

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Revenue income from development or surplus sites
Reference:	HRPR_INC_07_Surplus-Site-Development
Lead officer:	Patrick Dubeck
Ward/s affected	All Wards
Cabinet portfolio	Housing Development and Planning
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
Y	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
A corporate non-housing estate review is currently underway to review the Council's corporate, operational and office estate. The review seeks to identify prioritised opportunities to enable better utilisation of the Council's assets, income generation, and land supply for housing development and to enable service transformation.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	231	3,045	2,814	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
There are approximately 860 assets within the Council's non-housing asset register. The non-housing portfolio includes assets mainly used to deliver; the Council's civic functions (offices, libraries, depot, hostels etc.), help discharge statutory obligations (e.g. schools), generate revenue income stream (retail units, light industrial sites etc.) and help deliver specific corporate objectives.
A review of the Council's non-housing asset portfolio is currently underway. The review seeks to identify prioritised opportunities to enable better utilisation of the Council's assets, land supply for housing development and to enable service transformation.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

As part of the asset review officers undertake an options appraisal to fully explore all possible outcomes for an asset. One of the options for consideration is disposal. Disposals enable capital receipts to support the Capital Programme; however, there may be other opportunities to generate revenue instead of capital receipts. This approach has been applied on schemes such as Besson Street and Copperas Street where Council's land assets are used to secure revenue income in perpetuity through Private Rental Sector (PRS) Housing for example.

As part of the asset review, several assets have been identified which could be used for similar purpose to the sites as Besson Street and Copperas Street.

The lead in time for receiving the finished units from such schemes would be about 3 years from the point of agreeing terms with a development partner. However, is possible, as in the case of Copperas Street, to structure an arrangement where the Council can enjoy rent during the development period.

Current sites under review which could be used for such development or partnering opportunities include:

- Trundleys Road:

An in-house study suggests that this site in New Cross has capacity for circa 56 units and about 400sqm of commercial re-provision.

Based on a similar approach to Copperas Street (where private units are being offered as the land receipt) then approximately 8 of the units (say 2 bed flats) could be provided instead of a financial receipt. They would have a combined capital value of circa £4m (assuming all were agreed to be provided as private) and a combined annual income (if rented out privately) of circa £200k per annum (gross).

- House On The Hill (HOTH):

An in-house analysis demonstrated that this site located in Lewisham Central Ward has capacity for circa 45 residential units. On a PRS re-provision basis (as per the above), we would receive circa 6 units. This would have a GDV of £3m and an annual combined gross rental income of £150k.

- Mulberry Day Centre:

The third-party feasibility we commissioned on this demonstrated capacity for circa 53 apartments and 342sqm of commercial re-provision. On a PRS re-provision basis we would receive circa 7 units. This would have a GDV of £3.5m and an annual combined gross rental income of £175k.

- Library Resource Centre:

The third-party feasibility we commissioned on this demonstrated capacity for circa 12 units. On a PRS re-provision basis we would receive circa 2 of the units. This would have a GDV of about £1.2m and an annual combined gross rental income of £60k.

Are there any specific staffing implications?		N		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Revenue income from development or surplus sites			£300,000	£300,000
TOTAL			£300,000	£300,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:	Increased income to the commercial portfolio			
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receiving revenue income instead of capital receipt could reduce resources in the capital programme. The proposal seeks to use current assets as a means of revenue generation in which case generating capital receipts from those same assets will be an opportunity that will need to be foregone. This places greater pressure on the capital programme as disposal of assets is one of the means through which the programme is funded. Estimated income not achieved. The income projections in terms of timing and quantum, is based on the Council's deal with Kitewood at Copperas Street. The proforma assumes that the same deal can be made with another partner or developer and that the same level of income, allowing for rental inflation can be reached. A different arrangement to the above is likely to impact the timing and quantum of income. 				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
None. However, it is expected that there will be a call on internal legal resources to negotiate the agreements.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

None

Staff

None

Other Council Services

None

Partners

None

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				N/A
Disability				N/A
Ethnicity				N/A
Gender				N/A

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Gender reassignment				N/A
Marriage and civil partnerships				N/A
Pregnancy and maternity				N/A
Religion and belief				N/A
Sexual orientation				N/A
Socio-economic inequality				N/A
Is a full EAA required?			N	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis	X			
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness	X			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Housing Programme Commercial Units' Income
Reference:	HRPR_INC_08_Housing-Programme-Commercial-Units
Lead officer:	Patrick Dubeck
Ward/s affected	All Wards
Cabinet portfolio	Housing Development and Planning
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
The commercial portfolio comprises approximately 250 secondary and tertiary assets and generates an income of circa £2.8m per annum. It includes retail shops, offices, light industrial units, nurseries and various community assets.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	231	3,045	-2,814	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
The Building for Lewisham Programme includes a number of new commercial units, which are intended to form part of the Council's wider commercial estate.
Included within the current programme are three schemes due to be completed between Nov 2022 and Feb 2024. All three schemes have commercial units, which are intended to form part of the wider commercial portfolio. A brief description of each of the sites including units, projected rent and date of completion is set out below.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

- **Creekside** – The Creekside development is located at the junction of Creekside and Deptford Church Street (SE8). It comprises 92 residential units and commercial floor space of 1,200sqm GIA although the lettable space is approximately 800sqm. The commercial unit is for a Planning use close B and is expected to generate an annual rent of between £100 – £150k a year. The project is due to complete in Nov 2022. Marketing is underway and the expectation is that it will start to generate income from the second half of 2023 financial year allowing for a short period of rent holiday for the tenant.
- **Home Park** – This scheme is located on Winchfield Road, the Home Park development will deliver 31 one, two and three-bedroom homes to a site formerly occupied by a neighbourhood office, garages, pram sheds and storage buildings. The commercial element of the scheme is approximately 150sqm of lettable space of Planning Use Class A1, A2, A3 and B1 estimated to generate approximately £28k a year in rent. The project is expected to be completed in September 2023.
- **Edward Street** – The Edward Street development is another mixed used scheme providing 34 family units with ground floor accommodation comprising a mix of nursery and flexible A1/A2/A3 or B1 spaces arranged around secure a courtyard. The commercial space is approximately 520sqm and is expected to generate approximately £100k in rent. The project is due to complete in Feb 2024.

The above projected income will add to the current commercial estate income as and when they come stream in the next 2 years. The profile has therefore been developed to reflect the phasing of the receipt of the income.

Are there any specific staffing implications?		N		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	75,000	75,000	100,000	250,000
TOTAL	£75,000	£75,000	100,000	250,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	N	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
Delays to completion of projects impacting on when income can start to be generated from the assets. The income profile provided below is in line with the latest project delivery programme. It takes into account any marketing needed and, also rent free period, which may be granted to a prospective tenant. To keep the void period to a minimum, marketing of the units will start at least 6 months before practical completion. Where necessary, it will start with construction to ensure to ensure the unit meets the requirements of the tenant.				
Estimated rental level not achieved. The profiled income below is based on realistic estimates for comparable units of similar size and condition. The planning use class for the units are also such that they can lend themselves to a variety of uses, which makes letting them and achieving the estimated rents more realistic.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

None. However, it is expected that there will be a call on internal legal resources to negotiate the leases.

