td>David Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting the Council Tax Base &amp; Discounts for Second Homes and Empty Properties</td>
<td>21 January 2015 (Council)</td>
<td>5th Floor Laurence House</td>
<td>David Austin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information on this report, please contact:

Janet Senior  
Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration on 020 8314 8013

David Austin  
Head of Corporate Resources on 020 8314 9114

Shola Ojo  
Principal Accountant, Strategic Finance on 020 8314 7778

17. **APPENDICES**

**Capital Programme**

W1 Capital Programme 2014/15 to 2018/19 – Major Projects  
W2 Proposed Capital Programme – Original to latest Budget

**Housing Revenue Account**

X1 Proposed Housing Revenue Account Savings 2015/16  
X2 Tenants rent consultation 2015/16  
X3 Leasehold and Tenants charges consultation 2015/16  
X4 Leasehold and Tenants charges and Lewisham Homes Budget Strategy 2015/16  
X5 Other associated housing charges for 2015/16
X6 Summary of 20 historic housing debt cases proposed for write off

**General Fund**

Y1 Summary of previously agreed budget savings for 2015/16
Y2 Summary of Proposed Revenue Budget savings 2015/16 to 2017/18
Y3 Ready Reckoner for Council Tax 2015/16
Y4 Chief Financial Officer’s Section 25 Statement – *To follow M&C 18th February 2015*
Y5 Council Tax And Statutory Calculations
Y6 Making Fair Financial Decisions

**Treasury Management**

Z1 Interest Rate Forecasts 2015 – 2018
Z2 Economic Background
Z3 Credit Worthiness Policy (Linked to Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) – Credit and Counterparty Risk Management)
Z4 Approved countries for investments
Z5 Requirement of the CIPFA Management Code of Practice
## 2014 / 2015 TO 2018 / 2019 CAPITAL PROGRAMME - MAJOR PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Projects over £2m</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSF - Sydenham (D&amp;B)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSF - Brent Knoll (D&amp;B)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools - Primary Places Programme</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools - Other Capital Works</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Bridges - TfL</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Bridges - LBL</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catford TC (inc Broadway &amp; Milford Towers) Regeneration</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Programme - Non Schools</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT - Tech Refresh</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kender and Excalibur Regeneration</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside &amp; Lethbridge Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition – Hamilton</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge/Canonbie Rd</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition – Hostels Programme</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Homes – Property Acquisition</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Facilities Grant</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Grants and Loans</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids, Adaptations, Disabilities</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schemes</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>205.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT** |         |         |         |         |         |       |
|                            | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      |       |
| Customer Services          | 5.5     | 22.3    | 40.4    | 44.5    | 24.5    | 137.1 |
| Lewisham Homes             | 47.0    | 47.9    | 36.4    | 60.1    | 27.7    | 219.1 |
| **Total**                  | 52.5    | 70.2    | 76.8    | 104.5   | 52.2    | 356.2 |

**TOTAL PROGRAMME**

|         | 137.3 | 132.7 | 113.1 | 116.8 | 61.8  | 561.7 |
## Proposed Capital Programme - Original to Latest Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Original Budget (Feb 2014)</th>
<th>New Schemes during the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tfl – Highways Programme (14/15 – 16/17)</td>
<td>137,853</td>
<td>6,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Homes – Property Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostels Programme – Acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition – Canonbie Road/ Hamilton Lodge</td>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Catering Investment (UFSM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPZ Programme (14/15 – 16/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSF ICT - Sydenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSF ICT – Brent Knoll</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling Empty Homes Scheme – Rounds one and Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing 2 Year old Childcare Provision</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumbeat 6th Form School (Brockley site) – Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Travel Corridor – (Brockley Rise/Brockley Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baring School – Emergency Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Canal - NLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkstone Garden Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabash Centre Day Service – Refurbishment Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Gyms – Deptford Park and Mayow Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship Inn Project (Phoenix)</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham Leisure and Lifestyle Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Park Frontage Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18/19 Rolling Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Amount (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aids &amp; Adaptations</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT – Tech Refresh</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBL Highways</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Programme</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools AMP</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Facilities Grant</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Loans &amp; Grants</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cash Incentive Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved variations on existing schemes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/14 Underspends on various schemes</td>
<td>10,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Places Programme – Targeted Basic Needs funded</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Places Programme – Additional funding</td>
<td>1,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotshall Playing Fields Pavillion – Extra Grant allocations notified</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladywell Specialist Dementia Day Service Centre – Additional funding</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excalibur – Phase 3 – Additional Funding</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Variations</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latest Budget

| **205,414** |

### HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Budget (Feb 2014)</th>
<th>248,060</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Re-phasing Budgets and addition of 18/19 Budgets
- Lewisham Homes | 43,660 |
- Other HRA schemes including Housing Matters Programme | 64,488 | **108,148** |

### Latest Budget

| **356,208** |

### Overall Budget

| **561,622** |
APPENDIX X1: Proposed Housing Revenue Account Savings 2015/16

HRA Efficiencies/Savings & Growth proposals 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Proposals 2014/15 £’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings/Efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>*Lewisham Homes Fee</td>
<td>-284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Nil Inflation Increase for Repairs &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>-413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nil Inflation Increase for Energy Costs (now on 3 year fixed contract)</td>
<td>-304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Nil Inflation on Internal Support Costs</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings/Efficiencies total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased costs/income reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Reduction in Income on Communal Heating Systems</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Increased Property Insurance Costs</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Reduction in income forecast for tenants &amp; leasehold service charges</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total increase in costs/income reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net effect of proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td>-346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Already included in business plan

**Savings/Efficiencies**

**Item 1  Lewisham Homes management fee**

The initial fee proposal for 2015/16 after allowing an inflationary increase of 1% on salaries and 2.5% on running costs is £18,957m. However a reduction of £284k for stock loss through right to buy sales’ and regeneration schemes is also being made and will reduce the 2015/16 proposed fee to £18.673m.

The net effect, if the saving is taken, will be a management fee of £18.673m in 2015/16, against the fee for 2014/15 of £18.676m. This reflects an overall increase of 1.52% in the fee per property managed compared to 2014/15.

Savings of £284k can be achieved through efficiencies with no impact on service provision.
Item 2  No Inflationary increase to Repairs & Maintenance budgets

It has been proposed by Lewisham Homes that the forecast inflationary increase to the Repairs & Maintenance budget of 2.5% is removed, producing a saving or cost reduction of £413k.

This proposal will have an impact on Lewisham Homes trading account and M&E budgets. However, the Repairs Trading Account, operated by Lewisham Homes, made surpluses in both 2012/13 and 2013/14 respectively and is forecast to do so again in 2015/16. It is felt that this proposal can be accommodated without any impact on service provision, or reduction in repairs undertaken, due to improvements in efficiency.

Item 4  Nil Inflation on Internal Support Costs

No inflationary increase has been included for Internal support costs. This is due to cost efficiencies in the general fund being passed down to the HRA. Savings of £46k can be achieved with no impact on service provision.

Item 5  Reduction in Income on Communal Heating Systems

Lewisham Homes are proposing a reduction in the communal heating & hot water charge £1.87pw (18.93%). This will move the current charge down from £9.88pw to £8.01pw

The decrease is due to regular meter readings from the current supplier which has reduced the number of bills based on estimated readings. Consumption rates have also slightly decreased which has an effect on the 3 year average usage calculation.

Item 6  Increased Property Insurance Costs

The recharge to the HRA for property insurance will increase due to the recent revaluation of the stock and other council property effecting the charges received from the insurance brokers. The current forecast is for an increase in recharges of £110k.

Item 7  Reduction in tenants & leaseholders service charge income

The HRA financial model makes assessments regarding inflationary increases to both costs and income on annual basis. These need to be adjusted once firm proposals and inflationary data has been received.

It has been assessed that, following the proposals to reduce the average service charge levied to both tenants and leaseholders by Lewisham Homes, a shortfall of £166k against the model income assumptions for these areas is likely to arise.
APPENDIX X2: Tenants' Rent consultation 2015/16

The Tenants' rent consultation meeting took place on 11th December 2014 with Brockley tenants and on 15th December 2014 with Lewisham Homes managed tenants. Excalibur tenants consultation took place via letters to residents and a report sent to the committee in December 2014.

Views of representatives on rent rise & savings proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of representatives (excl Cllrs)/responses</th>
<th>Lewisham Homes</th>
<th>Brockley PFI</th>
<th>Excalibur TMO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent Rise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Savings Proposals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lewisham Homes Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. R&amp;M Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Energy Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support Costs Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communal Heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Property Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Service Charges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Service Charges inc: | No comments | No comments | n/a |
| Heating &amp; Hot Water Charges | No comments | No comments | No comments |
| Garage Rents | No comments | No comments | No comments |
| Tenants Fund | No comments | No comments | No comments |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of other comments made by representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewisham Homes Panel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent rise:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong concerns were raised relating to options B, C and D with regard for the impact of the rent rise on working tenants as the proposals were significantly higher that pay awards over the last 5 years. The comment was made that last year’s rise was also significantly higher than increases in pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants also requested that the council look at ways of mitigating the effect on those affected by the highest rent rises if options C or D were adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns where raised that arrears and evictions may increase as a result of higher rent rises. Lewisham Homes responded by advising the panel that rent arrears and evictions were falling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those present overwhelmingly supported option A, although one tenant added that they would have some support for option B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brockley PFI Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent Rise:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants unanimously favoured option A in light of the difficult economic times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Excalibur TMO Committee and Tenants | **Rent Rise:**  
The three responses received from tenants on the estate all presented the view that any rent increase would be unfair on residence as no investment had been made in the properties for some time and that accommodation standards were poor.  
The view was also expressed that anything other than the lowest option would discriminate against those that pay their rent in full, i.e. tenants not in receipt of benefits. |
APPENDIX X3: Leasehold and Tenants Charges Consultation 2015/16

1 Summary

1.1 The report sets out proposals to increase service charges to ensure full cost recovery in line with Lewisham Council’s budget strategy.

1.2 The report requests Brockley Residents Board members to consider the proposals to increase service charges based on an uplift of 2.2% for 2015/16 on specific elements. This is based on full cost recovery in line with previous years’ proposals.

2 Policy Context

2.1 The policy context for leasehold and tenant service charges is a mixture of statutory and Council Policy.

2.2 The Council’s Housing Revenue Account is a ring-fenced revenue account. The account is required to contain only those charges directly related to the management of the Council’s Housing stock. This requires that leaseholder charges reflect the true cost of maintaining their properties where the provision of their lease allows. This prevents the situation occurring where tenants are subsidising the cost of leaseholders who have purchased their properties.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Brockley Residents Board is requested to consider and comment on the proposals contained in this report and the feedback from the residents will be presented to Mayor and Cabinet as part of the wider rent setting report.

4. Purpose

4.1 The purpose of the report is to:

- outline the proposals for increases in service charges in line with the contract arrangements for leaseholders and tenants to recover costs incurred for providing these services
5. Housing Revenue Account Charges

5.1 There are a number of charges made to residents which are not covered through rents. These charges are principally:

- Leasehold Service Charges
- Tenant Service Charges

5.2 A service charge levy is applied to Tenants for caretaking, grounds maintenance, communal lighting, bulk waste collection and window cleaning. Tenants also pay a Tenants Fund Levy which is passed onto the Tenants Fund as a grant.

5.3 The key principles that should be considered when setting service charges are that:

- The charge should be fair and be no more or less than the cost of providing the service
- The charge can be easily explained
- The charge represents value for money
- The charging basis allocates costs fairly amongst those receiving the service
- The charge to all residents living in a block will be the same

5.4 The principle of full cost recovery ensures that residents pay for services consumed and minimises any pressures in the Housing Revenue Account in providing these services. This is in line with the current budget strategy.

5.5 In the current economic environment it must however be recognised that for some residents this may represent a significant financial strain. Those in receipt of housing benefit will receive housing benefit on increased service charges. Approximately 60% of council tenants are in receipt of housing benefit.

6. Analysis of full cost recovery

6.1 The following section provides analysis on the impact on individuals of increasing charges to the level required to ensure full cost recovery. The tables indicate the overall level of increases.

Leasehold service charges

6.2 The basis of the leasehold management charge has been reviewed and externally audited this summer to reflect the actual cost of the service. In line with best practice in the sector this is now a fixed cost rather than a variable cost. The management charge is £42.50 for street properties and £105.50 for blocks.
6.3 The uplift in leaseholder charges should reflect full cost recovery for the type of service undertaken. It is proposed that any uplift is applied at 2.2% (CPI (September 2014) + 1%).

6.4 The following table sets out the average weekly increase for the current services provided by Regenter Brockley:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Leasehold No.</th>
<th>Current Weekly Charge</th>
<th>New Weekly</th>
<th>Weekly Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caretaking</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>£3.55</td>
<td>£3.63</td>
<td>£0.07</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>£2.00</td>
<td>£2.04</td>
<td>£0.04</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>£0.74</td>
<td>£0.76</td>
<td>£0.01</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Waste</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>£1.21</td>
<td>£1.24</td>
<td>£0.02</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Cleaning</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>£0.09</td>
<td>£0.09</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Involvement</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>£0.24</td>
<td>£0.25</td>
<td>£0.01</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Services</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>£0.35</td>
<td>£0.36</td>
<td>£0.01</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Rent</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>£0.19</td>
<td>£0.19</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Repairs</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>£0.54</td>
<td>£0.55</td>
<td>£0.01</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Repairs</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>£0.32</td>
<td>£0.33</td>
<td>£0.01</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Phone</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>£0.05</td>
<td>£0.05</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>£0.30</td>
<td>£0.31</td>
<td>£0.01</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fee</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>£1.65</td>
<td>£1.69</td>
<td>£0.03</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£11.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>£11.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>£0.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenant service charges

6.5 Tenant service charges were separated out from rent (unpooled) in 2003/04, and have been increased by inflation since then. RB3 took over the provision of the caretaking and grounds maintenance services in 2007/08. Both tenants and leaseholders pay caretaking, grounds maintenance, communal lighting, bulk waste collection and window cleaning service charges.

6.6 In addition, tenants pay a contribution of £0.13pw to the Lewisham Tenants Fund. At present there are no plans to increase the Tenants Fund charges.

6.7 In order to ensure full cost recovery, tenant’s service charges for caretaking, grounds maintenance and other services should be increased in line with the percentage increase applied to leaseholder service charges. Overall, charges are suggested to be increased by an
average of £0.10pw which would move the current average weekly charge from £5.13 to £5.23.

6.8 The effect of increases in tenant service charges to a level that covers the full cost of providing the service is set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Weekly Charge</th>
<th>New Weekly Charge</th>
<th>Weekly Increase</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caretaking</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Waste</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Cleaning</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants fund</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.94%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9 The RB3 Board are asked for their views on these charges from 2015/16. Results of the consultation will be presented to Mayor and Cabinet for approval in February 2015.

7. Financial implications

The main financial implications are set out in the body of the report.

8. Legal implications

8.1 Section 24 of the Housing Act 1985 provides that a local housing authority may make such reasonable charges as they determine for the tenancy or occupation of their houses. The Authority must review rents from time to time and make such changes as circumstances require. Within this discretion there is no one lawful option and any reasonable option may be looked at. The consequences of each option must be explained fully so that Members understand the implications of their decisions.

8.2 Section 76 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 provides that local housing authorities are under a duty to prevent a debit balance in the HRA. Rents must therefore be set to avoid such a debit.

8.3 Section 103 of the Housing Act 1985 sets out the terms under which secure tenancies may be varied. This requires –

- the Council to serve a Notice of Variation at least 4 weeks before the effective date;
- the provision of sufficient information to explain the variation;
an opportunity for the tenant to serve a Notice to Quit terminating their tenancy.

8.4 The timetable for the consideration of the 2014/15 rent levels provides an adequate period to ensure that legislative requirements are met.