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?	N
--	---

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

None

Staff

None

Other Council Services

None

Partners

None

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X

Is a full EAA required?	N
--------------------------------	---

How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?

Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness	X			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Disposal Recharge
Reference:	HRPR_SAV_03_Disposal-Recharge-Salary-Costs
Lead officer:	Patrick Dubeck
Ward/s affected	All Wards
Cabinet portfolio	Housing Development and Planning
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
A corporate non-housing estate review is currently underway to review the Council's corporate, operational and office estate. The review seeks to identify prioritised opportunities to enable better utilisation of the Council's assets, income generation, and land supply for housing development, service transformation as well as disposals where appropriate.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	231	3,045	-2,814	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
There are approximately 860 assets within the Council's non-housing asset register. The non-housing portfolio includes assets mainly used to deliver the Council's civic functions (offices, libraries, depot, hostels etc.), help discharge statutory obligations (e.g. schools), generate revenue income stream (retail units, light industrial sites etc.) and help deliver specific corporate objectives.
A review of the Council's non-housing asset portfolio is currently underway. The review seeks to identify prioritised opportunities to enable better utilisation of the Council's assets and

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

potential opportunities for disposal to generate much needed capital receipt for the capital programme.

As part of the asset review, several assets have been identified as opportunities to explore (over the next 3-5years) for other uses including for housing development and or disposal. Some of these are listed below:

- House on the Hill
- Wesley Halls/Bankfoot former neighbourhood office site
- 203 Deptford High Street
- Trundleys Road
- Mulberry Day Centre
- Library Resource Centre
- Mornington Centre

Taken together and assuming all the above sites are disposed of in the 3-5 years, a capital receipt in excess of £20m can be generated. However, it is not expected that all the above sites will be disposed of and that some will be used to meet other corporate priorities including supporting housing delivery and revenue income generation.

For the purposes of this proposal, it is assumed that at least £5m will be generated in capital receipts from the asset disposals in the 3-5years. Generating this level of receipt will require additional resource to support the programme. It is therefore proposed that the cost of that resource will be met from the disposal receipt rather than through a call on general fund revenue resource.

Are there any specific staffing implications?		N		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Disposal Recharges	70,000	30,000		100,000
TOTAL				
% Net Budget	70,000	30,000		100,000
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	N	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
Estimated Income from disposal not being achieved: A disposal programme is being developed as part of the ongoing council wide asset review. The programme will have several medium to large assets which will generate the level of disposal estimated.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
None. However, it is expected that there will be a call on internal legal resources to effect disposals.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?		N		

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

5. Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
None				
Staff				
None				
Other Council Services				
None				
Partners				
None				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				
Disability				
Ethnicity				
Gender				
Gender reassignment				
Marriage and civil partnerships				
Pregnancy and maternity				
Religion and belief				
Sexual orientation				
Socio-economic inequality				
Is a full EAA required?			N	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health,				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

social care & support				
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness	X			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Apprenticeship Programme Resourcing
Reference:	HRPR_SAV_04_Apprenticeships
Lead officer:	Patrick Dubeck
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Business, Jobs and Skills
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
The Mayor's Apprenticeship Programme is managed by the Economy, Jobs and Partnerships service. The programme seeks to recruit local people to apprenticeship opportunities within the council. The programme's budget is used to pay for the first five months' salary of new apprentices within the council, plus two members of staff who deliver the programme.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	418,652	0	418,652	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	418,652	0	418,652	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	1	1		
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5	1	1		
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
The focus of the Mayor's Apprenticeship Programme is expanding. Roles within the council will continue to be the primary focus of the programme team. However, work will also take place to support residents into apprenticeship opportunities with other local employers (including those arising from new developments in the borough) and with employers elsewhere in London. This change is expected to be reflected in the new Corporate Strategy.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

When the focus of the programme was solely on internal opportunities, funding needed to be drawn from the council’s core budget. With the expansion in focus of the programme it is possible to use Section 106 Employment and Training contributions towards the programme. This will be included in a broader proposal for use of S106 funding towards employment and training activities, including Lewisham Works.

It is suggested that it will be possible to substitute 20% of the core budget currently used for the salaries of the programme team for S106 funding. This will allow the programme to continue being delivered at same level of resource but will provide a small saving to the General Fund.

Current staffing costs = £86,083 (1 x PO3, 1 x Apprentice). Therefore 20% = £17,217

Are there any specific staffing implications?		No		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Substitution of GF for S106	£17,217	-	-	£17,217
TOTAL	£17,217	-	-	£17,217
% Net Budget	4.1%			4.1%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
Ensuring that the activities of the Mayor’s Apprenticeship Programme are compliant with the requirements of the S106 obligations used.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
None				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?		No		

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?	
Service Users	
None	
Staff	
None	
Other Council Services	
None	
Partners	
None	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy			X Negative – opportunity cost of using S106 funding for other employment project	
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness				X

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Initiation	Review of S106 obligations to identify obligations which will align with these activities	John Bennett	November 2022
Planning	Produce Project Initiation Document (PID) for approval through appropriate S106 governance	John Bennett	January 2022
Implementation	S106 funds drawn down by Finance to appropriate cost code	Finance	March 2024
Review	Annual review to ensure ongoing compliance	John Bennett	March 2024

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Supporting local businesses
Reference:	HRPR_SAV_05_Business-Support-UKSPF
Lead officer:	Patrick Dubeck
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Business, Jobs and Skills
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
The Business Engagement team in the Economy, Jobs and Partnerships service provides local businesses with advice, support and signposting on issues that will support those businesses to survive and grow. The focus of the team has evolved post-pandemic to being more outward facing, going out to local high streets to talk to businesses and organising programmes and events which will provide relevant support.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	294,681	28,221	266,460	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	294,681	28,221	266,460	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	1	0		1
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5	4	3		1
PO6 – PO8	1	0		1
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
The Government have introduced the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) as a replacement for European structural funds which were received when the UK was a member of the European Union. These previous funds included European Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund.
The borough is being provided an allocation of UKSPF each year to March 2025. The funding is overseen by the GLA and has 3 themes – Communities & Place, Local Business

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Support, and People & Skills. The council will directly receive some of the funding for Communities & Place and Local Business Support. For these allocations the council will be required to identify outputs and outcomes which will be delivered, from a list of specified outputs agreed between the GLA and Government.

Some of the outputs being sought, specifically those relating to local business support, are linked to existing services being delivered by the Business Engagement team in the Economy, Jobs and Partnerships service. Therefore, it is considered possible that existing core budget could be substituted for UKSPF for the next two years. The level of substitution proposed is equivalent to 1.5 FTE (50%) of the current team.