8.5 Part III of Schedule 4 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 provides that where benefits or amenities arising out of the exercise of a Housing Authority’s functions, are provided for persons housed by the authority, but are shared by the community as a whole, the authority shall make such contribution to their HRA from their other revenue accounts to properly reflect the community’s share of the benefits or amenities.

8.6 Where as an outcome of the rent setting process, there are to be significant changes in housing management practice or policy, further consultation may be required with the tenants affected in accordance with section 105 of the Housing Act 1985.

9. Crime and disorder implications

There are no specific crime and disorder implications in respect of this report paragraph.

10. Equalities implications

The general principle of ensuring that residents pay the same charge for the same service is promoting the principle that services are provided to residents in a fair and equal manner.

11. Environmental implications

There are no specific environmental implications in respect of this report.

12. Conclusion

12.1 Revising the level of charges ensures that the charges are fair and residents are paying for the services they use.

12.2 The additional resources generated will relieve some of the current pressures within Housing Revenue Account and will contribute to the funding of the PFI contract which is contained within the authorities Housing Revenue Account.

If you require any further information on this report please contact

Maxene McFarlane on 0207 635 1208 or Maxene.mcfarlane@pinnacle-psg.com
1. **Purpose of the Report**

1.1 This report sets out proposals to change existing service charges for residents in 2015/16 and updates the Area Panel on the Lewisham Homes budget position for 2015/16.

2. **Recommendations**

That the Area Panel:

2.1 Comments on the proposed service charges for 2015/16.

2.2 Notes the average changes, from 2014/15, in the tenanted and leasehold service charges:

- Tenants - decrease of £0.01 (-0.13%)
- Leaseholders - decrease of £0.09 (-0.65%)

2.3 Note the RPI for September 2014 is 2.3%.

2.4 Note that Lewisham’s service charges remain below the average charge for London Boroughs.

3. **Background of the Report**

3.1 The Council’s Housing Revenue Account is a ring fenced account. The account can only contain those charges directly related to the management of the Council’s housing stock. As a result, leaseholders must be charged the true cost of maintaining their properties, where the provision of their lease allows. This prevents tenants subsidising the cost to leaseholders.

3.2 The Lewisham Homes budget process has identified net efficiency savings, of £0.559m for 2015/16. These have been passed on to residents and contributed to the proposed changes for 2015/16.
3.3 Charges for both leaseholders and tenants have reduced. The proposed 2015/16 average service charge for tenants is £7.71. This is an average decrease of -0.13%, on the current charges of £7.72, though 70% of tenants are to receive an increase of 1.99% which is below the rate of inflation. Leaseholders average charge has reduced by -0.65%, on the current charges of £13.89 with 77% to receive an increase of 1.54%.

3.4 The tenant charges decrease is less than the leasehold decrease as they are not charged for services such as Entry Phone, the charge for which has reduced by 25% (-0.09) in 2015/16.

3.5 The proposed 2015/16 average service charge for tenants, at £7.71, is below the London average charge of £9.19 for 2013/14.

Lewisham Homes aims to provide services that are affordable to residents and that represent value for money.

4. Tenant and Leasehold service charges 2015/16

4.1 Table 1 below sets out the proposed changes between the current 2014/15 average charge and the 2015/16 proposed charge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Service</th>
<th>Tenant (T) / Leaseholders (LH)</th>
<th>Estimate (per week charge)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaking</td>
<td>T &amp; LH</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Maintenance</td>
<td>T &amp; LH</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Social Behaviour</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Services</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Involvement</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance - Building</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance Technical</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Phone</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Pest Control</td>
<td>T &amp; LH</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Rent</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeping</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Window Cleaning  | T & LH  | 0.06  | 0.06  | no change | 0.00 | 0.00%

Bulky House Hold Waste Collection Service  | T & LH  | 0.48  | 0.48  | no change | 0.00 | 0.00%

Insurance  | LH  | 0.87  | 0.87  | no change | 0.00 | 0.00%

Communal Lighting  | T & LH  | 0.86  | 1.21  | increase | 0.35 | 40.70%

Communal Heating and Hot Water  | T & LH  | 9.88  | 8.01  | decrease | -1.87 | 18.93%

Grand Total  | 30.54  | 29.11  | -1.43  | -4.68%

T & LH - Services Charges to both Tenant and Leaseholders , LH - Services Charges to Leaseholders only

5. Analysis of impact due to changes in Service Charges for Tenants

5.1 There is an overall decrease of -0.13% for the service charge for tenants, from £7.72 to £7.71 per week. This decrease is a result of a decrease in communal hot water and heating of -18.93%. The decrease in communal hot water and heating is due to a consistent drop in energy usage and stable purchase price over the last 3 years. The decrease in energy usage has been due to the relatively mild winters that we have had.

5.2 Communal lighting and block pest control charges have increased by 40.70% and 5.16% respectively. The increase in communal lighting charge is due to higher energy prices. Block Pest Control has increased as there are more infestation treatments on the 2015-16 programme.

5.3 Table 2, below sets out the impact of the changes for current services for Tenants. The average decrease is 0.13%, with 70% receiving an increase of 1.99%, which is below inflation at 2.3% (September RPI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bands of Decrease / Increase</th>
<th>Number of Tenants</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Average decrease / increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. £3.00 plus</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>-26.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec £2.01 to £3.00</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>-18.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec - £1.01 to £2.00</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>-11.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec - 0 to 1.00</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
<td>-4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc - 0 to 1.00</td>
<td>9,311</td>
<td>69.50%</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc - £1.01 to £2.00</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>16.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc - £2.01 to £3.00</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>23.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc – 3.00 plus</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>167.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>13,398</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dec – Decrease , Inc - Increase
6. Analysis of Impact due to changes in Service Charges for Leaseholders

6.1 Charges for leaseholders have reduced by -0.65%, i.e. from £13.89 to £13.80 per week. This is mainly due to reduction in communal heating and hot water, and entry phone charges.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bands of Decrease / Increase</th>
<th>Number in Band</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Average decrease / increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec - 3.00 plus</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>-31.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec - £2.01 to £3.00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>-11.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec - £1.01 to £2.00</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
<td>-8.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec - 0 to 1.00</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td>-2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc - 0 to 1.00</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>77.02%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc - £1.01 to £2.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc - £2.01 to £3.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>13.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc - 3.00 plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>901.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4,705</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-1.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dec – Decrease , Inc - Increase

7. Tenant Service Charge Benchmarking

7.1 The benchmarking data for 2014/15 is not currently available. As a result, the data for 2013/14 has been used to benchmark the service charge.

As Table 4 below shows the proposed average service charge for tenants for 2015/16 still remains below the average service charge for all London Boroughs in 2013/14.

Average charges per week for London Boroughs for tenanted Service Charges 2013/14.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>17.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>9.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewisham proposed charge 15/16</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.71</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Lewisham Homes Budget Proposals for 2015/16

8.1 Company Budget and the Fee

8.2 The fee and budget that Lewisham Homes is proposing for 2015/16 is £18.671m. This assumes inflation at 1% for staff pay and 2.5% for non-pay costs (1.5% effective rate). The changes to the management fee from 2014/15 to 2015/16 are set out in Table 5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Fee/budget</th>
<th>£’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/15 fee</td>
<td>18,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock loss</td>
<td>(282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 Fee</td>
<td>18,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 The proposed fee includes savings of £-0.936 and growth pressures from service areas of £0.337 resulting in a net saving of £-0.559.

8.4 The savings and growth with explanations are set out below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Savings</td>
<td>-444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Budgets</td>
<td>-492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-936</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate Savings - £-0.444m**

8.5 Corporate savings have been identified through savings on inflation provisions that have not been used in 2014/15. This is due to the effective and efficient delivery of services removing the need for increased budget provision.
Service improvements and Pressures £0.337m

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in SLA charges as a result of Town Hall move</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff to support residents through welfare reform changes</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretakers Enhanced Weekend Working</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff resources to support the community engagement team</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Town Hall Property Move £0.100m

8.6 The relocation of all our core operations to one site office has resulted in an increase in property related costs by £100,000. However, the Council will be offering rent free periods in the first two years of occupancy thereby reducing the growth requirement in property related costs for these periods.

Income and Revenue £0.154m

8.7 A total growth requirement of £154,000 has been identified in the Income and Revenue service, 50% of this is to cover two roles to mitigate the impact of Welfare Reforms. These two roles are currently funded on an ad hoc basis from company reserves and are now considered as mainstream requirements. The other 50% is to cover an increase in court fees.

Caretakers Enhanced Weekend Working £0.060m

8.8 A total growth requirement of £60,000 has been identified in the Estate services. This is to cover the cost of enhanced weekend working by caretakers.

Head of Community Engagement £0.063m

8.9 A new post of Head of Community engagement which has been funded from reserves in 2014/15 is now proposed to be part of core mainstream budgets at a cost of £63,000.

If you require further information on this report please contact Adam Barrett on 020 8613 7697 or email adam.barrett@lewishamhomes.org.uk
APPENDIX X5: Other Associated Housing Charges for 2015/16

Garage Rents

1. Allowance has been made for a 2.3% inflationary increase to garage rents in the Brockley area, based on the RPI rate at September 2014. This equates to an increase of £0.20 per week and raises the average basic charge from £8.49 to £8.69 per week.

2. Garage rents for the Lewisham Homes managed area are also proposed to rise in line with RPI inflation as at September 2014. This equates to an increase of £0.27 per week and would raise the average basic charge from £11.67 per week to £11.94 per week.

Tenants Levy

3. As part of the budget and rent setting proposals for 2005/6, a sum of £0.13 per week was ‘unpooled’ from rent as a tenants service charge in respect of the Lewisham Tenants Fund. There was no increase in charges for the period 2009/10 to 2013/14 following consultation with Housing Panels.

4. Lewisham Tenants Fund (LTF) put forward proposals to leave the levy at £0.13 for 2014/15. These were submitted to Housing Panels and agreed. Therefore, the levy for 2014/15 remains at £0.13 per property per week.

Hostel charges

5. Hostel accommodation charges are set based on rent restructuring rules and will rise by around 2.20% (£1.50 per week) under the rent restructuring formula.

6. Hostel services charges are set to achieve full cost recovery, following the implementation of self-financing. For 2015/16, the charge for Caretaking/management and Grounds Maintenance are proposed to be increase by 4.08% or £2.77 per week to reflect inflationary increases. This will move the average charge from £68.00 per unit per week to £70.77 per unit per week.

7. In addition, the charge levied for Heat, Light & Power (Energy) and Water Charges will not be increased due to further analysis on consumption patterns and communal area assumptions, which is now included within the service charge value noted in item 6 above. The charge for Heat, Light & Power will therefore remain the same at £5.24pw. Water charges will increase from £0.17 to £0.18 an increase £0.01pw. The charge for Council Tax will be based on the total recharged received from Council Tax section. All charges will be based on the total number of hostel units after being reconfigured resulting in a small increase in the total number of units.
8. Hostel residents were consulted on these proposals via individual letters. Officers also invited hostel residents to meet them to discuss the changes and how these may affect them. However, no comments or representations were received.

9. There are no proposals to increase support charges, as it has been assumed that Supporting People grant will not receive an inflationary increase for 2015/16. The charge for Sheltered Housing tenants will be held at £10.66 per week. The charge for Very Sheltered Housing tenants will be held at £94.53 per week. There are approximately 312 sheltered housing tenants and 37 Very Sheltered Housing tenants.

Linkline Charges

10. It is proposed to increase Linkline charges for 2015/16 by 2.5%. Charges will increase to £5.30 per week for line rental and £0.93 per week for maintenance from the current charge of £5.16 and £0.91 per week, respectively.

Private Sector Leasing (PSL)

11. Rent income for properties used in the Private Sector Leasing (PSL) scheme is a General Fund resource. Following consultation, the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) announced that the threshold for 2015/16 for housing benefits subsidy allowances will be based on the January 2011 Local Housing Allowance, less 10%, plus a management fee of £40 per property, subject to a maximum capped amount of £500 per week. It is recommended that rents for private sector leased properties are kept within the 2011/12 weekly threshold, as set out in Table B3 below.

Table B3 - Local Housing Allowances for 2015/16 (used for PSL purposes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Size</th>
<th>Total LHA Inner Lewisham</th>
<th>Total LHA Outer Lewisham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bed</td>
<td>£211.34</td>
<td>£180.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bed</td>
<td>£268.47</td>
<td>£211.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bed</td>
<td>£310.00</td>
<td>£246.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bed</td>
<td>£413.84</td>
<td>£310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bed</td>
<td>£500.00</td>
<td>£393.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heating & Hot Water Charges

12. As part of last year’s rent setting process the Mayor agreed to continue with the current formula methodology for calculating increases in Heating & Hot Water charges to tenants and leaseholders. This
formula was originally approved by Mayor & Cabinet in December 2004.

13. The current charging methodology allows a limited inflationary price increase plus a maximum of £2 per week per property increase on the previous years charge. Consumption levels are also updated and included in the formula calculation.

14. A new corporate contract for the supply of electricity and gas was re-let on 1st January 2014. This was a fixed price contract for a 3 year term. Consumption patterns remain under review and form part of the variable element of the contract.

15. The proposal for 2015/16 is for an decrease of 18.93% or -£1.87 per week for energy usage for communal heating. The decrease is a result of a consistent drop in energy consumption/usage and stable purchase prices. This will move the current average charge from £9.88pw to £8.01pw.

16. The proposal for communal lighting is an increase of 40.0% or £0.35 per week. This will move the current average charge from £0.86pw to £0.1.21pw. The increase is due to higher energy prices. Officers will review the costs and actual energy usage in 2014/15 as part of the monitoring regime for 2015/16 financial year and recommendations brought forward as part of the 2016/17 budget setting process.
A summary of the 20 historic debt cases proposed for write off is set out below. In each case any information that might be identifiable to a certain individual or property has been removed.