Are there any specific staffing implications?		No		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Substitution of GF for UKSPF	100,000	5,000	0	105,000
TOTAL				
% Net Budget	38.4%	1.9%		40.3%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
Ensuring that the activities of the Business Engagement team are compliant with the output requirements of the UKSPF funding. This may require existing activities to be amended to ensure delivery is focused on contracted outputs. It will also require adequate monitoring systems to be in place for reporting to the GLA/Government.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
None				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?		No		

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

It should be noted that this proposal has the impact of reducing the amount of funding for additional programming and support measures that might have otherwise been available for business support at a time when many small businesses are facing significant pressures due to the rising cost of energy bills and rents.

Staff

None

Other Council Services

None

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Partners				
No direct impact. However, local partners may be disappointed that the council chooses to keep UKSPF for its own internal purposes rather than commissioning much needed business support programmes.				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy			X Negative – opportunity cost of using UKSPF funding for other business support projects	
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Good governance and operational effectiveness				X
--	--	--	--	---

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Agree UKSPF Investment Plan with the GLA which includes outputs to be delivered by the Business Engagement team	John Bennett	October 2022
Planning	Service Plan for Business Engagement team developed	John Bennett	March 2023
Implementation	UKSPF funds drawn down by Finance to appropriate cost code	Finance	March 2024 and March 2025
Review	Quarterly reviews to ensure ongoing compliance and delivery against UKSPF outputs	John Bennett	Ongoing quarterly

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview			
Proposal title:	Review of the Temporary Accommodation (TA) Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Lewisham Homes (LH)		
Reference:	HRPR_SAV_06_Review-TA-Lewisham-Homes-Agreement		
Lead officer:	Fenella Beckman		
Ward/s affected	All wards		
Cabinet portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness		
Scrutiny committee/s			
2. Decision Route			
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	
No	No	No	
3. Contextual Information			
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?			
<p>The Housing Services Division works to support people who are in housing need, gives advice to customers on their housing options, works to raise standards in the private rented sector and to enable residents to live independently in their homes through the provision of grants for home adaptations.</p> <p>One of the three core service groups within the Division is the Housing needs and refugee services who work to: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ deliver our statutory homelessness services through front-line homelessness prevention and relief services; ○ procure temporary homes for a range of customers across the Council who are in housing need; ○ support our customers who are living in temporary accommodation in and out of the borough and working to help them settle into the private rented sector ○ with customers who have no recourse to public funds; ○ deliver the award-winning refugee resettlement programme ○ jointly with children’s social care on s17 (Children’s Act 1989) homeless households ○ in partnership with RPs on the allocations and lettings of social homes ○ undertake statutory reviews of decisions and coordinating the management of complaints across the Division <p>This service works very closely with Lewisham Homes on accepted clients housed in LBL temporary accommodation managed by Lewisham Homes on behalf of the Council. A Service Level Agreement exists between LH and LBL for the activity.</p>			
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?			
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	2,915	1,395	1,520
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	11	11		
Scale 6 – SO2	7	7		
PO1 – PO5	3	3		
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				
4. Cuts Proposal				
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?				
Lewisham Homes provide management services for homeless households in temporary accommodation owned by London Borough of Lewisham. The cost of management and administration relating to this service is currently charged to the general fund. Going forward this charge will cease, and the costs of management will revert back to the Council's Housing Revenue Account.				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			No	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Recharge to the HRA	£162,000			£162,000
TOTAL	£162,000			£162,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	Y	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:	Will switch funding from General Fund into the HRA.			
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
Not applicable				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
None. This is a change in funding source only				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			No	
5. Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
None. This savings plan will not result in any changes to the way the service carries out its work, it is simply a change of funding source, to fund the same activities.				
Staff				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

None				
Other Council Services				
None				
Partners				
None				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis	Positive			
Giving children and young people the best start in life		Positive		
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support			Positive	
Making Lewisham greener				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Building safer communities		Positive		
Good governance and operational effectiveness	Positive			
6. Delivery Plan				
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales	
Initiation	Agree with finance, legal and Director of Housing	Fenella Beckman	April 2023	
Planning	As above	Lewisham Homes	Leading up to April 2023	
Implementation	Make changes to budget allocations	LBL Finance	April 2023	
Review	We will review whether there have been any negative impacts of this change at the end of next financial year.	Clienting	October 2023	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview				
Proposal title:	Reducing General Fund spend in the Private Sector Licensing and Housing Enforcement service			
Reference:	HRPR_SAV_07_Private-Sector_Licensing			
Lead officer:	Fenella Beckman			
Ward/s affected	All wards			
Cabinet portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness			
Scrutiny committee/s				
2. Decision Route				
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation		
No	No	No		
3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>The Housing Services Division works to support people who are in housing need, gives advice to customers on their housing options, works to raise standards in the private rented sector and to enable residents to live independently in their homes through the provision of grants for home adaptations. One of the three core service groups within the Division is the Private Sector Housing Agency which includes the Private Sector Licensing and Housing Enforcement Service This service: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> works to manage and improve the private rented sector in Lewisham through licensing and enforcement interventions; supporting tenants in the private rented sector who are being harassed by rogue landlords; supporting homeowners to adapt homes for vulnerable people's changing needs through the distribution of loans and facilitating the construction/building works distributing loans to owners of empty homes to bring them back into occupation <p>The Service is headed by the Head of Private Sector Licensing and Home Improvement and includes 16 FTEs. As a result of increased demand following the launch of the Additional Licensing Scheme, there are 4 temporary short term Coordinator roles that have been created and funded through licensing income to clear the backlog of applications.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	1,084	556	528	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	2	2		
Scale 6 – SO2	2	2		
PO1 – PO5	11	11		
PO6 – PO8				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

SMG1 – SMG3	1	1		
JNC				
4. Cuts Proposal				
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?				
<p>We currently fund 35% of the private sector licensing and enforcement service from general fund, and 65% from the proceeds of licensing. This reflects the fact that until this financial year, 35% of the team’s caseload was statutory disrepair cases, relating to non-licensable properties and which cannot, therefore, be funded from the proceeds of licensing.</p> <p>However, with the introduction of a new borough-wide additional licensing scheme in April 2022, many more disrepair cases are likely to fall under the remit of the licensing scheme and can therefore be funded from licensing income. We have conducted an analysis of what the likely change to the statutory disrepair caseload will be, and we believe that we can now reduce the service’s reliance on the council’s general fund.</p> <p>This would leave the equivalent of three senior licensing and enforcement officers, one programme coordinator, 0.5 of an Intelligence and Investigation Officer and 0.3 of a Head of Service funded by the council general fund.</p> <p>In addition, we have conducted an analysis of the likely minimum income the service will generate from Civil Penalty Notices (CPNs) given to landlords for certain types of offences. This income can be used to fund statutory disrepair. At a conservative estimate the minimum income likely to be generated by this avenue is £90k per annum. We are clear that this does not involve setting targets for income to be generated from CPNs, which would be inappropriate, simply that this is the minimum likely to be generated by the service undertaking business as usual. This income can be used to cover a proportion of the licensing and compliance officers’ time that relates to statutory disrepair.</p>				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			No	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Replacing general fund with licensing income	150,000			150,000
TOTAL	150,000			150,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>The risk to taking the above approach is that the service is incentivised to bring in licensing income and civil penalty income, potentially at the expense of less financially lucrative, and often more complex statutory disrepair work. However, this risk can be managed by ensuring that employee target-setting is not based on income generation, but on outcomes</p>				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

achieved for residents. This is already set out in this service’s draft service improvement plan.