1. Former Tenant Arrears cases over £10k and prepared for write off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Balance Including Court Costs</th>
<th>Tenancy Start Date</th>
<th>Tenancy End Date</th>
<th>Case Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE 1</td>
<td>£10,820.61</td>
<td>15-Jul-02</td>
<td>02-May-04</td>
<td>This is a historic case and no information is available to demonstrate how the debt was accrued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 2</td>
<td>£12,973.48</td>
<td>08-May-95</td>
<td>06-Nov-05</td>
<td>This is a historic case and no information is available to demonstrate how the debt was accrued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 3</td>
<td>£18,359.35</td>
<td>22-Jul-02</td>
<td>23-Sep-07</td>
<td>This is a historic case and no information is available to demonstrate how the debt was accrued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 4</td>
<td>£14,598.34</td>
<td>14-Jul-03</td>
<td>20-Jan-08</td>
<td>This is a historic case and there is only limited information available to demonstrate how the debt was accrued. This is insufficient to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£56,751.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cases ended Pre July 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Balance Including Court Costs</th>
<th>Tenancy Start Date</th>
<th>Tenancy End Date</th>
<th>Case Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE 5</td>
<td>£10,578.23</td>
<td>25-Feb-85</td>
<td>22-Jun-08</td>
<td>This is a historic case and there is only limited information available to demonstrate how the debt was accrued. This is insufficient to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 6</td>
<td>£11,903.62</td>
<td>23-Aug-04</td>
<td>05-Oct-08</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 7</td>
<td>£11,856.23</td>
<td>07-Aug-00</td>
<td>21-Dec-08</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 8</td>
<td>£13,994.69</td>
<td>11-Dec-06</td>
<td>22-Mar-09</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 9</td>
<td>£13,206.05</td>
<td>28-Feb-00</td>
<td>26-Jul-09</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 10</td>
<td>£12,723.40</td>
<td>06-Mar-06</td>
<td>13-Sep-09</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 11</td>
<td>£10,792.96</td>
<td>15-Oct-07</td>
<td>01-Nov-09</td>
<td>This is a hugely complex case with very limited likelihood of there being a successful recovery action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 12</td>
<td>£10,345.70</td>
<td>14-Aug-06</td>
<td>15-Nov-09</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 13</td>
<td>£13,445.82</td>
<td>02-Feb-09</td>
<td>25-Apr-10</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 14</td>
<td>£10,616.87</td>
<td>10-Apr-95</td>
<td>25-Apr-10</td>
<td>There is insufficient information available to allow for recovery procedures to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£119,463.57</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cases ended post July 2010 (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Case Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 15</strong> £11,777.09</td>
<td>Unauthorised occupant, rent charges backdated, repossession delayed due to a stay hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 16</strong> £12,052.32</td>
<td>Arrears are from two tenancies. Tenant transferred from one LH property with £6k arrears and accrued £5k of arrears on the second LH property. There is a very limited likelihood of there being a successful recovery action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 17</strong> £10,154.73</td>
<td>Suspected abandonment and possession proceedings started, however unsuccessful in proving abandonment and legal action had to be re-started. Case further delayed by a 9 month wait for an eviction date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 18</strong> £10,204.43</td>
<td>Stay hearing delayed 4 times as judge accepted tenants delay in applying for HB due to husbands visa issues and their child’s poor health. Two further stay hearings then granted before eviction was successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 19</strong> £26,778.35</td>
<td>Both tenants deceased, no estate, arrears due to HB overpayment claw-back as tenants believed to be abroad when claiming HB. LH unsuccessfully appealed against HB overpayment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 20</strong> £18,661.54</td>
<td>Tenant passed away but the family did not inform HB or LH and relatives became unauthorised occupants. HB overpayment created as HB was paid after tenants death. LH unsuccessfully appealed against HB overpayment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Case Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> £89,628.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total all cases</strong> £265,843.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX Y1 – 2015/16 Previously Agreed Revenue Budget Savings

### 2015/16 SAVINGS SUMMARY - DIRECTORATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
<th>LEWISHAM FUTURE WORKSTRAND</th>
<th>2015/16 Agreed Savings £’000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN &amp; YOUNG PEOPLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support placements &amp; procurement</td>
<td>Safeguarding &amp; Early Intervention (Q)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after children, leaving care &amp; adoption service</td>
<td>Safeguarding &amp; Early Intervention (Q)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Safeguarding &amp; Early Intervention (Q)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance to welfare services</td>
<td>Safeguarding &amp; Early Intervention (Q)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to schools</td>
<td>School Effectiveness (J)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports development &amp; leisure centres</td>
<td>Culture &amp; Community (L)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green scene</td>
<td>Environmental Services (N)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Point – emergency hours</td>
<td>Public Services (O)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Point</td>
<td>Public Services (O)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES &amp; REGENERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Asset Optimisation (E)</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &amp; Operations</td>
<td>Management &amp; Corporate Overheads (I)</td>
<td>500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Partnerships</td>
<td>Management &amp; Corporate Overheads (I)</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL - REVENUE BUDGET SAVINGS AGREED</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,479.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX Y2 – 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings

Saving Proposals delegated on 12 November 2014 - Summary by Thematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Charging for Adult Social Care Services.</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Mental Health provision</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Proposal in respect of recouping health costs</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Efficiencies in the current facilities management contracts and optimising the current operational estate (reduction in the quantum of office accommodation).</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>New ways in generating income from assets.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Energy efficiency measures</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Establishment of a centrally located, corporate business support service which combines a general support function with specialist service hubs.</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1a</td>
<td>Reviewing charges to our School Service Level Agreements (SLAs), and reviewing the Council’s current investment strategy.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1b</td>
<td>Improving Council Tax debt collection.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Savings in management overheads, commissioning, and professional services budgets covering Finance, Legal Services, Audit and Risk, Human Resources and IMT.</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount £’000</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>The Prevention and Inclusion service will be tendering a number of services to increase efficiencies while reducing and targeting provision such as residential rehabilitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>574</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>Withdraw funding from the case mgt/support team element of the Integrated Offender Management Service.</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Libraries staff reorganisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Transfer of non-housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Review Parking Contract Client Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Restructure of planning service and Cutting funding for legal locum to deal with s106 agreements that is no longer required</td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total proposed savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>2,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: G1b Council Tax collection savings achieved via Collection Fund surplus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total proposed savings towards 15/16 General Fund budget requirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,058</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>2,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Saving Proposals returning to Mayor & Cabinet following 12 November 2014 - Summary by Thematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>This proposal will ensure that a consistent approach is taken in meeting</td>
<td>2,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>care and support needs in the most cost effective way. This may result in</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some community based packages of care ending or being reduced where</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needs can be met in different and more cost effective ways.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>The majority of this savings proposal (£900k) represents a negotiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reduction in 24 hour individual prices of care packages.£550K of saving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relates to pathway clarification and redesign. The final £50 relates to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extension of charging to people using supported living services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Reconfiguring sensory services provision.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Remodelling building based day services and associated transport costs.</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Public Health programme review (I)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Public Health programme review (II)</td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Review of services to support people to live at home</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining</td>
<td>1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>capacity, reductions in service capacity, service closures, a review of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mental health services across the board lends itself to changes in what is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>currently commissioned via the SP programme, and a complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reconfiguration and re-procurement of all remaining floating support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>In setting the 2014/15 budget the decision was agreed to effect this</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>efficiency saving by means of holding back an annual amount of £2.5m of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-pay inflation when setting service budgets. It is anticipated that this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approach will continue for the remainder of the programme (i.e. to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017/18). This assumption will be re-proposed for agreement as part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>setting the Council’s annual budget in February each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration &amp; Asset Management Division.</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount £’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1c</strong></td>
<td>Blue Badge administration fee</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong></td>
<td>Restructuring of enforcement and regulatory services</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K2</strong></td>
<td>Restructure of YOS service and changes in interventions and reduction in some contracts.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1</strong></td>
<td>Review of VCS grants programme.</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N1</strong></td>
<td>To close and cease to maintain a number of small parks, highways enclosures and closed churchyards and reduce management and management support posts</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N2</strong></td>
<td>Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs.</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1</strong></td>
<td>Discretionary Freedom Pass scheme.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>3,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2</strong></td>
<td>Review of Youth Services – Option 1.</td>
<td>1,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total proposed savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong> Q1 Non LFP element relating to resetting 14/15 Children’s budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total proposed savings towards 15/16 General Fund budget requirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW Saving Proposals for Mayor & Cabinet on 11 February - Summary by Thematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Reduction in a number of development budgets, an increase in income</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the deletion of two vacant posts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Reduction in the operating period of the Broadway Theatre.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total proposed savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Less:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total proposed savings towards 15/16 General Fund budget requirement</strong></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Saving Proposals contributing to the General Fund Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Previously agreed for 2015/16</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,480</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Delegated to officers on 12 November 2014</td>
<td>8,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Returning to M&amp;C in February 2015 for decision</td>
<td>18,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>New for M&amp;C in February 2015 for decision</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,929</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Total proposed savings towards 15/16 General Fund budget</td>
<td><strong>28,409</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirement**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ready Reckoner for Council Tax 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Council Tax (Band D)</th>
<th>Increase / Decrease</th>
<th>GLA Precept (Band D)</th>
<th>Total Council Tax (Band D)</th>
<th>Increase / Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£'M</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>268.062</td>
<td>1,060.35</td>
<td>299.00</td>
<td>1,359.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244.344</td>
<td>1,044.44 (1.50%)</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,339.44 (1.46%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244.745</td>
<td>1,049.75 (1.00%)</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,344.75 (1.07%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>245.146</td>
<td>1,055.05 (0.50%)</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,350.05 (0.68%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>245.546</td>
<td>1,060.35 0.00</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,355.35 (0.29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>245.946</td>
<td>1,065.65 0.50%</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,360.65 0.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246.347</td>
<td>1,070.95 1.00%</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,365.95 0.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246.748</td>
<td>1,076.26 1.50%</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,371.26 0.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246.948</td>
<td>1,078.91 1.75%</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>1,373.91 1.07%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Y4: Chief Financial Officer’s Section 25 Statement

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER’S STATEMENT REQUIRED UNDER SECTION 25 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

To follow for Mayor & Cabinet 18th February 2014
APPENDIX Y5

COUNCIL TAX AND STATUTORY CALCULATIONS

Council Tax Calculation

As part of the Localism Act 2011, any Council Tax increases that exceed 2% in 2015/16 will trigger an automatic referendum of all registered electors in the borough. The statutory calculation for whether the Council is required to hold a referendum is based upon the ‘relevant basic’ amount of Council Tax, which under accounting regulations, includes levies. Any final recommendations on Council Tax levels will need to meet statutory requirements.

To date, Lewisham has only received one formal provisional notification from its levy bodies for 2015/16 (the Environment Agency). The LPFA and the Lee Valley levies have both been estimated for 2015/16 (it is assumed they will not change). Formal final notifications are expected to be received week commencing 9th February 2015.

Council Tax and Levies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Relevant Basic’ Amount of Council Tax</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Base</td>
<td>73,941</td>
<td>75,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Requirement with Levy (£)</td>
<td>78,403,552</td>
<td>79,178,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Amount of Council Tax (£)</td>
<td>1,060.35</td>
<td>1,060.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in basic amount of Council Tax (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy bodies for Lewisham</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPFA (estimated)</td>
<td>1,243,426</td>
<td>1,243,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Valley Regional Park (estimated)</td>
<td>232,766</td>
<td>232,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency (provisional)</td>
<td>170,425</td>
<td>172,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Levies</td>
<td>1,646,617</td>
<td>1,649,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term “relevant basic amount of council tax” is defined in section 52ZX of the 1992 Act (inserted as above and amended by section 41(1) and (9) to (13) of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014).
Statutory Calculations

1) It be noted that at its meeting on 21 January 2015, the Council calculated the number of 75,526.1 as its Council Tax base for 2015/16 in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Taxbase) Regulations;

2) The following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2015/16 in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

a. £1,040,469,544 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for gross expenditure, calculated in accordance with Section 32(2)A of the Act;

b. £794,923,465 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for income, calculated in accordance with Section 32(3)A of the Act;

c. £245,546,079 being the amount by which the aggregate of 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate of 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32A(4) of the Act, as its General Fund budget requirement for the year;

d. £160,598,382 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of the Settlement Funding Assessment. This includes a Settlement Funding Assessment adjustment of £1,259,461;

e. £84,948,100 being the residual amount required to be collected from Council Tax payers. This includes the surplus on the Council’s Collection Fund of £4,864,000.

f. £1,060.35 being the residual sum at (e) above (less the surplus on the Collection Fund), divided by the Council Tax base of 75,526.1 which is Lewisham’s precept on the Collection Fund for 2014/15 at the level of Band D;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Council Tax (LBL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>706.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>824.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>942.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1,060.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,295.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,531.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1,767.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,120.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at (f) above by the number which, in proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council in
accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands;

3) It be noted that for the year 2015/16, the Greater London Authority is currently consulting on the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended), for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>GLA Precept</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>196.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>229.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>262.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>360.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>426.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>491.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>590.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Having calculated the estimated aggregate amount in each case of the amounts at 2) (f) and 3) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, assumed the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2015/16 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Total Council Tax (LBL &amp; GLA)</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>903.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,054.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,204.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1,355.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,656.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,957.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2,258.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,710.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Y6 - Making Fair Financial Decisions

Equality and Human Rights Commission

This guidance has been updated to reflect the new equality duty which came into force on 5 April 2011. It provides advice about the general equality duty.

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.

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.

2B Aim of this guide

This guide aims to assist decision-makers in ensuring that:

• The process they follow to assess the impact on equality of financial proposals is robust, and
• The impact that financial proposals could have on 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:

3B The benefits of assessing the impact on equality

By law, your assessments of impact on equality must:

• Contain enough information to enable a public authority to demonstrate it has had ‘due regard’ to the aims of the equality duty in its decision-making
• Consider ways of mitigating or avoiding any adverse impacts.

Such assessments do not have to take the form of a document called an equality impact assessment. If you choose not to develop a document of this type, then some alternative approach which systematically assesses any adverse impacts of a change in policy, procedure or practice will be required.

Assessing impact on equality is not an end in itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision that is being made.

Whether it is proportionate for an authority to conduct an assessment of the impact on equality of a financial decision or not depends on its relevance to the authority’s particular function and its likely impact on people from the protected groups.

We recommend that you document your assessment of the impact on equality when developing financial proposals. This will help you to:

• Ensure you have a written record of the equality considerations you have taken into account.
• Ensure that your decision includes a consideration of the actions that would help to avoid or mitigate any impacts on particular protected groups. Individual decisions should also be informed by the wider context of decisions in your own and other relevant public authorities, so that particular groups are not unduly affected by the cumulative effects of different decisions.

• Make your decisions based on evidence: a decision which is informed by relevant local and national information about equality is a better quality decision. Assessments of impact on equality provide a clear and systematic way to collect, assess and put forward relevant evidence.

• Make the decision-making process more transparent: a process which involves those likely to be affected by the policy, and which is based on evidence, is much more open and transparent. This should also help you secure better public understanding of the difficult decisions you will be making in the coming months.

• Comply with the law: a written record can be used to demonstrate that due regard has been had. Failure to meet the equality duty may result in authorities being exposed to costly, time-consuming and reputation-damaging legal challenges.

4B When should your assessments be carried out?

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

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

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

5B What should I be looking for in my assessments?

Assessments of impact on equality need to be based on relevant information and enable the decision-maker to understand the equality implications of a decision and any alternative options or proposals.
As with everything, proportionality is a key principle. Assessing the impact on equality of a major financial proposal is likely to need significantly more effort and resources dedicated to ensuring effective engagement, than a simple assessment of a proposal to save money by changing staff travel arrangements.

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

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

  Joint working with your public authority partners will also help you to consider thoroughly the impact of your joint decisions on the people you collectively serve.

  **Example:** A local authority takes separate decisions to limit the eligibility criteria for community care services; increase charges for respite services; scale back its accessible housing programme; and cut concessionary travel. Each separate decision may have a significant effect on the lives of disabled residents, and the cumulative impact of these decisions may be considerable. This combined impact would not be apparent if the decisions were considered in isolation.

• **Has the assessment considered available evidence?**
  Public authorities should consider the information and research already available locally and nationally. The assessment of impact on equality should be underpinned by up-to-date and reliable information about the different protected groups that the proposal is likely to have an impact on. A lack of information is not a sufficient reason to conclude that there is no impact.

• **Have those likely to be affected by the proposal been engaged?**
  Engagement is crucial to assessing the impact on equality. There is no explicit requirement to engage people under the equality duty, but it will help you to improve the equality information that you use to understand the possible impact on your policy on different protected groups. No-one can give you a better insight into how proposed changes will have an impact on, for example, disabled people, than disabled people themselves.

• **Have potential positive and negative impacts been identified?**
  It is not enough to state simply that a policy will impact on everyone equally; there should be a more in-depth consideration of available evidence to see if particular protected groups are more likely to be affected than others. Equal treatment does not always produce equal outcomes; sometimes authorities will have to take particular steps for certain groups to address an existing disadvantage or to meet differing needs.
• What course of action does the assessment suggest that I take? Is it justifiable?
The assessment should clearly identify the option(s) chosen, and their potential impacts, and document the reasons for this decision. There are four possible outcomes of an assessment of the impact on equality, and more than one may apply to a single proposal:

**Outcome 1: No major change required** when the assessment has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to advance equality have been taken.

**Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers identified by the assessment or to better advance equality.** Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified?

**Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified some potential for adverse impacts or missed opportunities to advance equality.** In this case, the justification should be included in the assessment and should be in line with the duty to have ‘due regard’. For the most important relevant policies, compelling reasons will be needed. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact, as discussed below.