A further risk to taking the approach outlined above is that the law could change to radically alter the statutory private sector housing enforcement framework and remove the council’s access to licensing income. Due to the reduced general funding to the service, this would leave the council with a skeleton service to meet its statutory obligations. However, we consider this to be a high impact/low probability risk.

The Government’s recently published and very comprehensive white paper on private rented sector reform *A fairer private rented sector* indicates there is no intention to scrap property licensing, and indeed recent decisions by the Housing and Homelessness Minister suggest the Government is more supportive of councils using property licensing than at any time in the preceding 5 years. In any case, if licensing powers were to be abolished or amended, the Government would be likely to allow the clock to wind down on existing schemes. This means there would be no cliff edge, which would allow the council time to plan for the reduction in income.

Are there any specific legal implications?

No specific legal implications

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?

No

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

None. This savings plan will not result in any changes to the way the service carries out its work, it is simply a change of funding source, to fund the same activities.

Staff

Minimal. As set out above, there is a risk that staff could be incentivised to prioritise ‘low hanging fruit’ over complex cases, but this is mitigated by service managers designing staff targets to avoid this outcome. In the longer term it means that more of the licensing and enforcement staff are dependent on licensing income to fund their roles, which means they will be subject to any changes in legislation governing how the council collects licensing income, however no changes to this are anticipated in the short-medium term.

Other Council Services

Positive. As outlined above there are potentially other roles in the council which could be funded from either the proceeds of licensing or the proceeds of CPN income, which will support other services to meet their savings targets

Partners

None. The only partners who are connected to this work are our TA provider landlords whose properties are licensable, and again, the service they receive will not change in any way, only the funding source.

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?	No			
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis	Positive			
Giving children and young people the best start in life		Positive		
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support			Positive	
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities		Positive		
Good governance and operational effectiveness	Positive			
6. Delivery Plan				
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Initiation	Agree with finance, legal and Director of Housing	Fenella Beckman	April 2023
Planning	As above	Rhona Brown	
Implementation	Make changes to budget allocations	Rhona Brown	April 2023
Review	We will review whether there have been any negative impacts of this change at the end of next financial year.	Fenella Beckman	October 2023

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview

Proposal title:	Education – Delete Remainder of Vacant BSO Post (Education Operations)
Reference:	CYP_SAV_02_Delete-Vacant-Education-Post
Lead officer:	Angela Scattergood
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Children, Young People and Community Safety
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route

Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information

Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?

Business support for Education Services.

This proposal follows on from a previously taken saving in this area, where a member of staff was retiring having reviewed the work demands the proposal didn't require us to fill the post due to successful digitisation of services and Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with schools have allowed this to be possible.

This saving now takes the remainder of that budget for that individual that couldn't be taken previously due to when they were retiring.

What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	102	0	102
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL	102	0	102

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?

Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	1	1		
Scale 6 – SO2	1	1		Remainder of 1
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

Not to fill what is left from a vacant post following previous savings proposal.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Are there any specific staffing implications?					N
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)					
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL	
Vacant 'Post' Deletion	12	0	0	12	
TOTAL	12	0	0	12	
% Net Budget	11.8	0	0	11.8	
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health	
	Y	N	N	N	
If yes, please describe impact:	Saving realised				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?					
No risks associated, post has been deemed unnecessary to meet service needs, and is not filled (partial savings have already been taken from this post anyway)					
Are there any specific legal implications?					
No					
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N		

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?					
Service Users					
None					
Staff					
None					
Other Council Services					
None					
Partners					
None					
Are there any specific equalities implications?					
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral	
Age				X	
Disability				X	
Ethnicity				X	
Gender				X	
Gender reassignment				X	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness	Positive			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Inform Finance ready for new financial year budget setting process	Matt Henaughan	Immediately post decision
Planning	As Above	Matt Henaughan	As Above
Implementation	As Above	Matt Henaughan	As Above
Review	Not necessary	Matt Henaughan	As Above

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Reduction in funding to the Youth Service Budget by £200k
Reference:	CYP_SAV_04_Youth-Service-Budget-Review
Lead officer:	Sara Rahman
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Children, Young People and Community Safety
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information
<p>Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?</p> <p>Local Authorities have a responsibility to provide a youth service offer within its local area, although this is not defined. Across the country there has been a significant reduction in spend for youth services. Although spend in Lewisham has reduced in recent years it still compares well with many other Local Authorities. The main spend for youth services relates to Youth First, but in addition to this the Council maintains youth engagement and participation staff, primarily within the Young Mayor’s Team. In addition, the Council funds the Lewisham Young Leadership Academy which particularly supports young people with an African or African-Caribbean heritage.</p> <p>To date the primary focus for youth service provision has been on universal provision, but there is a concern about unmet need, through a current review of our adolescent services we may need to refocus resources on more targeted provision.</p> <p>Youth First deliver the core Youth Services contract in Lewisham. The contract value is £1.25m and it runs from 1st April 2021 to 31 March 2025. This is a large part of the overall Council budget of £1.9m.</p> <p>In addition, Youth First currently manage our Adventure Playgrounds. Following the adoption of our new Play Strategy the offer here is currently being tendered, so this is outside the scope of this savings proposal.</p> <p><u>Current Delivery model</u></p> <p>The service is an essential part of the universal and targeted element of our Early Help approach to provide the right support, in the right place at the right time.</p> <p>Youth First organises three delivery modes:</p> <p>Delivery Mode 1: Maintain (and shape) a flexible, fun, safe, educational and engaging universal offer at core sites across the borough that meet an appropriate Youth Quality Mark.</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open access to an agreed number of sessions that can be delivered at core sites across the borough.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

- Delivery of all-year-round and school holiday provision to provide safe social spaces of activity and education (expanded to alternative sites as required)
- Delivery of youth-led projects, social action and youth participation (e.g. local campaigning, volunteering, peer mentoring, intergenerational activities, youth panels and social enterprise)
- High-quality website, branding and partnership working with Lewisham’s Family Information Service to maximise uptake and access.
- In the light of the Public Health challenge presented by Covid 19, provision of an engaging virtual offer to allow ongoing support through lockdown and beyond as appropriate.

Delivery Mode 2: Provide outreach support and engagement that responds flexibly to the changing needs of young people in the borough, with a view to engaging young people in open access provision

- Retaining open access capacity for localised outreach as need dictates – e.g. planned response to localised community and social issues.
- This would be delivered through the core 720 hours, i.e. instead of planned open access sessions

Delivery Mode 3: Develop a targeted offer for more vulnerable young people and families. Including 1:1 case holding and themed session delivery

- Bespoke interventions that support young people to improve outcomes, sustain change and make positive life choices will be delivered by Senior youth and community workers
- Young people may self-refer, be identified by youth workers during open access sessions or be referred through Family Thrive.
- The breadth of need that Family Thrive identify is wide-ranging and include: issues at school; family or relationship problems; drug/alcohol concerns; concerns around behaviour; peer groups; emotional wellbeing; keeping safe; anti-social behaviour.