**Outcome 4: Stop and rethink** when an assessment shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination.

• Are there plans to alleviate any negative impacts?
Where the assessment indicates a potential negative impact, consideration should be given to means of reducing or mitigating this impact. This will in practice be supported by the development of an action plan to reduce impacts. This should identify the responsibility for delivering each action and the associated timescales for implementation. Considering what action you could take to avoid any negative impact is crucial, to reduce the likelihood that the difficult decisions you will have to take in the near future do not create or perpetuate inequality.

**Example:** A University decides to close down its childcare facility to save money, particularly given that it is currently being under-used. It identifies that doing so will have a negative impact on women and individuals from different racial groups, both staff and students.

In order to mitigate such impacts, the University designs an action plan to ensure relevant information on childcare facilities in the area is disseminated to staff and students in a timely manner. This will help to improve partnership working with the local authority and to ensure that sufficient and affordable childcare remains accessible to its students and staff.

• Are there plans to monitor the actual impact of the proposal?
Although assessments of impact on equality will help to anticipate a proposal’s likely effect on different communities and groups, in reality the full impact of a decision will only be known once it is introduced. It is therefore important to set out
arrangements for reviewing the actual impact of the proposals once they have been implemented.

6B What happens if you don't properly assess the impact on equality of relevant decisions?

If you have not carried out an assessment of impact on equality of the proposal, or have not done so thoroughly, you risk leaving yourself open to legal challenges, which are both costly and time-consuming. Recent legal cases have shown what can happen when authorities do not consider their equality duties when making decisions.

Example: A court recently overturned a decision by Haringey Council to consent to a large-scale building redevelopment in Wards Corner in Tottenham, on the basis that the council had not considered the impact of the proposal on different racial groups before granting planning permission.

However, the result can often be far more fundamental than a legal challenge. If people feel that an authority is acting high-handedly or without properly involving its service users or employees, or listening to their concerns, they are likely to become disillusioned with you.

Above all, authorities which fail to carry out robust assessments of the impact on equality risk making poor and unfair decisions that could discriminate against particular protected groups and perpetuate or worsen inequality.

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

www.equality.humanrights.com
APPENDIX Z1: Interest Rate Forecasts 2015 - 2018

The Council has appointed Capita Asset Services as its treasury advisor and part of their service is to assist the Council to formulate a view on interest rates. The following table gives Capita’s central view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Average %</th>
<th>Bank Rate %</th>
<th>PWLB Borrowing Rates % (including certainty rate adjustment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2015</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2015</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2016</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2016</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2016</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2017</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2017</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2017</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2018</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Z2: Economic Background

The UK. Economy

Growth Performance

UK. After strong UK GDP growth in 2013 at an annual rate of 2.7%, and then in 2014 0.7% in Q1, 0.9% in Q2 2014 (annual rate 3.2% in Q2), Q3 has seen growth fall back to 0.7% in the quarter and to an annual rate of 2.6%. It therefore appears that growth has eased since the surge in the first half of 2014 leading to a downward revision of forecasts for 2015 and 2016, albeit that growth will still remain strong by UK standards. For this recovery to become more balanced and sustainable in the longer term, the recovery needs to move away from dependence on consumer expenditure and the housing market to exporting, and particularly of manufactured goods, both of which need to substantially improve on their recent lacklustre performance.

Employment and wages

This overall strong growth has resulted in unemployment falling much faster than expected. The MPC is now focusing on how quickly slack in the economy is being used up. It is also particularly concerned that the squeeze on the disposable incomes of consumers should be reversed by wage inflation rising back significantly above the level of inflation in order to ensure that the recovery will be sustainable. There also needs to be a major improvement in labour productivity, which has languished at dismal levels since 2008, to support increases in pay rates.

Unemployment is expected to keep on its downward trend and this is likely to eventually feed through into a return to significant increases in wage growth at some point during the next three years. However, just how much those future increases in pay rates will counteract the depressive effect of increases in Bank Rate on consumer confidence, the rate of growth in consumer expenditure and the buoyancy of the housing market, are areas that will need to be kept under regular review.

Inflation

Also encouraging has been the sharp fall in inflation (CPI), reaching 1.0% in November 2014, the lowest rate since September 2002. Forward indications are that inflation is likely to remain around or under 1% for the best part of a year. The return to strong growth has helped lower forecasts for the increase in Government debt over the last year but monthly public sector deficit figures during 2014 have disappointed until November. The autumn statement, therefore, had to revise the speed with which the deficit is forecast to be eliminated.
The Eurozone

Growth and inflation

The Eurozone is facing an increasing threat from weak or negative growth and from deflation. In November 2014, the inflation rate fell further, to reach a low of 0.3%. However, this is an average for all EZ countries and includes some countries with negative rates of inflation. Accordingly, the ECB took some rather limited action in June and September 2014 to loosen monetary policy in order to promote growth. It now appears likely that the ECB will embark on full quantitative easing (purchase of EZ country sovereign debt) in early 2015.

Sovereign debt

Concern in financial markets for the Eurozone subsided considerably after the prolonged crisis during 2011-2013. However, sovereign debt difficulties have not gone away and major issues could return in respect of any countries that do not dynamically address fundamental issues of low growth, international uncompetitiveness and the need for overdue reforms of the economy, (as Ireland has done). It is, therefore, possible over the next few years that levels of government debt to GDP ratios could continue to rise for some countries. This could mean that sovereign debt concerns have not disappeared but, rather, have only been postponed.

The ECB’s pledge in 2012 to buy unlimited amounts of bonds of countries which ask for a bailout has provided heavily indebted countries with a strong defence against market forces. This has bought them time to make progress with their economies to return to growth or to reduce the degree of recession. However, debt to GDP ratios (2013 figures) of Greece 180%, Italy 133%, Portugal 129%, Ireland 124% and Cyprus 112%, remain a cause of concern, especially as some of these countries are experiencing continuing rates of increase in debt in excess of their rate of economic growth i.e. these debt ratios are likely to continue to deteriorate.

Any sharp downturn in economic growth would make these countries particularly vulnerable to a new bout of sovereign debt crisis. It should also be noted that Italy has the third biggest debt mountain in the world behind Japan and the US.

Greece

The general election due to take place on 25 January 2015 is likely to bring a political party to power which is anti EU and anti austerity. However, if this eventually results in Greece leaving the Euro, it is unlikely that this will directly destabilise the Eurozone as the EU has put in place adequate firewalls to contain the immediate fallout to just Greece.

USA

The U.S. Federal Reserve ended its monthly asset purchases in October 2014. GDP growth rates (annualised) for Q2 and Q3 of 4.6% and 5.0% have been stunning and
hold great promise for strong growth going forward. It is therefore confidently forecast that the first increase in the Fed. rate will occur by the middle of 2015.

**China**

Government action in 2014 to stimulate the economy appeared to be putting the target of 7.5% growth within achievable reach but recent data has indicated a marginally lower outturn for 2014, which would be the lowest rate of growth for many years.

**Japan**

Japan is causing considerable concern as the increase in sales tax in April 2014 has suppressed consumer expenditure and growth to the extent that it has slipped back into recession in Q2 and Q3. The Japanese government already has the highest debt to GDP ratio in the world.

**Capita Asset Services Forward View**

Economic forecasting remains difficult with so many external influences weighing on the UK. Our Bank Rate forecasts, (and also MPC decisions), will be liable to further amendment depending on how economic data transpires over 2015. Forecasts for average earnings beyond the three year time horizon will be heavily dependent on economic and political developments. Major volatility in bond yields is likely to endure as investor fears and confidence ebb and flow between favouring more risky assets i.e. equities, or the safe haven of bonds.

The overall longer run trend is for gilt yields and PWLB rates to rise, due to the high volume of gilt issuance in the UK, and of bond issuance in other major western countries. Increasing investor confidence in eventual world economic recovery is also likely to compound this effect as recovery will encourage investors to switch from bonds to equities.

The overall balance of risks to economic recovery in the UK is currently evenly balanced. Only time will tell just how long this current period of strong economic growth will last; it also remains exposed to vulnerabilities in a number of key areas.
APPENDIX Z3: Credit Worthiness Policy (Linked to Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) – Credit and Counterparty Risk Management)

Annual Investment Strategy

The key requirements of both the Code and the investment guidance are to set an annual investment strategy, as part of its annual treasury strategy for the following year, covering the identification and approval of the following:

- The strategy guidelines for choosing and placing investments
- The principles to be used to determine the maximum periods for which funds can be committed.
- Specified or non-specified investments that the Council will use. These are high security (i.e. high credit rating, although this is defined by the Council, and no guidelines are given), and high liquidity investments in sterling and with a maturity of no more than a year.

Specified Investments: These investments are sterling investments of not more than one-year maturity, or those which could be for a longer period but where the Council has the right to be repaid within 12 months if it wishes. These are considered low risk assets where the possibility of loss of principal or investment income is small. These would include sterling investments which would not be defined as capital expenditure with:

1. The UK Government (such as the Debt Management Account deposit facility, UK treasury bills, or a gilt with less than one year to maturity).
2. Supranational bonds of less than one year’s duration.
3. A local authority, parish council or community council.
4. Pooled investment vehicles (such as money market funds) that have been awarded a high credit rating (AAA) by a credit rating agency.
5. A body that is considered of a high credit quality (such as a bank or building society)

Within these bodies, and in accordance with the Code, the Council has set additional criteria to set the time and amount of monies which will be invested in these bodies. This criteria is as described below.

Non-Specified Investments: These are any investments which do not meet the specified investment criteria. The Council does not currently invest in non-specified investments.

This Council applies the creditworthiness service provided by Capita Asset Services. This service employs a sophisticated modelling approach utilising credit ratings from the three main credit rating agencies - Fitch, Moody’s and Standard and Poor’s. The credit ratings of counterparties are supplemented with the following overlays:

The credit ratings of counterparties are supplemented with the following overlays:
- credit watches and credit outlooks from credit rating agencies;
• CDS spreads to give early warning of likely changes in credit ratings; and
• sovereign ratings to select counterparties from only the most creditworthy countries.

These factors are weighted and combined with an overlay of Credit Default Swap CDS spreads. The end product is a series of ratings (colour coded) to indicate the relative creditworthiness of counterparties. These ratings are used by the Council to determine the suggested duration for investments.

The criteria, time limits and monetary limits applying to institutions or investment vehicles are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum credit criteria / colour band</th>
<th>Max % of total investment s/ £ limit per institution</th>
<th>Max. maturity period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMADF – UK Government</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Government gilts</td>
<td>UK sovereign rating</td>
<td>£20m 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Government Treasury bills</td>
<td>UK sovereign rating</td>
<td>£60m 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money market funds</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>£30m Liquid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£10m 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term deposits with banks and building societies</td>
<td>Yellow Purple Blue Orange Red Green*** No Colour</td>
<td>£30m £25m £40m £20m £15m £10m 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call accounts and notice accounts</td>
<td>Yellow Purple Blue Orange Red Green No Colour</td>
<td>In line with the above Liquid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*for UK Government debt, or its equivalent, constant net asset value money market funds and collateralised deposits where the collateral is UK Government debt
The monitoring of investment counterparties - The credit rating of counterparties will be monitored regularly. The Council receives credit rating information (changes, rating watches and rating outlooks) from Capita Asset Services as and when ratings change, and counterparties are checked promptly. On occasion ratings may be downgraded when an investment has already been made. The criteria used are such that a minor downgrading should not affect the full receipt of the principal and interest. Any counterparty failing to meet the criteria will be removed from the list immediately by the Executive Director of Resources and Regeneration, and if required new counterparties which meet the criteria will be added to the list. Any fixed term investment held at the time of the downgrade will be left to mature as such investments cannot be broken mid term.

Accounting treatment of investments. The accounting treatment may differ from the underlying cash transactions arising from investment decisions made by this Council. To ensure that the Council is protected from any adverse revenue impact, which may arise from these differences, we will review the accounting implications of new transactions before they are undertaken.
APPENDIX Z4: Approved countries for investments

Based on lowest available rating

AAA
- Australia
- Canada
- Denmark
- Germany
- Luxembourg
- Norway
- Singapore
- Sweden
- Switzerland

AA+
- Finland
- Hong Kong
- Netherlands
- U.K.
- U.S.A.

AA
- Abu Dhabi (UAE)
- France
- Qatar
APPENDIX Z5: Requirement of the CIPFA Management Code of Practice

Treasury management scheme of delegation

(i) Full Council
- budget consideration and approval;
- approval of annual strategy.
- approval of/amendments to the organisation’s treasury management policy statement

(ii) Public Accounts Committee
- receiving and reviewing reports on treasury management policies, practices and activities;

The treasury management role of the section 151 officer

The S151 (responsible) officer
- Recommending treasury management policy for approval, reviewing the same regularly, and monitoring compliance;
- submitting regular treasury management policy reports;
- submitting budgets and budget variations;
- receiving and reviewing management information reports;
- reviewing the performance of the treasury management function;
- ensuring the adequacy of treasury management resources and skills, and the effective division of responsibilities within the treasury management function;
- ensuring the adequacy of internal audit, and liaising with external audit;
- approval of the division of responsibilities;
- approving the organisation’s treasury management practices;
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1. **Purpose**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Mayor and Cabinet and to seek their approval to change the model of delivery and contracts for the provision of healthy eating and physical activity initiatives from mainly designated local services in specific wards to a single contract and provision that is available more widely in the borough.

2. **Recommendation/s**

2.1. Mayor and Cabinet are recommended to:

   a) Agree the plan to reconfigure the delivery of community based healthy eating and physical activity initiatives.

   b) Agree the proposal to tender the delivery of borough-wide healthy eating and physical activity initiatives to a suitable provider.

3. **Policy Context**

3.1 The Health and Social Care Act (2012) places a statutory obligation on the Council, Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and the NHS Commissioning Board to develop a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment to produce a joint Health & Wellbeing Strategy to meet identified needs.

3.2 Achieving a healthy weight in children and adults is a priority in Lewisham’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Children and Young People’s plan. Promotion of nutrition and healthy eating are key actions in delivering this priority.

3.3 Promoting the uptake of physical activity is one of the key actions in the Lewisham Health and Wellbeing Delivery Plan.

3.4 Achieving a healthy weight and promoting the uptake of physical activity also support the Sustainable Communities priority of healthy, active and enjoyable-where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being.
3.5 Healthy eating and physical activity interventions contribute to the preventative and health behaviour change aspects of Lewisham’s Adult Integrated Care Programme.

3.6 The mayor’s manifesto commitments include developing comprehensive local food and nutrition policies to tackle food poverty.

4. **Background**

4.1 The Public Health Service currently fund a number of healthy eating/nutrition and physical activity initiatives delivered mainly in specific localities in the borough. These are:

i. The Downham Nutrition Partnership covering Downham, Whitefoot, Catford South and Grove Park wards. The current contract is with Downham Nutrition Partnership. It supports over 30 organisations and approximately 1000 people per year.

ii. The Community Development and Nutrition Project in New Cross and Evelyn wards. The current contract is with Greenwich Cooperative Development Agency. It reaches approximately 120 beneficiaries per year through a Community Development for Health post that supports local groups.

iii. The Food Co-operative in the north of the Borough promotes healthy eating through the provision of affordable and accessible food to those in the local community who may not have had access to healthy foods both due to location and cost. The Food Co-op reaches on average 900 people per year.

iv. The Community Cookery programme is delivered in different parts of the borough to enable people to learn the skills of cooking healthily on a limited budget. The current contract is with Greenwich Cooperative Development Agency. The programme reaches approximately 120 beneficiaries per year.

v. The Healthier Catering Commitment scheme that supports businesses to provide healthier food options while helping the business itself save money. The current contract is with Lewisham Environmental Services. The scheme supports 40 businesses per year.

vi. The Gateway Physical Activity Project to promote physical activity opportunities to local adult residents who are sedentary or active at low levels in the North Lewisham area (Evelyn and New Cross) and Catford South and Well London Bellingham. The project supports on average 100 people per year on long term behavioural change engagement.
4.2 Current contract values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Contract value per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downham Nutrition Partnership</td>
<td>£34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development and Nutrition Project</td>
<td>£14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Cooperative</td>
<td>£10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Cookery Programme</td>
<td>£14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthier Catering Commitment</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gateway Physical Activity Project</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£109,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 There are currently separate contracts for the above lifestyle initiatives and these are delivered by four different providers. This report seeks agreement to reconfigure the delivery of community based healthy eating and physical activity initiatives and to tender the delivery of borough-wide healthy eating and physical activity initiatives to a suitable provider.

5. Proposed changes

5.1 The community-based initiatives described in the previous section have engaged individuals, agencies and communities in their respective geographical areas in health improvement activities and projects. The self-reported outcomes indicate that participation in activities that promote healthy eating and physical activity resulted in positive behaviour lifestyle changes. Details were presented in a report to the Health and Wellbeing Board (19th September 2013): ‘An Evaluation of the North Lewisham Health Improvement Programme and the Transfer of Learning’. A further report was presented to the Healthier Communities Select Committee (2nd December 2014): ‘Sustainability of Community Health Initiatives’. Public Health England have also recognised the value of Lewisham’s community cookery initiative and have stated that they intend to use the outcomes as a case study to support healthy eating in communities.

5.2 Options for the proposed changes:

a) Continue with the current model of delivery reaching only some sectors of the community or;

b) Deliver an alternative model so that the healthy eating/nutrition and physical activity initiatives would be more widely available in the borough.

5.3 It is felt that this second option b) is preferable so that more communities will benefit from lifestyle changes leading to greater health equality opportunities.
5.4 It is proposed that the learning from the programmes described in the previous section will be used as a basis for transferring the community-based initiatives from a localised model to a borough-wide approach.

5.5 The borough-wide approach aligns with plans at Neighbourhood level including the integration of health and social care. The healthy eating and physical activity initiatives will complement and enhance the existing North Lewisham Health Improvement programme in Neighbourhood 1, Bellingham Well London in Neighbourhood 4 and planned health improvement programmes in Downham (Neighbourhood 3) and Central Lewisham (Neighbourhood 2).

5.6 The initiatives delivered to improve the skills and resilience of local residents around food and healthy eating will form an integral component of the council’s local food and nutrition policy to tackle food poverty.

5.6 An aspect of the long term plan is to enable some of the existing work to become self-sustaining. For example the running and management of the Food Co-operative in the north of the borough will be taken over by the community steering group allowing funds to be reallocated to support borough-wide initiatives.

5.7 A Train the Trainer approach will be used to enable local people to lead the planning and delivery of cook and eat sessions in their setting. This will provide sustainable local support for ongoing and future initiatives.

5.8 Commissioning the delivery of borough-wide healthy eating and physical activity from one provider will provide the following benefits;

i. ensure a co-ordinated service operating via separate but linked programmes
ii. improved opportunity to share good practice and learning
iii. single procurement process
iv. cost-savings on management and overheads.

6. **The new service model**

6.1 The new service model will take a community development approach to delivery, supporting individuals, groups and organisations to promote healthy lifestyles with a focus on healthy eating and physical activity. The proposal is to tender the delivery of the borough-wide healthy eating and physical activity to a suitable provider. This will be undertaken through an open tender process using either a prime provider model or collaborative partnership model approach.

6.2 It is expected that the new model will include the appointment of a community development nutritionist, a community development physical activity specialist and a community development food worker. These posts will work to enhance the existing programmes in the Neighbourhoods and increase synergy between the varied initiatives in the community.
6.3 The objectives of these posts will be to:

i. Promote healthy eating through the provision of appropriate information and training to develop people’s knowledge and skills on healthy recipes and food choices.

ii. Deliver nutrition sessions and workshops.

iii. Increase local people’s consumption of fruit and vegetables.

iv. Increase the number of people who have the knowledge and interest in growing food.

v. To promote active lifestyle for local residents.

vi. Deliver physical activity sessions and workshops.

vii. Increase the number of people who are active.

viii. Increase the number of community development practitioners promoting healthy lifestyle messages.

ix. Develop and maintain relationship with key community leaders and organizations to enhance opportunities for promoting healthy lifestyles.

tax. Provide one to one support sessions to groups and individuals.

xi. Facilitate the development and sustainability of partnerships to ensure engagement in activities and share learning.

xii. Increase community engagement through partnership links between local volunteers and other agencies in order to improve health through promotion of healthy eating and active lifestyles.

xiii. Increase local knowledge and skills for developing social enterprise to enable the long term sustainability of the project.

6.4 The service will also deliver the following borough-wide activities:

a) Community cookery programmes

6.5 The objectives are:

i. To improve healthy eating behaviours amongst beneficiaries through cooking healthy meals.

ii. To increase beneficiaries confidence to prepare healthy meals from fresh ingredients on a budget.

iii. To improve knowledge and understanding of healthy eating to achieve a healthy lifestyle.

iv. To evaluate behaviour change at end of course and at 6 months after completion of course.

Target: to reach approximately 120 beneficiaries per year.

b) Healthier Catering Commitment (HCC)
6.6 The scheme works with catering businesses to help them change to providing healthier food options while at the same time saving money. The four main strands of work undertaken by the provider are:

i. Development and promoting the uptake of the HCC scheme by catering businesses in Lewisham.

ii. Provision of expertise to manage and run the scheme.

iii. Provision of reports on outcome of the scheme.

iv. Provision of advice, training and to implement the scheme.

Target: To support 40 businesses per year.

c) The Gateway Physical Activity Project

6.7 The objectives are:

i. To promote active lifestyle for local residents

ii. Identify and recruit inactive/sedentary adults and young people from specified areas

iii. Follow up 25% of those recruited and increase their physical activity levels from baseline over a 12 week period

iv. Record number of residents engaged and signposted to activity opportunities over the specified period

Target: To support 100 people per year on long term behaviour change.

d) Universal Vitamin D Scheme

6.8 The service will support the implementation of the universal Vitamin D scheme in the borough through facilitating training sessions, promotion and raising awareness of the scheme.

e) Community Development approach to healthy eating and physical activity

6.9 The model will in addition support community development approach with funds for participatory budgeting in Neighbourhoods 2 and 3 (similar to the approach in the North Lewisham Health Improvement programme and Bellingham Well London). This will enable delivery of lifestyle activities aimed at promoting healthy eating and physical activity.

7. Financial Implications

7.1 This report proposes a reconfiguration of nutrition and physical activity initiatives in 2015/16. The funding for these activities is the ring fenced Public Health Grant.

7.2 The annual total funding available for 2015/16 is £124,000. This is derived from the budgets for the schemes described above less savings included in the 2015/16 Community Services savings proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community cookery</td>
<td>19,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downham nutrition partnership</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthier Catering Commitment</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Nutrition Project</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food co-op</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Physical Activity Coop</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community physical activity</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>154,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: proposed saving</td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available:</strong></td>
<td><strong>124,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Legal Implications**

8.1 The Council has responsibility for the public health of its residents and as set out in the Financial Implications received central government funding for this function. It is required to obtain efficiencies and value for money in all of its tendering and contracting activities.

9. **Crime and Disorder Implications**

9.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

10. **Equality Implications**

10.1 An Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) was undertaken on the options. It was concluded that the recommended option, whereby healthy eating/nutrition and physical activity initiatives would be more widely available in the borough will lead to greater health equality opportunities.

10.2 An Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) has also been carried out on the Lewisham Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The Lewisham Health and Wellbeing Strategy, which promotes healthy eating and physical activity, is underpinned by the principle of reducing inequalities.

11. **Environmental Implications**

11.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising from this report.
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1. Summary

1.1.1 This report sets out the processes that have been undertaken to seek the rebuilding of the Greyhound Public House following Mayor and Cabinet on 22 October 2014.

2. Purpose

2.1.1 To update progress reached with the rebuilding of the Greyhound Public House.

3. Recommendation

3.1.1 The Mayor is recommended:

(1) To note the content of the report and that a further report is prepared by the end of July 2015 to update progress.

4. Policy Context

4.1.1 The content of this report is consistent with the Council’s policy framework. Planning decisions are made on the basis of compliance with the development plan. The development plan for the borough consists of the London Plan and adopted Lewisham local plans including the Core Strategy, Lewisham Town Centre local plan, and the Site Allocation local plan. The Development Management local plan was formally adopted by the Council in November 2014. The development plan for Lewisham is part of the Council’s policy framework and is the spatial implementation mechanism for the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). It has a central role in implementing the six strategic objectives of the SCS.

5. Background

5.1.1 Planning permission and conservation area consent were granted in May 2010 for partial demolition of the pub with full restoration to provide pub/restaurant use, a new public square, residential and commercial units with parking and access provision. This was part of a wider scheme affecting not
only the pub but also adjoining land. The S106 agreement was signed by those with an interest in the land in the development site.

5.1.2 The development group Purelake then purchased the pub after the planning permission was granted in late 2010.

5.1.3 Between January and March 2012, the pub was substantially demolished, apart from the front elevation. This was in contravention of the consents and a criminal act. The Council then prosecuted, and in March 2013, Purelake were subsequently convicted and fined.

5.1.4 The planning obligations attached to the 2010 consents required the restoration and refurbishment of the pub.

5.1.5 A new application was submitted in September 2012 for the rebuilding of the public house. In April 2013 Planning Committee (C) granted permission subject to the variation of the original Section 106 agreement. This required the consent of the signatories to the original agreement, or their successors in title.

5.1.6 Planning officers were hopeful that a resolution may be found, however subsequent to negotiations between Purelake, Hexagon’s solicitors, and the legal representatives of both the commercial and residential owners, they failed to reach an agreement to enable the Deed to be signed. The Council unfortunately is not in a position to influence this process as it is a matter for the relevant potential signatories to resolve. Planning officers have made efforts with all parties in an attempt to establish the reasons why this has stalled.

5.1.7 The Head of Planning met with Purelake on 28th February 2014, and following a meeting with Hexagon, Cllr Chris Best and the Council’s relevant officers, on the 13th June 2014, Purelake indicated they would be submitting a fresh planning application for the Greyhound building, which would be different from the outstanding submission.

5.1.8 In response to the significant delays encountered in redeveloping the Greyhound, and the signing by all interested parties regarding the Deed of Variation, the Council sought advice from Counsel to agree upon an effective approach to progress matters.

5.1.9 The advice received was that the Council should consider commencing proceedings against the proprietors for breach of the original S106 Agreement relating to the 2010 consent, namely the Restoration and Refurbishment Works referred to in the provisions of Schedule 10.

5.1.10 In addition, a S96a Non-Material Amendment application should be submitted to address alterations to the building that were not proposed within the 2010 consented scheme.

6. **Current Position**
6.1.1 A S96a Non Material Amendment application was formally submitted in October 2014, which sought permission for the following:

- The retention of an enlarged basement;
- The omission of a rear elevation window;
- The formation of an external staircase to the rear of the building;
- Amendment to the flank elevation regarding the proposed sliding door;
- The formation of a chimney to accommodate internal ventilation ducting.

6.1.2 In regard to Schedule 10 of the S106, officers considered that the submission failed to sufficiently address the proposed schedule of works, therefore the following information was requested by 3 December:

- A full Condition Survey undertaken by a qualified surveyor that outlines the existing condition of the building;
- A Construction Method Statement advising how the unauthorised mezzanine floor will be removed, and appropriate measures to ensure the structural integrity of the building is maintained during the works, in particular the historic front wall. This must be prepared and signed off by a Chartered Civil Engineer (MICE) or Structural Engineer (MI Struct.E)
- The nature of repairs that will be required to address the serious cracks that have formed to the front gables and lintels.

6.1.3 The applicant disputed the need to provide a structural condition survey or a method statement, contrary to the Council letter dated 6 October 2014 that requested the submission of a detailed schedule setting out their proposals for complying with the provisions of Schedule 10. It was therefore considered necessary that prior to the December 3rd deadline, a meeting should be arranged at the Greyhound site between officers and Purelake to discuss the structural condition of the building, and the further information requested.

6.1.4 Officers were allowed onto the site to inspect the level of damage incurred to the building since construction works ceased. The window lintels were severely cracked, and measures to repair or replace them were discussed. An inspection was also made inside the building, and from the first floor level of the assembled scaffolding.

6.1.5 Details relating to the S96a application were raised during the meeting, including the proposed window openings, the appearance of balcony railings, brickwork and re-pointing. Officers advised the re-instatement of single-sash windows or the installation of slim-glazed sash windows would be considered acceptable, and that further plans should be submitted accordingly.

6.1.6 It was also advised that the external stairs proposed to the rear of the building were not considered to be a non-material amendment, and therefore should be omitted from the plans and submitted as a separate application.
6.1.7 The submission of details relating to the S96a application were received on 22 December, which included window detailing, the omission of the stairs and alterations to the first floor balcony railings to the front of the building.

6.1.8 However, neither a structural survey or a detailed method of works were submitted in regard to Schedule 10. The applicant maintained this was not required, advising that the recently constructed side and rear walls are sound, and that when the main roof is built at an early stage when works recommence, it would serve to stabilise the existing building. This would allow for other works, including the removal of the unauthorised timber mezzanine floor, to be undertaken without significantly impacting upon the integrity of the structure.

6.1.9 In response, officers arranged a further site meeting between Purelake, Building Control and Planning officers on 14th January 2015 to discuss the structural condition of the building and the nature of works to be undertaken. Officers agreed in principle during the meeting that the construction of the roof would provide lateral stability for the structure.

6.1.10 The submission of further information was requested for the removal of the damaged window lintels as it was established during the inspection that repairs could not be undertaken due to the considerable damage they had suffered. The applicants have advised the replacement stone lintel would be of a similar appearance to the existing.

6.1.11 Officers were able to inspect the two front gables from the scaffold platform, where one was leaning significantly, whilst cracks had formed to the other. It was agreed that both gables were sufficiently unstable to necessitate their removal, and to be rebuilt to the same size and appearance with the salvaged bricks.

6.1.12 Structural details addressing the method of works to the gables, in addition to the roof and lintels must be submitted for assessment to Building Control prior to the recommencement of building works. A drawing was submitted on January 23rd to Planning outlining the proposed method of removing the gables and lintels, however officers advised the level of information was insufficient to resolve the outstanding Schedule 10 requirements.

6.1.13 The applicants have since advised that their architects and engineers have been instructed to prepare detailed plans for a Building Control submission by the end of February, which would also serve to address the requirements of Schedule 10.

6.1.14 In regard to the S96a application, officers had requested further detailed plans of the windows and balcony door to ensure the reinstatement of openings that replicate the Victorian detailing of the original building. This was subsequently received on January 22nd, and was considered to be acceptable by officers. The S96a application was therefore due to be determined during week beginning 2 February.
6.1.15 There is no agreed date in place for the recommencement of building works at present, however the applicant has advised they would seek to mobilise works within approximately 3 weeks of Building Control details being approved.

6.1.16 Details of the replacement lintels will be submitted in accordance with Schedule 10, however this will only be possible once the existing lintels are removed, and samples are sent to a quarry to find a suitable match. Should officers be satisfied that the proposed replacement lintels would be of a similar appearance to the existing, Schedule 10 may then be concluded.

6.1.17 Thereafter, should works not recommence within a reasonable timeframe, appropriate enforcement action would be considered by officers.

6.1.18 It is acknowledged, however that further planning applications will be formally submitted to the Council that may potentially affect future timescales. These would propose the construction of an adjoining conservatory to the side of the Greyhound, together with the formation of external stairs to the rear leading down to basement level.

6.1.19 The principle of a side conservatory was granted at committee in 2013, and it is assumed the proposed extension would be of a similar scale and appearance.

6.1.20 The external stairs is a wholly new proposal, therefore the siting and resulting impact upon passing pedestrians would need to be formally assessed by officers.

7. Legal Implications

7.1.1 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.

7.1.2 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.