What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	1,943		1,943
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL	1,943		1,943

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?

Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

4. Cuts Proposal				
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?				
<p>It is being proposed that a reduction of £200k be taken from the base budget. This will involve negotiations with Youth First on their delivery model taking into consideration the balance between universal and targeted youth provision, together the level of Council spend that fund front line youth work as opposed to back office and management functions. The Council is pleased that Youth First are showing more success in identifying alternative sources of funding including NCIL from the Council for neighbourhood work and grants and donations from external organisations.</p> <p>In addition, through both the adolescent review and the development of Family Hubs there may be opportunities to develop other elements of a youth offer.</p>				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			Y – these would be for Youth First	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	200,000			200,000
TOTAL				
% Net Budget	200,000			200,000
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on the model adopted, there could be TUPE implications that would require further consultation. Up to 5/6 staff FTE may be affected by redundancies, needing services to be redesigned much more intelligently Staff shortages could impact on service delivery/access <p>Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would ask the provider to trim down elements of their business support costs first – a task that could possibly be merged with other existing staff members. They may also consider sharing business support functions with other organisations We would ask the Provider to involve volunteers Officers will signpost the Provider in obtaining funding from sources such as charitable trusts 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any specific legal implications? 				
To be completed with Legal input.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?				

5. Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
<p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users may not be able to access services according to current set timetables • Service users may not be able to access all or part of the services in certain parts of Lewisham depending on the model adopted • This may result in club closure due to staffing shortages – as centres must operate on an agreed staff: YP ratio <p>Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through possible increased volunteering opportunities, services may be maintained including using increased targeted approach. The latter approach is where services can be put in place quickly for those most in need. • The emerging Family Hub model, planned to be put in place in April 2023, will ensure that there is a further safety net, where children and young people can access a menu of relevant services • For older children, the Provider could increase services virtually building on learning and feedback from CV19 lockdowns.
Staff
<p>Impact For the provider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 4-6 FTE staff could be made redundant impacting on the running of clubs – which may result in reduced hours or even closure • Other staff not affected may feel demotivated, particularly when they may have to do more due to cuts • Recruitment and retention of youth service staff has proved difficult over the years, further cuts is likely to exacerbate this <p>Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Provider could make use of more sessional staff, and those who are affected by redundancies, could option to take up these new opportunities • For those affected staff, the Provider will be asked to signpost them to the Council’s job website as well as its partners; the Council together with ICB commission many services locally and thus support job creation in Lewisham • The Provider could involve volunteers
Other Council Services
<p>Negative/Positive impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cuts in services could see more referrals into children social care Cuts in services could see more young people use other universal services such as sports, parks, leisure and libraries

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cuts in services could see more young people making use of school extra-curricular activities 				
Partners				
<p>Negative and positive impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater referrals to other services for such as Family Thrive, CAMHS and YOS. It may encourage increased access to leisure/sports/parks facilities for young people including take-up of activities that schools/libraries have to offer It may encourage all services for children and young people to come together to work much more closely and collaboratively – this is something that is planned for Lewisham’s emerging Family Hub model. 				
<p>Are there any specific equalities implications?</p> <p>Services are assessed as having medium positive equalities implications due to the fact that at least 84% of the funding is planned to be retained.</p> <p>For socio-economic equality, this is deemed as having a high negative equalities implication – current statistics show that a large proportion of users are from BAME backgrounds - predominantly Black British and Mixed Race heritage. We also know from the Covid pandemic experience, that the BAME population were heavily impacted exposing inequalities in Lewisham’s communities as well as nationally. In this case, we would ensure that services are targeted and targeted in the most deprived parts of the ward. The service is also used by young people who are predominantly in the age range of 8 -15 and more males attend than females. There are 130 young people categorised as having some kind of disabilities e.g. emotional health and wellbeing issues, physical disabilities and learning disabilities. Any service design will ensure that this is taken into account to ensure that there is minimum impact for this group of children and young people.</p>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Negative)	Medium (Positive)/	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X	
Disability			X	
Ethnicity			X	
Gender			X	
Gender reassignment			X	
Marriage and civil partnerships			N/A	
Pregnancy and maternity			N/A	
Religion and belief			x	
Socio-economic inequality			x	

*Please note, where there is N/A stated in the box, this means the organisation do not have sufficient data or that the protected characteristic is not recorded due to its irrelevance.

Is a full EAA required?	Y (with Corporate Policy input)
--------------------------------	---------------------------------

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

How do the proposed changes align with the Council’s Corporate Strategy?				
Preservation of large portion of Youth First (84%) funding means that the Council continues to commit to the corporate priorities listed below.				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive)	Medium (Positive)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham			X Preservation of large portion of funding will enable support to be provided to marginalised young people e.g. LGBTQ+	
Tackling the Housing crisis				X Service may continue to signpost young people and their families to specialist support
Giving children and young people the best start in life			X Preservation of funding means that children and young people continue to meet outcomes of the Children and Young People's Plan	
Building an inclusive local economy				X The service is able to refer young people to suitable training opportunities through colleges, local apprenticeship schemes

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<p>Delivering and defending: health, social care & support</p>			<p>X Preservation of funding means that through Early Help and Prevention Services, we can ensure that those most in need are supported early in order to prevent them from needing social care services</p>	
<p>Making Lewisham greener</p>				<p>X Officers will continue to ensure that Providers meet Lewisham's environmental targets through contracts monitoring</p>
<p>Building safer communities</p>			<p>X Supporting young people early means that young people know how to keep safe in the borough and be diverted from crime and gangs</p>	
<p>Good governance and operational effectiveness</p>			<p>Governance is managed through I-Thrive Board, and operational effectiveness is managed through contractual monitoring.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

--	--	--	--	--

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Consultation with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet • Commissioners • Heads of service • Directors • Providers • HR 	Sara Rahman, supported by Harsha Ganatra, Joint Commissioner and Serita Kwofie, Head of Prevention and Early Help	19th September to February 2022 to March 2023
Planning	Negotiate with Providers as to new service model taking into account funding levels, staffing needed, redundancies	Harsha Ganatra, Joint Commissioner and Serita Kwofie, Head of Prevention & Early Help	From October 2023 to 31 March 2023
Implementation	Finalise Service model re-design, arrange variation to the contract to be signed with new KPIs/model	Harsha Ganatra, Joint Commissioner and Serita Kwofie, Head of Prevention & Early Help	From 1 April 2023
Review	Review the new model continuously assessing impact/risk/mitigation. Mitigation could also look at what additional funding the service could attract, greater collaborative working such as through Family Hub model.	Harsha Ganatra, Joint Commissioner and Serita Kwofie, Head of Prevention and Early Help	From 1 April 2023 - every month for three months then every quarterly

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Reduction in funding to the Youth Offending Service by £100k
Reference:	CYP_SAV_05_Youth-Offending-Service-Review
Lead officer:	Sara Rahman
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Children, Young People and Community Safety
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>The Lewisham Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2022 sets out the priorities for the Youth Offending Service to provide a child first service to prevent and reduce offending according with the requirements of the CJ Act 1998. The YOS has been on an improvement path since 2016 when some additional Lewisham LA funding was provided to support a post inspection action plan which included additional consultancy fees for external support, expert advice and auditing of service delivery.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
Health	106,456	106,456	0	
LA	1,334,675	1,334,675	0	
YJB	609,037	609,037	0	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
N/A				

4. Cuts Proposal	
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?	
It is being proposed, following a thorough financial audit that a reduction of £100k for consultancy linked to external quality assurance be taken from the base budget.	
Are there any specific staffing implications?	N

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	£100k			
TOTAL	£100k			
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
The provision of additional support for the YOS for improvement has produced the outputs required since the funding was provided in 2016. Auditing is now undertaken by team managers. Should there be an identified need for consultancy it could be offset by 50% resulting from an increase in the YJB grant for 22/23.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
To be completed with Legal input.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?				