7.1.3 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.
7.1.4 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/

7.1.5 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

7.1.6 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:


7.1.7 The Section 106 Agreement dated the 24 May 2010 and referred to in paragraph 5.1.4 of this report imposed obligations on the owner of the land of which the Greyhound public house forms a part. Those obligations included the requirement to construct and complete the “Restoration and Refurbishment Works”, in accordance with the details that have been approved by the Council.

7.1.8 The Restoration and Refurbishment works are defined in the Agreement as “the works to the Greyhound Public House including the reinstatement of the former drinking corridor tiles within the building in a scheme to be agreed with the Council and the design and implementation of a new ceramic rear elevation to the building in accordance with the plans and Design and Access Statement submitted as part of the Application.

7.1.9 Paragraph 6 of this report sets out those steps that the Owner and the Council have taken with regards to securing the necessary details to enable
the Council to approve the proposed Restoration and Refurbishment Works. Where the Council requires further information from the Owner, it is necessary to give a reasonable period of time for the Owner to comply with such a request. Paragraph 6.1.12 of this report indicates that the Council expects such information to be forthcoming by the end of January.

7.1.10 Should the Owner fail to start the works within a reasonable timeframe once the nature of the works have been agreed, then the Council can consider whether or not to commence proceedings against the owner for breach of the provisions of the Section 106 Agreement and to seek an order for compliance with the relevant provisions of the Agreement and/or such other remedy as may be appropriate.

7.1.11 A Section 96A application is an application to make a change to a planning permission that is non-material. There is no statutory definition of 'non-material'. This is because it is dependent on the context of the overall scheme and what may be non-material in one context may be material in another. However in deciding whether or not a change is material the local planning authority must have regard to the effect of the change, together with any previous changes made. They must also take into account any representations made by anyone notified, provided they are received within 14 days of notification.

7.1.12 Officers have considered the Section 96A application and have determined, that with the omission of the proposal in relation to the external stairs, the application is one for the non material amendment to the planning permission dated the 24th May 2010.

8. Financial Implications

8.1.1 There are no specific financial implications arising from this report although there are costs being incurred by the Council in terms of officer time and external legal opinions on the matters raised, however these are currently being contained within existing budgets. These costs and any future costs arising may need to be considered in light of any enforcement action should it be required.

9. Crime and disorder implications

9.1.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications in this case.

10. Equalities implications

10.1.1 Shaping our future, Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy for 2008-2020, sets out a vision for Lewisham:

"Together we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live work and learn."

This is underpinned by hard-edged principles for:
• **reducing inequality** – narrowing the gap in outcomes for citizens

• **delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably** - ensuring that all citizens have appropriate access to and choice of high quality local services

10.1.2 The Council’s Comprehensive Equality Scheme for 2012-16 provides an overarching framework and focus for the Council's work on equalities to support the Sustainable Community Strategy and to ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010.

10.1.3 A full Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) (previously known as Equality Impact Assessment) was carried out for the policies in the Council’s Core Strategy in February 2009. The overall assessment was that the policies in the Core Strategy would not discriminate and that most policies have a positive impact. Three potential adverse impacts were identified: protection of employment land; designation of mixed use employment locations; and concerns of community groups about the amount of new housing development putting undue stress on the existing network of facilities (shops, transport, health facilities, community facilities and other services) particularly in the Deptford/New Cross area.

10.1.4 The Site Allocations DPD followed on from the Core Strategy and identifies sites, usually 0.25 hectares and above which area likely to be developed during the lifetime of the LDF (2011 – 2026). The Core Strategy sets out the policy context and principles for the development of the allocated sites.

10.1.5 An EAA of the Site Allocations DPD was undertaken in 2011 to identify the positive and negative impacts of the Core Strategy DPD and as a consequence the Site Allocations DPD, on three protected characteristics that were not included in the earlier EIA as it pre-dated the Equality Act 2010. This EAA also provided an update on the Core Strategy EIA.

10.1.6 The Development Management Local Plan proposes specific objectives and policies to help ensure that new development complies with inclusive design principles to ensure that the town centres are safe, attractive and inclusive places. Planning applications for development will need to demonstrate how proposals meet these objectives and policies. The DMLP was the subject of an EAA in 2012.

11. **Environmental implications**

11.1.1 There are no specific environmental implications from this report.

12. **Conclusion**

12.1.1 The Greyhound site has remained in a poor condition since the stalling of development in 2013, which has resulted in an adverse and unacceptable impact upon the character of the Cobbs Corner Conservation Area and the streetscene generally.
12.1.2 Officers are working closely with the applicants to ensure the recommencement of building works at the Greyhound. However, the current S96a and Schedule 10 submissions can only be determined once officers are satisfied that the method of intended construction works, together with proposed alterations and facing materials, are appropriate, and would not compromise the structural integrity or character of the building.
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1. Report Purpose & Summary

The report sets out the proposals for minor amendments to the Blackheath Events Policy part of the 2011-16 Events Policy Parks.

2. Policy Context

2.1 Shaping our Future – the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy includes the following priority outcomes:

- Empowered and responsible - where people are actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities
  - Empower citizens to be involved in their local area and responsive to the needs of those who live there.
  - Champion diversity and the contribution everyone makes to the borough’s quality of life

- Clean, green and liveable – where people live in high quality housing and care for and enjoy their environment
  - protect and enhance our parks, open spaces and local biodiversity

- Healthy, active and enjoyable – where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being
  - improving the well-being of our citizens by increasing participation in healthy and active lifestyles

2.2 The Council has outlined ten corporate priorities which enables the delivery of the Sustainable Community strategy. Priority number 9 Active, Healthy Citizens promotes greater community cohesion through cultural, sport and leisure activities.

2.3 The Council’s Cultural Strategy sets out the following key themes:

- Placemaking – develop high quality leisure, heritage and cultural facilities that contribute to the borough’s physical character and sense of place
- Community – Build vibrant and cohesive communities by encouraging participation in cultural and leisure activities
3. **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Mayor approves

3.1 The adoption of the amended Blackheath Events Policy as outlined in this report.

4. **Background**

4.1 Parks and open spaces provide a wonderful setting for events and activities that can be enjoyed by residents and visitors to the borough. The Council is keen to promote a varied programme of events and activities that can offer both cultural and active enjoyment whilst recognising the need to protect parks from over-use.

4.2 It is important that potential hirers and the public at large have a clear picture of how events bookings are taken, how they are evaluated, what legal processes are required and how health and safety implications are addressed.

4.3 As part of the Council’s Green Space contract, it is the responsibility of parks contractor, Glendale Grounds Management, to manage all bookings held in the borough’s parks.

4.4 Blackheath is a historic green open space situated in a heavily populated area of south-east London. It is of value for its quietness, and for its ecology, as well as for the opportunities it offers for outdoor recreation. It is well-used as a relatively car-free walking and cycling route. Blackheath is shared between the boroughs of Greenwich and Lewisham. Its open spaces provide a wonderful setting for organised events and activities. For many years two major events, the London Marathon and Blackheath Fireworks, along with a variety of smaller events, have been enjoyed by residents and visitors to both boroughs.

4.5 Both Councils play a key role in the provision, management, improvement, protection and promotion of Blackheath. The Blackheath policy document sets out the desire of Lewisham and Greenwich Councils for closer collaboration and partnership between the two Councils, and between them and the private and voluntary sectors, as well as other public sector bodies, in order to develop new opportunities to enhance the quality and diversity of Blackheath for the benefit of all those who use and enjoy it.

4.6 Both Councils are keen to continue to promote a varied programme of events and activities on the heath that can offer both cultural benefits and active enjoyment whilst recognising the needs of existing users and local residents as well as the importance of protecting the fragile ecology of the heath from over-use.

4.7 The Blackheath Joint Working Party (BJWP) is a local forum consisting of Councillors of both boroughs as well as representatives from many local amenity societies, including the Blackheath, Greenwich and Westcombe Societies. The Working Party’s remit includes advising on events and activities and ensuring that the fabric of the heath is protected and that the views of residents and regular heath users are considered when the heath is hired for events.
4.8 The Council through the nominated Authorised Officer, in this case the Executive Director for Customer Services, retains the final say as to whether the applicant is given formal approval to hold the event or not. This document sets out the booking process for events on Blackheath (appendix 1) with amendments highlighted.

Consultation

4.9 The proposed amendments listed have been discussed and approved by the Blackheath Joint Working Party at their meeting on 15th January 2015. These minor amendments have been proposed in order to clarify the process of obtaining approvals for events on the heath.

- Agree to limit to 2 x 2-day music festivals annually
- The Authorised Officer can apply additional conditions over and above conditions applied to the Premises Licence
- The Chair of the BJWP will write to the AO, following applicant’s presentation of their pre-approval questionnaire setting out the advice of the BJWP
- Formal Contracts to be signed once approvals have been given to applicants
- The AO reserves the right to set both a maximum Music Noise Level (MNL) and a maximum Base Music Noise Level (BMNL)

5. Financial implications

5.1 Under the terms of the Green Space Contract 2010-20, income from events held in parks is retained by the Council’s parks contractor, Glendale Grounds Management.

5.2 An agreement with Glendale has been reached to share the hire fee for major festival style events with the Council for the purpose of making improvements to parks.

5.3 All costs relating to events bookings and the management of the event process are undertaken by Glendale at no additional cost to the Council.

6. Legal and human rights implications

6.1 For the purposes of section 193 of the Licensing Act 2003 (“LA 2003”), an open space (whether or not enclosed by ropes or stakes,) such as the land at Blackheath is deemed to be ‘Premises’. As such, any events which are likely to be held there which may involve one or more ‘licensable activities’, for example the performance of a play, dance, live music, playing of recorded music, entertainment of a similar description, and/or the sale of alcohol, requires a form of Licence to be granted by ‘the relevant licensing authority’ in advance of the proposed event(s).

6.2 ‘The relevant licensing authority’ (s. 199 LA 2003) for the granting of statutory
licences, in relation to any 'premises' is “(a) the licensing authority in whose area
the premises are situated, or (b) where the premises are situated in the areas of
two or more licensing authorities, each of those authorities.”

6.3 Whenever it is proposed to use 'premises' for one or more licensable activities,
for an event which is likely to have no more than 499 people attending for a
continuous period “not exceeding 96 hours...” (s.100 LA 2003), then an
application by means of a Temporary Event Notice must be submitted to the
'relevant licensing authority. If the event is likely to have 500 or more people
attending, then there is a statutory requirement to submit an application to the
'relevant licensing authority for a Premises Licence (s. 16 LA 2003). In both
instances, ‘the relevant authority' will need to ensure that the correct time periods
and procedures governed by the LA 2003 are adhered to. In both instances,
there are statutory provisions for objections; in particular, as to who can make
representations upon these applications, the relevant specific grounds for
objecting and procedures for determining such applications.

6.4 Licensing Authorities, as defined by the Licensing Act 2003, section 3(1) are
public authorities for the purposes of the Human Rights Act 1998. Accordingly,
they are under a duty to act compatibly with Convention rights in the exercise of
their functions. Article 6(1) of the Convention provides that everyone is entitled to
a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and
impartial hearing established by law. The right to apply for a licence falls within
the scope of civil rights and obligations in Article 6(1) because it relates to the
applicants' right to make a living and pursue commercial activity. Therefore, an
applicant for such a licence has the right to have the application determined fairly
in accordance with the guarantees contained within Article 6(1).

6.5 A premises licence is considered to be a possession for the purposes of the
Human Rights Act 1998. However, the right to hold such a licence is not
absolute. It is a ‘qualified right’. So, where the grant of a premises licence may
affect the interests of local residents or others, in a significant way, then article
6(1) will be engaged. Thus the right to hold a licence may lawfully be interfered
with where, for instance, it is in the interests of wider society to do so. Objectors’
rights under article 6(1) will not automatically be triggered merely because they
wish to object. The question of whether they have a sufficient interest to engage
article 6(1) is ultimately a question of fact.

6.6 The Council has powers under Article 7 of the Ministry of Housing and Local
Government Provisional Order Confirmation (Greater London Parks and Open
Spaces) Act 1967 (as amended by the Commons Act 2006) to in any open space
(amongst other things) provide amusement fairs and entertainments including
bands of music, concerts, dramatic performances, cinematograph exhibitions and
pageants; provide meals and refreshments of all kinds to sell to the public; and
set apart or enclose in connection with any of the matters referred to in this article
any part of the open space and preclude any person from entering that part so
set apart or enclosed other than a person to whom access is permitted by the
local authority. The part of any open space set apart or enclosed for the use of
persons listening to or viewing an entertainment (including a band concert,
dramatic performance, cinematograph exhibition or pageant) is not to exceed in
any open space one acre or one-tenth of the open space, whichever is greater.

6.7 Under Article 8, the Council may "subject to such terms and conditions as to
payment or otherwise as they may consider desirable, grant to any person the right of exercising any of the powers conferred upon the local authority by Article 7 and to let to any person for any of the purposes mentioned in that Article … any part of an open space set apart or enclosed, pursuant thereto". This enables the Council to hire out open space land for events and to enable hirers to do the things that the Council is permitted to do under Article 7.

6.8 There is a restriction on the exercise of powers under Articles 7 and 8 in relation to commons. Article 12 provides that in the exercise of powers conferred by Articles 7 and 8, the Council cannot, without the consent of the Minister "erect or permit to be erected any building or other structure on, or enclose permanently, or permit to be enclosed permanently, any part of a common". However, temporary enclosure is permitted without Ministerial Consent and it is therefore not envisaged that any event approved under the Blackheath Events Policy will require Ministerial Consent.

6.9 The grant of permission to use the heath granted by the Authorised Officer under the Blackheath Events policy is a separate matter to any licence which has been obtained by an applicant under the Licensing Act 2003. The fact that an applicant has such a licence does not entitle them to actually hold the event on the heath.

6.9 Blackheath is managed under a Scheme of Management made under the Metropolitan Commons Act 1866. Following the dissolution of the Greater London Council, management responsibility is split along the Borough Boundary between the Council and the London Borough of Greenwich, with each Borough having its own grounds maintenance arrangements. The Blackheath Events Policy sets out the desire of Lewisham and Greenwich Councils for closer collaboration and partnership and as such, it is a joint policy and its adoption by the Council is therefore subject to its also being adopted by the London Borough of Greenwich.

6.10 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) brings together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act includes a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty), replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. The new duty 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.

6.11 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.

6.12 As was the case for the original separate duties, the new 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.
6.13 The Equality and Human Rights Commission issued guides in January 2011 providing an overview of the new equality duty, including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. The guides cover what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guides were based on the then draft specific duties so are no longer fully up-to-date, although regard may still be had to them until the revised guides are produced. The guides do not have legal standing unlike the statutory Code of Practice on the public sector equality duty. However, that Code is not due to be published until April 2012. The guides can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sectorduties/new-public-sector-equality-duty-guidance/

7. Crime and disorder implications

7.1 For large and major events the application, together with a detailed Event Management Plan, will be assessed by the Lewisham Events Safety Advisory Group (ESAG). The ESAG is a multi agency group, chaired by the Head of Strategy and Performance for Customer Services, which offers advice to the Council in relation to upholding reasonable standards of public safety at large and major events where the attendance is over 5000 people or less than 5000 if the events contains one of the following elements: the sale of alcohol; major funfair rides; the likelihood of major impact on local residents, businesses.

8. Equalities implications

8.1 It is a key policy aim to “promote a diverse range of community, sporting, charity, commercial and council run events that can add value to the quality of life for residents and visitors to the borough”. An events rate card will be compiled and concessions will be offered to small community and charitable groups to ensure that a wide range of smaller events can take place. The Council’s parks contractor will offer help and assistance in completing the necessary application forms and assisting groups with the management of the event.

9. Environmental implications

9.1 It is a policy aim to “prevent any damage being done by events to the biodiversity and natural and historic fabric of the park and to promote improved environmental sustainability”. The Council’s parks contractor will actively engage with event organisers to promote a sustainable event which may include an ecologist’s report to ensure the protection of the park and a transport plan to promote public transport.

9.2 In considering applications officers from both Green Scene and Glendale will be concerned with the environmental and ecological impact of the event, the accumulative impact of events during the year and the effect of the event on park users, residents and local businesses. Applicants will be expected to have considered what impact their event may place on the park and to have practices which will mitigate against damage, for example providing metal track-way to reduce vehicle damage to grasslands. In considering specific applications for
Blackheath the Blackheath Joint Working Party will assess the application at the pre-approval stage.

9.3 In considering applications at the pre-approval stage, officers from both Green Scene and Glendale will be concerned with the level of noise emitted by an event. Applicants for major events will be required to commission an independent acoustic survey and noise management plan which will be required as part of the detailed event management plan and discussed at the Council’s ESAG who will agree a maximum decibel level allowed for the event. In considering specific applications for Blackheath the Blackheath Joint Working Party will assess the potential noise impact at the pre-approval stage.

10. Conclusion

10.1 The report sets out the minor amendments to the 2011-16 Blackheath Events Policy in order to clarify the process for both applicants and users of the Heath. A full detailed review of the Policy will take place in 2016.

11. Background documents and originator

11.1 The background documents, including notes of meetings are attached as Appendix 1

11.2 If you require any further information about this report please contact Martin Hyde on 020 8314 2034.
Blackheath Events Policy

2011-2016

December 2011
Amended January 2015

London Borough of Lewisham
1. **Scope**

1.1 This document sets out the policy for both Greenwich and Lewisham Council in relation to events and activities taking place on Blackheath.

1.2 The policy covers the period 2011 – 2016. During the first part of this period we will be preparing for the 2012 London Olympic Games, but specific Olympic planning is not in the remit of this document.

2. **Context**

2.1 Blackheath is a historic green open space situated in a heavily populated area of south-east London. It is of value for its quietness, and for its ecology, as well as for the opportunities it offers for outdoor recreation. It is well-used as a relatively car-free walking and cycling route. Blackheath is shared between the boroughs of Greenwich and Lewisham. Its open spaces provide a wonderful setting for organised events and activities. For many years two major events, the London Marathon and Blackheath Fireworks, along with a variety of smaller events, have been enjoyed by residents and visitors to both boroughs. Both Councils play a key role in the provision, management, improvement, protection and promotion of Blackheath. This document sets out the desire of Lewisham and Greenwich Councils for closer collaboration and partnership between the two Councils, and between them and the private and voluntary sectors, as well as other public sector bodies, in order to develop new opportunities to enhance the quality and diversity of Blackheath for the benefit of all those who use and enjoy it.

2.2 Both Councils are keen to continue to promote a varied programme of events and activities that can offer both cultural benefits and active enjoyment whilst recognising the needs of existing users and local residents as well as the importance of protecting the fragile ecology of the heath from over-use.

2.3 The Blackheath Joint Working Party (BJWP) is a local forum consisting of Councillors of both boroughs as well as representatives from many local amenity societies, including the Blackheath, Greenwich and Westcombe Societies. The Working Party’s remit includes advising on events and activities and ensuring that the fabric of the heath is protected and that the views of residents and regular heath users are considered when the heath is hired for events.

2.4 As part of the overall consultation process the advice of the BJWP is sought for major and large events and activities taking place on the heath and its advice will be an important factor to be taken into consideration by the Authorised Officer for parks and open spaces at Lewisham and the Head of Stakeholder Relationships and Events at Greenwich before a decision is made.

3. **Policy aims**

1. To promote a diverse range of community, sporting, charity, commercial and council run events that can add value to the quality of life for residents of both boroughs

2. To ensure that events and activities held on the heath cover their costs and potentially generate an income for both boroughs.
3. To prevent any damage being done by events to the biodiversity and natural and historic fabric of the heath and to promote improved environmental sustainability. In the event of damage to the fabric of the heath, to ensure full remediation begins immediately after the event.

4. To reduce the overall impact of events on Blackheath, for example ensuring noise from events does not cause a nuisance and is maintained at or below the levels permissible under our environmental licence requirements or other set limits.

5. To keep the impact of cars, road closures and other possible transport problems to a minimum and ensure that footpaths and cycleways across the heath remain open.

6. To introduce a set of clear criteria against which all potential events are evaluated.

7. To provide clear guidance notes for organisers of events

8. To introduce a tariff framework and ‘Event Rate Card’ to move towards harmonising the charging structure and provide transparency

9. To ensure that the potential hirer can meet the conditions of the premises licence set by each individual Council.

10. To ensure that the potential hirer has the necessary financial resources, qualifications and experience to deliver a high quality event

11. To improve the visitor economy by ensuring event organisers deliver activities that promote the boroughs' cultural and visitor offer.

12. To co-ordinate effectively with park teams, the Royal Parks team, the World Heritage Site team and between boroughs.

13. To have better and more systematic consultation procedures and improved information management.

14. To improve risk management with the aim of reducing the potential for unsuccessful events.

15. To improve event management across Blackheath open space.

16. To ensure that the decision making process is fair, open, consistent and transparent for all potential hirers and the general public

17. To maintain and improve the heath.

4. **How we will achieve our aims**

4.1 **Promoting events**

Lewisham and Greenwich are amongst London’s most diverse boroughs and a varied events and activities programme can enhance the cultural life of the local community. Both Councils will continue to promote and offer a range of community, sporting, charity commercial and Council-run events to help strengthen community use of open space and to promote greater social inclusion. Similarly both Councils will continue to promote healthy lifestyles and well-being offering a programme of sporting and fitness activities, with the aim of increasing participation and physical activity by residents of both boroughs. *The number of Large Music Festivals will be limited to two x 2-day festivals annually on the Lewisham side of the heath (see Appendix B for definition).*

All applicants will be required to provide details of how the event is going to be financed, what the main sources of income are and any funding that may already be guaranteed. Applicants must also provide details of their personal qualifications and experience to demonstrate that they can successfully manage the event proposed.
4.2 Protecting the heath

In considering applications the BJWP and both Councils will be concerned with the environmental and ecological impact of an event, the cumulative impact of events during the year and the cumulative impact of events year after year. The two Councils will also be concerned with the effect of the event on heath users, local residents, local businesses and visitors to the area: both as individual events and as part of a continuous series of events year after year. Applicants will be expected to have considered what impact their event may place on the heath and to have in place practices which will prevent damage to the natural fabric of the heath, in particular damage to the fragile heathland soil. Areas of the heath which are mapped as relict acid heathland soil will generally not be available for events. Areas of the heath where the soil is found to be decreasing in depth year by year, where the soil surface is broken, where the grass cover has been worn away leaving only sparse cover to the soil, or where the soil has been eroded, will be closed to events.

4.3 Sustainability

Managing events sustainably is a key priority. Greenwich and Lewisham Councils actively engage with event organisers to measure and capture key environmental sustainability, audience and event data. This data will be published on the website of the appropriate Council. Environmental sustainability data will need to include details of an event 'Transport Plan' and to promote public transport. There will need to be an Event Data Form pre and post event for completion. This information will be used to improve the environmental performance of both Councils as well as of those working on Blackheath and it will also be used to benefit the wider London community. Recommended reading for event organisers: BS 8901 Specification for a sustainable event management system – British Standards (2007)

4.4 Stakeholder engagement

Officers from both Councils have consulted with members of the BJWP on the preparation of a pre-approval questionnaire as set out in appendix A, which will form the basis of the assessment of all major and large event applications proposed for the heath. The completed assessment will be given to the relevant Council’s Authorised Officer in order that consideration can be given to the application. The process will be undertaken at an early stage (refer to Guidance Notes appendix B) to ensure that the applicant can proceed with the knowledge that the event is confirmed in principle.

4.5 Event safety

Everyone organising or running an event of any kind has a legal duty of care to their employees, contractors and members of the public. We require that a named person takes responsibility for the proposed event and this individual will be the point of contact for the relevant Council during the planning and execution of the event.

Recommended reading:
‘The Event Safety Guide – A guide to Health, Safety and Welfare at Music and Similar Events’ otherwise known as the purple guide or HSG195. This can be bought from the HSE or downloaded on-line (for free) at http://hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg195.htm
4.6 **Premises licences**
If the applicant is intending to have any form of entertainment i.e. music, singing, dancing, acting etc, and/or the sale of alcohol, then they will need to apply to the Council Licensing Department for a Premises Licence or Temporary Event Notice (TEN). These licences should only be applied for once the applicant has sought the advice of the BJWP and received the authorised officers in-principle approval to hold the event. Each applicant will also need to satisfy the Council’s Events Safety Advisory Group (ESAG) that they are experienced and competent to stage the event. The applicant may also be asked to attend the Council’s Events Safety Advisory Group (ESAG) meetings to demonstrate their ability to deliver a safe event. For large and major events the applicant will be asked to prepare a detailed Event Management Plan. (refer to section 7).

4.7 **Hiring tariff**
It is important that applicants know in advance the tariff or range of tariffs that each Council applies to events held on Blackheath. An event rate card will be produced and will be displayed on the Councils web sites and made available to applicants when they make their initial enquiry. The event rate card will include free usage for certain local charitable/community events where entrance is free and more significant charges for larger scale commercial activity on what is a prestigious site.

4.8 **Deposits and conditions**
A compulsory non-refundable administration fee will be charged to recover administrative costs once approval for the event has been given from the Authorised Officer. A venue hire fee will also be charged to secure dates on the events calendar, reduce cancellations, and encourage timely booking. 25% of the venue hire fee is payable when the event has been approved with the remainder of the fee to be paid 6 weeks prior to the event. Where an application is declined, a full refund of fees will be made.

4.9 **Damage deposits**
A refundable damage deposit of £250 for events up to 1000 attendees, up to £1000 for events up to 5000 attendees and up to £10,000 for major events over 5000 attendees will be taken 15 working days before the event. This deposit shall be returned providing the site and surrounding area is left in a clean, safe, undamaged and secure way and the terms and conditions of hire have been complied with. The damage deposit will be used to repair any damage to the heath, property and buildings and/or to remove additional litter from the site to bring the site to a suitable standard.

4.10 **Cancellation fees**
In case of cancellation of the event booking, the hirer must inform the respective Council in writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancellation</th>
<th>Refund Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 days prior to event</td>
<td>100% venue hire refund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 days prior to event</td>
<td>50% venue hire refund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days prior to event</td>
<td>No refund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Lewisham/Greenwich Council</td>
<td>100% refund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lewisham/Greenwich Council reserve the right to cancel a booking at any time having given notification of no less than 14 days in advance to the hirer. In this case, a 100% refund will be made.

In case of emergency, no prior notice shall be given should the heath be required for exceptional circumstances. Lewisham/Greenwich Council’s accept no liability whatsoever other than to refund any fees paid (without compensation/interest).

Lewisham/Greenwich Councils reserves the right to cancel the booking at any time if the hirer intends to use the heath for any other purpose than stated on the application form.

4.11 Reduced Fees
The venue hire fee may be waived for community/charity events. The refundable damage deposit may also be waived for these types of events.

5. How will applications be assessed

5.1 The role of the Greenwich Council (for events to the north of the A2)

5.1.1 All applications for events on the Greenwich side of the heath are managed by the Council’s Communications department. On request Greenwich Council’s Authorised Officer will issue a small or large events application together with the pre-approval questionnaire in the case of a major or large event. The pre-approval questionnaire will be considered at the next Blackheath Joint Working Party meeting and the applicant may be required to attend in person.

5.1.2 On receipt of the completed application form, pre-approval questionnaire and the advice of the BJWP, the Council’s Authorised Officer will give either in-principle approval or rejection for the event. At this stage the applicant will be advised whether they require a premises licence and that their application may be discussed, and attendance may be required, at the Events Safety Advisory Group (ESAG). Please note: Annual and repeat events will be treated on an event by event/year on year basis and the approval of the Authorised Officer must be sought in all cases and not assumed for subsequent occasions.

5.2 The role of Lewisham Council and its Parks contractor (for events to the south of the A2)

5.2.1 All applications for events on the Lewisham side of the heath are managed by the Council’s parks contractor. On request they will issue a small or large events application together with the pre-approval questionnaire in the case of a major or large event. The pre-approval questionnaire will be considered at the next Blackheath Joint Working Party meeting and the applicant may be required to attend in person.

5.2.2 On receipt of the completed application form and pre-approval questionnaire, and the advice of the BJWP the Council’s Authorised Officer will give either in-principle approval or rejection for the event. The Authorised Officer can, if he or she feels appropriate apply conditions to any in-principle approval. At this stage the applicant will be advised whether they require a premises licence and that their
application may be discussed and attendance may be required, at the Events Safety Advisory Group (SAG).

Please note: Annual and repeat events will be treated on an event by event/year on year basis and the approval of the Authorised Officer must be sought in all cases and not assumed for a subsequent occasion.

5.3 The role of the Blackheath Joint Working Party (BJWP)

5.3.1 The BJWP is a local forum for the Councils and other organisations having an interest in Blackheath. It was established by the Councils when they took over responsibility for their respective sections of Blackheath in the late 1980s. Its membership comprises Councillors from both boroughs, as well as representatives from many local amenity societies, including the Blackheath, Greenwich and Westcombe Societies. There are nine voting members of whom six are Councillors (three from each borough).

5.3.2 The BJWP therefore has an important and long established role in advising on activities held on Blackheath and, in reaching their decisions under this policy, the Councils’ Authorised Officers will, having regard to the presence of elected Councillors on the BJWP, give very considerable weight to its advice on proposals for large and major events and activities that are proposed for Blackheath.

5.3.3 In considering such applications the BJWP will be particularly concerned with the environmental and ecological impact of an event, the visual impact of the event in the natural environment of Blackheath and considerations of noise (including low frequency noise), transport and parking. The BJWP will also be concerned with the impact of each individual event, the cumulative effect of all events in any one year, the long term impact of events year after year, and the effect of events on heath users, residents, local businesses and visitors to the area. The Chair of the BJWP will write to the responsible Authorised Officer setting out the advice of the BJWP.

5.3.4 If the Lewisham or Greenwich Authorised Officer (as the case may be) declines to accept the advice of the BJWP the Authorised Officer concerned will provide a written explanation of the reasons for the decision and a reasonable opportunity for the BJWP to discuss it with him/her before the decision is notified to the applicant.

5.3.5 If the application receives in-principle approval more detailed planning may then be undertaken including the issuing of formal Contracts, and the Authorised Officer will take the advice of the BJWP on all aspects of the detailed plans which materially differ from the initial application.

5.3.6 The Authorised Officer can, if he or she deems it appropriate add further conditions over and above any conditions that may be applied to the Premises Licence.

5.4 The role of the Event Safety Advisory Group (SAG)
5.4.1 The Events Safety Advisory Group (SAG) is a multi agency group which offers advice to the authority in relation to upholding reasonable standards of public safety at major and large events.

5.4.2 The role of the group will be to consider large scale public events and associated requirements. The groups remit is to cover major outdoor events including firework displays, carnivals, parades, music festivals, faith events, and any other major event of a similar nature.

5.4.3 A major event will refer to any event with an attendance of over 5,000 or less than 5000 if the event contains one or more of the following elements:

- Alcohol sales (if over 500 people, i.e. covered by Premises Licence)
- Major funfair rides
- The likelihood of major impact on local residents, businesses (i.e. traffic and parking restrictions, significant noise or other disruption)

5.4.4 All matters that relate to public safety, crime and disorder, noise and nuisance and protection of children from harm for major events will be addressed at the dedicated event planning meetings. It is anticipated that any issues can be negotiated, addressed and resolved through the event planning process.

5.4.5 Where the Events Safety Advisory Group is aware of an issue related to a major event that presents an undue and unacceptable risk to public safety, the Chair of the ESAG may escalate the matter to the Executive Director for Community Services and the Police’s Borough Commander for further action.