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
The impact on service users is thought to be minimal as this is not a saving that involves a staffing reduction or redesign.				
Staff				
There will not be any impact on staffing. Should there be a need to support the quality assurance activity in the team then this could be offset by the YJB grant as highlighted above, and the peer support available from Islington as our partners in practice.				
Other Council Services				
There could be additional ask from other areas of the council such as the programme management service for project support if there is a need for a focused piece of work in relation to the quality and performance of the service.				
Partners				
The lack of finance available for this type of assurance work could mean that improvement work with partners could be delayed. This work could come from the youth justice board and as a result of emerging themes and issues.				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X	
Disability			X	
Ethnicity			X	
Gender			X	
Gender reassignment			X	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Marriage and civil partnerships			X	
Pregnancy and maternity			X	
Religion and belief			X	
Sexual orientation			X	
Socio-economic inequality			X	
Is a full EAA required?			Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				
Tackling the Housing crisis				
Giving children and young people the best start in life				
Building an inclusive local economy				
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				
Making Lewisham greener				
Building safer communities			x	
Good governance and operational effectiveness				

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Review budgets with finance	Keith Cohen	December 2023
Planning	Set forecast with finance	Keith Cohen	January 2023
Implementation	Saving	Keith Cohen	April 2023
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Review of Short Break services to children with complex needs
Reference:	CYP_SAV_06_Short-Breaks
Lead officer:	Angela Scattergood
Ward/s affected	All Wards
Cabinet portfolio	Children, Young People and Community Safety
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information
<p>Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?</p> <p>The Short Breaks budget of circa £2.5m is the proposed scope for cuts to this proposal.</p> <p>Short Breaks is used to describe services delivered to provide respite activities and support for children and young people who have complex needs and disabilities. It supports parents and carers with a short break from their caring role. It may also support families by providing activities to a child or young person to support their social needs within the community. For children and young people who are eligible for Social Care support there are two types of Short Breaks which are provided: Targeted and Specialist Short Breaks. These services are aimed to support children and young people who have disabilities and complex needs at different levels. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted Short Breaks are for eligible families with disabled children who have additional needs which prevent them from accessing activities independently and through accessing these activities. Their parent or carers can take a short break from their caring responsibilities. The service provided is for 2 hours per week. • Specialist Short Breaks are for eligible children and young people who have complex needs and require regular care and support from their parents to meet their needs in caring for them. This service is for families with children and young people who have significant levels of needs whereby their needs have been assessed by a Social Worker through the Children Social Care assessment framework. This service provides 3 or more hours per week. <p>While the above services are provided, often to ensure that outcomes are met and that children are not put at risk of harm, spot purchased support has been used for children who are Children in Need and children who are looked after. Spot purchased support has provided crisis intervention and support to prevent children and young people from becoming looked after. Care is provided by external agencies and falls into three broad categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In complex cases of challenging behaviour when a family's find it difficult to manage the providers will offer additional support for the family at home. • Interim placement support while a long term placement is identified where agencies provide care into a residence to support the child or young person.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

- Crisis support for complex cases where the specific care needs are greater than the contracted support can provide. Specifically where the capacity of the agency or complexity of the care means extra support it required. This can be a wrap-around service to prevent escalation of needs and prevent a child or young person becoming looked after; or to support foster carers to stabilise the placement.

What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	2465	0	2465
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL	2465	0	2465

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?

Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	0	0	0	0
Scale 6 – SO2	0	0	0	0
PO1 – PO5	0	0	0	0
PO6 – PO8	0	0	0	0
SMG1 – SMG3	0	0	0	0
JNC	0	0	0	0

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

A review of the current arrangements is currently underway, and a high level of spot purchased spend has been identified which should provide an opportunity to identify efficiencies without this having an impact on individual families, however this cannot be ruled out at present. We are seeking to establish what services can be commissioned differently.

Within the Short Breaks Service the following is proposed:

- Review of targeted and specialist criteria and offer for short breaks.
- Unit costing exercise to assess value for money and impact of services.
- Review of contacts and commissioned services.
- Review Spot Purchases.

Most of the contracts have had extensions due to Covid and this has impacted on any potential savings that may have been considered as part of the commissioning intentions. The targeted short breaks review which was to look at the eligibility criteria and offer, has been given a new revised timescale of December 2022 by commissioning. To date the review has already identified, through performance information a potential saving of £132k.

From the perspective of Commissioning there is still scope to develop a provider framework to better manage the external provision of care in this area. The framework will mean the Council has better control of the budget with consistent costs, manage the relationship with the providers and provide better oversight of the care being supplied. In addition, the use of

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

the framework will present an opportunity to broaden the existing care market with other care providers. Savings against the spot purchase costs will be recurrent.

There is also the option to consider expanding the use of the existing Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) used by the Council to incorporate this care provision. Other councils have used this model to offer more flexibility to the framework as it allows providers to come onto the framework at any time. The DPS also automates some of the process of quality checks, facilitation of entering the framework and the tendering process meaning there will be less pressure on Council staff. There will be an increase to the current £45k annual licensing fee with the existing provider but this will be an extension rather than full implementation of the system so will be less costly.

Are there any specific staffing implications?		No		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Complex Care Framework	200,000			£200,000
TOTAL	200,000			£200,000
% Net Budget	8%			8%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	Y
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>This is a demand led budget, governed by statutory requirements.</p> <p>Reductions in numbers and levels of support packages would be introduced for new claimants and an annual review of care packages.</p> <p>The impact of inflation and the ongoing cost of living wages has potential to see significant requests for cost uplifts from care agencies over the next 5 years. The framework can help manage this increase but will not be able to remove the need to consider inflationary uplifts entirely.</p> <p>The Framework will require engagement and some support from the care market in order to be successful. Whilst it is in the interest of agencies to be part of the framework there will be a risk to their own financial positions linked to better management of the Council's budget. Full engagement with the current and potential providers should be undertaken to help them to facilitate the move to the framework.</p>				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
If the Council is considering moving to an in-house care provision then TUPE may apply for staff who are already providing similar care for children and young people.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			Y (if there is a cut to support being offered)	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

The framework will provide the council with better oversight of the packages of care being offered, with clarity over the positive outcomes being achieved for children and young people engaged with agencies; and an improved mechanism for case management and feedback.

The framework will include checks on the quality of the agencies providing care and enable the council to undertake better performance management as part of contractual relationship.

Staff

Currently there is no council service. There is scope that external staff currently employed by care agencies could move to any proposed in-house service development.

Other Council Services

This would allow the Placements Team to better manage the existing spot purchase process and the use of the DPS has the potential to decrease the time required to find care. There will be no impact outside of CYP services.

Partners

The ICS (Health) jointly commission packages of care for children and young people with complex care needs and moving to the framework would have a positive impact on the management of the NHS budget as well.

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive)	Medium (Positive)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			Potentially positive as this could improve outcomes and service provision for vulnerable young people.	
Disability			Potentially positive as this could provide better care and outcomes for CYP with complex care needs.	
Ethnicity				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Gender				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.
Gender reassignment				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.
Marriage and civil partnerships				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.
Pregnancy and maternity				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.
Religion and belief				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.
Sexual orientation				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.
Socio-economic inequality				This will provide care for all CYP irrespective of this characteristic.
Is a full EAA required?			Y	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive)	Medium (Positive)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				No Impact on Open Lewisham
Tackling the Housing crisis				No impact on housing.
Giving children and young people the best start in life			The proposal should have a limited impact on services for young people needing support for complex care.	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Building an inclusive local economy				No Impact
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support			The proposal should have a limited impact on services for young people	
Making Lewisham greener				No impact
Building safer communities				No impact
Good governance and operational effectiveness		The framework will provide improved oversight and quality assurance for services.		

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Feasibility Study	Harriet Jannetta	December 22
	Market Analysis	Paul Creech	December 22
Planning	Financial Analysis	Paul Creech	January 22
	Market Engagement	Paul Creech	January-April 23
Implementation	Framework Development	Paul Creech	April-September 23
Review	Service User Feedback	Paul Creech	March 24

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Implementation of Electronic call monitoring systems for Maximising wellbeing at home services.
Reference:	COM_SAV_01_Electronic-Call-Monitoring
Lead officer:	Joan Hutton/ Kenneth Gregory
Ward/s affected	All
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>Adult social care is in the process of retendering contracts for Domiciliary care. The Maximising Wellbeing at Home service will provide focused support delivered by Wellbeing Teams through a rehabilitation lens. The new contracts allow an opportunity for the providers to implement the use of electronic call monitoring systems (ECM). This will ensure better oversight for the provider and resident who is receiving care and support and will provide more accurate information for charging and payment purposes.</p> <p>Scope: The Service is provided to people with care and support needs who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the national eligibility threshold for care and support as set out in the Care and Support (Eligibility Criteria) Regulations 2014 for the Care Act 2014 Have unmet eligible needs and outcomes that can be met through the provision of Maximising Wellbeing at Home; and Are deemed to be ordinarily resident within the administrative area of Lewisham Council. 				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	120,500	57,100	63,400	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	120,500	57,100	63,400	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	N/A			
Scale 6 – SO2	N/A			
PO1 – PO5	N/A			
PO6 – PO8	N/A			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

SMG1 – SMG3	N/A				
JNC	N/A				

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

Currently payments are made to providers on what is planned within the support plan rather than what is delivered. Consequently, charging to residents and payment to providers is not always accurate. Technical improvement work to the 3 systems has made electronic call monitoring possible. This means that:

- The providers of the new contracts for the Wellbeing at home service can implement electronic call monitoring (ECM) system that is compatible with Liquidlogic Adults' Social Care System.
- It is the Provider's responsibility to manage the day-to-day information from electronic monitoring. There will be flexibility to adjust time spent with the person in receipt of care, but these adjustments will be more transparent and allow the provider to plan rotas more effectively.

The ECM system will ensure:

- Increased transparency including adherence to fixed visit schedules and rostering requirements
- Improved management information for performance and quality monitoring
- There is a mechanism for Providers to monitor and manage high- risk / time critical alerts
- There is accurate invoicing information, minimising disputes reduced administration as information is captured electronically

The ECM will achieve this by comparing the expected provision and actual provision in order to:

- Recharge clients accurately; actual delivery can be more accurately
- Enable the Provider to monitor care and support calls so that an accurate measure of the actual care and support provided is obtained.
- Ensure that all visits are recorded electronically and in real time. The system used will be able to generate alerts and should be monitored throughout the service delivery in real time to ensure any issues are highlighted early for immediate attention.
- The system will to be able to generate electronic timesheets and invoices and be able to produce tailored reports to identify that the service requirements are being met.
- The Provider shall comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 and other legislation governing the use and storage of electronic information. It must also provide an audit trail for time sheet entries including when the entries were created and who created them.

Are there any specific staffing implications? No

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	£650,000			£650,000

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

TOTAL	£650,000			£650,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
No reduction in actual hours in comparison to what is paid now. This will be mitigated by the implementation of the new homecare model where no inflation will be paid to providers for the 5 years of the contract.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
No, the requirements to use ECM is within the contract. These changes follow what is already used nationally in many local authorities.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			No	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

The implementation of ECM will ensure that the three lead providers are paid based on actuals rather than planned.

Staff

Staff will need to tap in and tap out at each visit. Providers will need to maintain and continue to remind staff to do this.

Other Council Services

n/a

Partners

n/a

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium Positive	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				No Impact
Disability		Service users will be charged accurately.		
Ethnicity				No Impact
Gender				No Impact

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Gender reassignment				No Impact
Marriage and civil partnerships				No Impact
Pregnancy and maternity				No Impact
Religion and belief				No Impact
Sexual orientation				No Impact
Socio-economic inequality				No Impact
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High Positive	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low / Negative	Neutral
Open Lewisham				No Impact
Tackling the Housing crisis				No Impact
Giving children and young people the best start in life				No Impact
Building an inclusive local economy				No Impact
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support	Improved resource management.			
Making Lewisham greener				No Impact
Building safer communities				No Impact
Good governance and operational effectiveness	Accurate charging and payment information.			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Re-procurement of contract	Tristan Brice	April 2023
Planning	Ensure call monitoring can be analysed	Tristan Brice	April 2023
Implementation	Wellbeing model implementation	Tristan Brice	April 2023

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Review	Implementation post-mortem	Joan Hutton / Kenneth Gregory	December 2023
---------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Delegation of budgets to Operation Manager
Reference:	COM_SAV_02_Delegated-Care-Budgets
Lead officer:	Joan Hutton
Ward/s affected	All Wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information
<p>Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?</p> <p>Over the past 3 years Adult social Care has developed rigorous monitoring arrangements for budget management which is monitored weekly at Departmental Management Team and Bi- monthly by the Adult Social Care recovery board.</p> <p>The Empowering Lewisham programme has focused on embedding a strength- based culture to practice. Performance improvements have been achieved with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The management of demand from both the community and hospital pathways • As a result of effective decision making, reductions in the number of people placed in a care home setting. • Effective use of short-term interventions that promote independence by reducing or delaying the need for long term care <p>This proposal further strengthens the oversight of both performance and the use of resources by frontline managers. As they will use budget information to influence effective decision making.</p> <p>This will add to the rigour of performance and budget management and allow them to consider the resources available as part of their oversight of team performance and decisions made to meet eligible needs and outcomes for residents.</p>
<p>What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?</p>

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	120,500	57,100	63,400
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL	120,500	57,100	63,400

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Scale 1 – Scale 5	N/A			
Scale 6 – SO2	N/A			
PO1 – PO5	N/A			
PO6 – PO8	N/A			
SMG1 – SMG3	N/A			
JNC	N/A			

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

Adult Social Care Supports approximately 3,200 adults at any one time. Budgets are currently monitored by Heads of Service along with finance to ensure good budget management.