6. **Application process**

6.1 **How to apply**

Step 1

Initial contact to discuss applicant’s proposal, advice can quickly be given if the application is unlikely to be successful (for example if we already have a booking at that time)

Step 2

Applicant to complete the appropriate events application form (major/large or small event) to include details of times/dates, size of area required, set up and take down times and expected numbers etc

Step 3

For major and large events the applicant must also complete the Blackheath pre-approval questionnaire which will be discussed at the next Blackheath Joint Working Party meeting (applicants should therefore ensure that at least 6 months notice is given prior to the event for all approvals to be given)
Step 4

Depending on the nature of the application attendance may be required at the next Blackheath Joint Working Party meeting to discuss the application in more detail.

Step 5

When the Councils are satisfied that the application can proceed formal approval from the appropriate Council’s Authorised Officer will be given, this will give the applicant the knowledge that their event is confirmed in principle, subject to the detailed event planning and the grant of any premises licence or Temporary Event Notice (TEN).

(Please note; the granting of a premises licence or TEN does not confer the Council’s approval to hold the event)

Step 6

*A formal agreement is prepared and signed by the applicant and the Council (or nominated contractor)*

Step 7

*Detailed event planning and liaison, including obtaining any licenses required and health and safety certification. Attendance at the Councils Events Safety Advisory Group (SAG) may be required*

7. Application requirements/criteria

A summary of the key criteria is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application requirements/criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event dates and location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant will need to provide definitive start up and break down dates including both setup, clear-up and the actual event dates in addition to the proposed hours of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A brief description of the event is required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is required to provide a map of precisely which area of the Heath the event is to take place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The map should include the location of relevant event facilities (enclosures, tents, stage, toilets, sound equipment and food and drink outlets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Status and experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant will need to provide evidence of which organisational sector it belongs to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private company</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence- Company Registration number from Companies House and/or audited accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education sector</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Evidence - school or college require DFE/ Local education authority reference

Community/Charitable Faith - organisation
Evidence - Charity commission registration number or local authority reference or audited accounts

Experience
Applicants will be required to demonstrate evidence that they have the experience (or the capacity) of organising similar events in similar settings.

Financial Capability
Applicants will be required to demonstrate how the event is going to be financed, what the main sources of income are and what funding has already been guaranteed.

Attendance information
All applicants will need to provide anticipated audience and participation numbers including the key target age ranges and nature of activities. This will include information on the types of performance and audience it will attract.

Open or ticketed access requirements
The event must be registered as either a ticketed or free open access event. Information must be provided if concessions and/or stall holdings within the event will be present.

If ticketed the applicant organisation will need to provide information about ticket rates. (refer to the section on Tariff information below)

Licensing Requirements
All organisations must produce an Event Management Plan.

All events will require registration with the licensing section of the local authority. The type of licence needed will be determined in accordance with licensing guidelines as part of the application.

Applicants are advised to contact the licensing section as soon as they have in-principle approval to familiarise themselves with licensing requirements.

Organisation must ensure that food and drink (including alcohol) outlets have relevant food safety and alcohol licences

Applicants must be responsible for the event clean up during and after the event. The site must be returned a high standard of cleanliness and any occurrence of environmental damage must be notified to the Council and repair carried out as directed by the Council.

All musical events organisations will be required to comply with environmental standards with respect to amplification of sound including arrangements for noise level monitoring during the event. For major events an independent noise assessment in the form of an acoustic survey will be required to ensure that noise from outdoor music events follow current best practice guidance and do not cause a nuisance. The Authorised Officer reserves the right to set a Maximum Noise level (MNL) dB(A) and a Base Music Noise Level (BMNL) dB(A) for low frequency noise.

All major events will require a Transport Plan to comply with local authority traffic management.
Standards including any traffic diversions or road closures. Footpaths and cycle paths should remain open during events. If closure of footpaths or cycle paths are necessary then suitable alternative routes must be identified.

Applicants will need to provide details of how residents are to be informed about events in accordance with the licensing requirements. All streets around the heath which are going to be affected by road closures, changes in traffic flow, additional parking, must be included in the list of residents to be informed.

Event organisation will need to include detailed information in the Event Management Plan outlining arrangements for the event control and command structure; security and stewarding; the provision of toilets and other key infrastructure services.

Events organisers will need to provide an assessment of the impact on local business in the locality of Blackheath.

Event applicants will need to provide information on the measures it will take to minimise any adverse environmental impact on the heath. Because of the fragile nature of the heathland soil on Blackheath, applicants may need to produce an ecologist’s report on the impact of their event.

Information will be required to demonstrate how the event organisers will carry out full rectification work on the heath in the event of environmental damage, with the work beginning soon after the event.
## Pre-approval questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Event:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organiser:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed date and hours of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brief description of event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the event for charity / educational / sporting / commercial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the event of national or local significance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anticipated audience/participants numbers and age ranges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the event open or ticketed and if the latter what will be the range of ticket prices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What licences are required for the event?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will these be applied for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Give previous experience of organising comparable events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For how long will there be a presence on the heath?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the proposed dates of set up and departure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the timescale for organising the event?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Indicate on a map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
precisely which area of the Heath is required for the event including relevant features (enclosures, tents, stage, toilets, sound equipment and food and drink outlets).

10. If appropriate give details of food and drink (including alcohol) outlets.

11. What arrangements exist for cleaning up litter during and after the event?

12. Will there be any amplification of sound?

If so, what will be the maximum noise level at the perimeter of the event and how will this be monitored? *(The Authorised Officer reserves the right to set a Maximum Noise level dB(A) and a Base Music Noise Level (BMNL) dB(A) for low frequency noise,)*

What will be the maximum level of low frequency sound at the perimeter of the event, and how will this be monitored?

How will the event organisers keep informed of any noise nuisance that may occur, and how will they respond when notified that a nuisance is being caused?

13. Does the event involve any road closures / traffic diversions/increased parking on surrounding streets?

Will the event have an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>impact on users of footpaths and cyclepaths and other frequently used routes across the heath. If so please outline proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Is there a transport plan for the event? If so please attach it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What are the arrangements for people arriving by car and the vehicles involved in the event organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Have residents been consulted and if not when will this take place?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will residents be consulted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What are the arrangements for stewarding the event site and wider perimeter and monitoring the impact of the event during the hours of operation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. What additional infrastructure is planned e.g. toilet facilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What is the envisaged effect on businesses in Blackheath?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is this a one off event or do you wish to repeat it and if so how frequently?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Please indicate what measures will be taken to protect the heath from any damage and what rectification work will be carried out should any damage occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Guideline notes for application process Blackheath only

Introduction

These notes are intended to assist you in completing the application form for your proposed event and to help you ensure your event meets all the necessary legal and statutory obligations and requirements made by Lewisham Council and partner Glendale Grounds Management, for all events to the south of the A2 and Greenwich Council for all events to the north of the A2.

Throughout the examples given are to illustrate the type of information that is required. These are only intended to be examples and not an exhaustive list of possible considerations of specific events.

Please refer to the Health and Safety Executive publication ‘The Event Safety Guide – A guide to Health, Safety and Welfare at Music and Similar Events’ otherwise known as the purple guide or HSG195. This can be bought from the HSE or downloaded on-line (for free) at http://hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg195.htm

Application process

Step 1

Initial contact to discuss your proposal, we can advise you quickly if your application is unlikely to be successful (for example if we already have a booking at that time)

Step 2

Applicant to complete the appropriate events application form (large or small event) to include details of times/dates, size of area required, set up and take down times and expected numbers etc

Step 3

For major and large events the applicant must also complete the Blackheath pre-approval questionnaire which will be discussed at the next Blackheath Joint Working Party meeting (applicants should therefore ensure that at least 6 months notice is given prior to the event for all approvals to be given)

Step 4

Depending on the nature of the application attendance may be required at the next Blackheath Joint Working Party meeting to discuss the application in more detail

Step 5

When we are satisfied that the application can proceed formal approval from the Council's Authorised Officer will be given, this will give you the knowledge that the event
is confirmed in principle, subject to the detailed event planning and grant of any Premises Licence or Temporary Event Licence (TEN). (Please note: the granting of a premises licence or TEN does not confer the Council’s approval to hold the event)

Step 6

A formal agreement is prepared and signed by the applicant and the Council

Step 7

Detailed event planning and liaison, including obtaining any licences required and health and safety certification. Attendance at the Council’s Events Safety Advisory Group (ESAG) may be required.

Events Guidance

Depending on the size of your event, either a small or large application form will need to be completed. Examples are as follows:

Small events (under 100 people)

- A small sponsored run or walk or similar
- A guided walk
- A picnic
- A community sports competition
- Organised fitness training

Large Events (over 100 people)

- Outdoor concerts
- Festivals
- Large sponsored runs and walks
- Sports festivals
- Fairs, flower shows and exhibitions
- Circuses
- Large performing arts events
- Any event that would normally involve co-ordination with the local authority, emergency services or similar. (If you are intending to have a carnival, procession or celebrities at your event, you must inform the Police and Council Licensing Department as soon as possible)

Major Events (over 5,000)

- Major events that are free or offer affordable public access, events that are predominantly outdoor, that encourage physical and mental well-being, and that promote an appreciation of the value of our open spaces to Londoners

The number of Large Music Festivals will be limited to two x 2-day festivals annually on the Lewisham side of the heath.

Large Music Festival (over 10,000 people)
A large enclosed event, free or ticketed and over one or two consecutive days, with at least one main stage for the performance of live music.

It may be that the date you request is not available, this could be due to a previous booking or because there are a number of events taking place close to the date which you requested. It would be helpful if you could indicate other dates that would be agreeable to you.

**Licensing**

Once the event has been approved by the Authorised Officer, you may need to apply for licences.

If you are intending to have any form of entertainment i.e. music, singing, dancing, acting etc, and/or the sale of alcohol, then you will need to apply to the Council Licensing Department for a Premises Licence or Temporary Event Notice (TEN). The Licence can take up to 8 weeks to obtain. It is illegal to operate an event with entertainment and/or sale of alcohol without this licence and you could face legal action by Lewisham Council if you operate your event without a Premises Licence or TEN.

**NB.** The following types of events will require either a Premises Licence or TEN:

- Musical events
- Performances
- DJs
- Plays
- Operas
- Films
- Sale of Alcohol

**Listed below are the minimum time scales to apply for licences:**

The minimum statutory time period to obtain a Premises licence is 28 days, this application process also involves serving the application on all the responsible Authorities:

- Planning
- Environmental Enforcement
- Fire Safety
- Health and Safety
- Children’s Services
- Metropolitan Police service
- Trading Standards

The minimum statutory period for a TEN is ten clear working days (note these notices can only be used for events with a capacity of no more than 499 including all performers and staff).

**General Timescales**

Major and large events require at least 6 months notice to give sufficient time for all approvals.
**Insurances**
If you are given permission to hold your event you will need to arrange public liability insurance cover. The minimum amount of cover required is £5 million pounds.

**Deposits and conditions**
A compulsory non-refundable administration fee will be charged to recover administrative costs once approval for the event has been given from the Authorised Officer. A venue hire fee will also be charged to secure dates on the events calendar, reduce cancellations, and encourage timely booking. 25% of the venue hire fee is payable when the event has been approved with the remainder of the fee to be paid 6 weeks prior to the event. Where an application is declined, a full refund of fees will be made.

**Damage deposits**
A refundable damage deposit of £250 for events up to 1000 attendees, up to £1000 for events up to 5000 attendees and up to £10,000 for major events over 5000 attendees will be taken 15 working days before the event. This deposit shall be returned providing the site and surrounding area is left in a clean, safe, undamaged and secure way and the terms and conditions of hire have been complied with. The damage deposit will be used to repair any damage to the heath, property and buildings and/or to remove additional litter from the site to bring the site to a suitable standard.

**Cancellation fees**
In case of cancellation of the event booking, the hirer must inform the respective Council in writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancellation Timeframe</th>
<th>Refund Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation 21 days prior to event</td>
<td>100% venue hire refund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation 14 days prior to event</td>
<td>50% venue hire refund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation 7 days prior to event</td>
<td>No refund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation by Lewisham/Greenwich Council</td>
<td>100% refund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lewisham/Greenwich Council reserve the right to cancel a booking at any time having given notification of no less than 14 days in advance to the hirer. In this case, a 100% refund will be made.

In case of emergency, no prior notice shall be given should the heath be required for exceptional circumstances. Lewisham/Greenwich Councils accepts no liability whatsoever other than to refund any fees paid (without compensation/interest).

Lewisham/Greenwich Council reserves the right to cancel the booking if the hirer intends to use the heath for any other purpose than stated on the application form.

**Reduced Fees**
The venue hire fee may be waived for community/charity events. The refundable damage deposit may also be waived for these type of events.
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1 Summary

1.1 This report sets out for the Mayor proposals to amend the Board of Phoenix Community Housing (PCH), which have been developed in line the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Regulatory Framework and the National Housing Federation Code of Governance, and recommends that the Mayor agrees that the Council should agree these changes, as is required by PCH’s transfer agreement.

2 Recommendations

The Mayor is recommended to:

2.1 Note the background to the proposed changes to the Board of Phoenix Community Housing, and the changes themselves, and

2.2 Agree the proposed changes set out in paragraph 5.

3 Policy Context

3.1 The contents of this report are consistent with the Council’s policy framework. It supports the achievements of the Sustainable Community Strategy policy objectives:

- Ambitious and achieving: where people are inspired and supported to fulfil their potential.
- Empowered and responsible: where people can be actively involved in their local area and contribute to tolerant, caring and supportive local communities.
- Healthy, active and enjoyable: where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being, supported by high quality health and care services, leisure, culture and recreational activities.

4 Background

4.1 As a Housing Association, PCH is regulated by the Homes & Communities Agency which expects, as best practice, that all Housing Associations will follow guidelines set out in their Code of Governance.
4.2 Every year PCH completes a review of its governance arrangements, against its code of governance. Currently PCH does not meet best practice guidance set out by the National Housing Federation in the code around the size of its Board. As a result of this, PCH proposes to make changes to the size and nature of its Board.

4.3 When PCH was created following a stock transfer from the Council in 2009, its constitution contained provisions that meant the Council was required to sanction any changes to its governance structures, including its Board.

5 Proposed changes

5.1 The National Housing Federation code of good practice sets out that a Board should have at least five members and no more than 12, including co-optees. Previously the PCH Board consisted of 15 members and as such the PCH Board agreed at its AGM in the autumn of 2014 to adopt a new arrangement in keeping with the National Federation Guidance, subject to that arrangement being sanctioned by the Council.

5.2 The changes that are proposed are for the PCH Board to reduce in size from 15 to 12. Whilst the Board stood at 15 members the composition was seven residents, five independents and three Councillor members. Residents formed the largest group on the Board. This is important for Phoenix Community Housing, as they are a Community Gateway and residents are at the heart of their work. The proposed rule change, if formally adopted, would result in a 12 person Board with six residents, four independents and two councillor members.

5.3 The net effect, therefore, would be that there would be one fewer each of resident board members, independent board members and councillor board members.

5.4 This new structure is already partly operational because – in advance of the changes being formally ratified – two rather than three Councillor appointments to the board were made following the Council’s AGM in 2014.

5.5 Given that the changes that PCH proposes to make to its board structure are in line with its regulatory framework and best practice in governance, the Mayor is recommended to formally ratify the proposed changes set out above.

6 Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

7 Legal Implications

7.1 The legal position is set out in the body of this report. There are no other specific legal implications arising out of this report.

8 Crime and disorder implications

8.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising out of this report.
9   Equalities Implications

9.1  There are no specific equalities implications arising out of this report.

10  Environmental Implications

10.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising out of this report.

11  Background documents and originator

11.1 There are no background documents to this report.

11.2 If you would like any further information on this report please contact Jeff Endean, Housing Strategy and Programmes Team Manager at jeff.endean@lewisham.gov.uk or on 020 8314 6213.
Recommendation

It is recommended that in accordance with Regulation 4(2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 and under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs [3, 4 and 5] of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act, and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

13. Housing Property Acquisition Lee Green
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.
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