We are proposing to introduce delegated budgets from Heads of Service to include Operational Managers (OM's). This will create good financial accountability and effective resource management throughout the process and will be introduced with appropriate training and support in place for the OMs.

Other LAs (local authorities) who have implemented this approach have seen more effective budget management that has contributed towards a reduction in overall spend.

Are there any specific staffing implications?

N

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	100,000	300,000		400,000
TOTAL	100,000	300,000		400,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N

If yes, please describe impact:

This approach will contribute to better use of resources.

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?

There is the potential that individual managers may feel “risk averse” so we will continue to have panels in place to ensure that eligible needs are met and that consistent decisions are made on an individual basis taking account of the presenting concerns, assessed needs and how these can be met within the reduced budget.

Are there any specific legal implications?

To be completed with Legal input.

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?

N

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Service Users				
Eligible needs will be met in accordance with Care Act legislation which allows for decisions to be made by taking into consideration resources available. This may impact adversely on service user choice.				
Staff				
Budget management support will be in place for the Front-line Managers				
Other Council Services				
Financial services will be required to support this proposal by extending budget management training to the LOMs				
Partners				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium Negative	Low Negative	Neutral
Age				No Impact
Disability			Individual choice may not be met	
Ethnicity				No Impact
Gender				No Impact
Gender reassignment				No Impact
Marriage and civil partnerships				No Impact
Pregnancy and maternity				No Impact
Religion and belief				No Impact
Sexual orientation				No Impact
Socio-economic inequality				No Impact
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High Positive	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low Negative	Neutral
Open Lewisham				No Impact
Tackling the Housing crisis				No Impact
Giving children and young people the best start in life				No Impact

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Building an inclusive local economy				No Impact
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support	Improved resource management			
Making Lewisham greener				No Impact
Building safer communities				No Impact
Good governance and operational effectiveness	Improved resource management			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Agee Budgets based on teams	Finance/ Joan Hutton	October 22
Planning	Set up Training Agree monitoring Make Changes to IT Systems	Finance/Mary Farinha	December 22 - onwards
Implementation	Agree budgets with Operational Managers	Joan Hutton	Mary 23
Review	Monitor reviews and outcomes	Heads of Service	April 23 - ongoing

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Reassessment of Care Plans for all 18–65 year-olds (non LD)
Reference:	COM_SAV_03_Care-Plan-Reassessment
Lead officer:	Joan Hutton
Ward/s affected	All Wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>Adult Social Care has approximately 740 adults between the ages of 18-65 who are in receipt of care and support to meet their Care Act eligible needs. (This figure excludes adults with a Learning Disability).</p> <p>Expenditure on this cohort is c£10m per year and is ranked as the second highest in London from data provided on finance returns. This data also indicates that Placement costs for working age adults with Physical Disabilities are higher than our neighbours.</p> <p>The intention is therefore to align expenditure with bench marking intelligence, the following processes will be applied to both improve the management of demand and to reduce the costs associated with care and support services that are already in place for individuals. This approach will contribute towards the achievement of savings for 23/24 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening partnership and multi-disciplinary working to ensure there is appropriate support to both Care homes and to people living at home when managing complex behaviours that are challenging, by reducing safely and appropriately, the need for 1-1 additional staffing support that is often requested by providers. • Continued use of the Care Cubed tool to understand the detail of costs and to negotiate fees. (This tool is used to calculate the fair cost of care with providers and is widely used across other local authorities). • Ensuring a strength-based approach is used in accordance with Care Act requirements, thereby focusing on and maintaining independence and what a person can do, as well as what they may need support with. • by offering the most cost-effective options to meet eligible needs, such as Direct payments where appropriate. • Continuing to undertake a systematic reassessment process that, builds on individual and community strengths, reduces appropriately the need for commissioned support and any enhanced support that may have been needed to deal with a crisis. 				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

This approach is Care Act compliant and builds on similar processes used over the last 2 years to manage demand and to ensure that support plans are value for money and reflect assessed eligible needs.

What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	120,500	57,100	63,400
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL	120,500	57,100	63,400

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

In accordance with Care Act requirements, we propose the continuation of the programme to re-assess all the adults in this cohort to ensure that the current level of care provided maximises independence, is proportionate and meets identified eligible needs.

There are a considerable number of individuals who will have health care needs. This process will allow the opportunity to ensure that we are funding care legally and that there are negotiations in place if thresholds for health funding are met.

We will continue using the Care Cubed tool to negotiate placements fees, which for this cohort of adults, is much higher than for older adults.

We will further embed the approach developed with practitioners and partners from the Empowering Lewisham work streams so that the learning from this is sustainable across all client groups who are in receipt of support.

Are there any specific staffing implications?

No

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	1,000,000			1,000,000
TOTAL	1,000,000			1,000,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N

If yes, please describe impact:

This should reduce costs.

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?

The delivery of this proposal must comply with legislative requirements for ASC. The impact of these initiatives will reduce the number of people in receipt of long-term care and potentially the levels of care provided.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Requests to seek NHS funding may be viewed as “cost-shunting”. However, there is a national transparent and collaborative process in place with ICB colleagues for the purpose of negotiating who pays for what. This will ensure the council does not commission services beyond our legal limits.

Where appropriate, Direct Payments will be used creatively to meet needs and empower individuals to work within a reduced cash envelope, this may mitigate any limitations on choice. (The reduction to expenditure is achieved as the DP unit rate is lower than commissioned services).

All re-assessments will follow the guidance within the Care Act 2014. However, there may be an increase to the levels of complaints received if choices and preferences regarding support offered are not realised. (For example, the person may want 4 calls a day but assessed eligible needs suggest 3 calls will be suffice).

Are there any specific legal implications?

To be completed with Legal input.

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?

No

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

The aim of this proposal is to promote independence in accordance with the Care Act legislation. Some Service Users are likely to receive less support from Social Care as the approach will optimise access to community and personal resources.

Care may be delivered differently; Direct payment offers may lead to changes in care staff. Equally, creative care planning may also help create new social networks and access to more universal provisions.

There may be a need to meet housing needs within the community as an alternative to long term accommodation that may have been provided during a crisis.

Staff

No impact on staff as re-assessing cases is a primary task and is part of statutory requirements.

Other Council Services

There will potentially be a need for accessible housing so that people can live within the community.

There may be an ask for universal services such as libraries and leisure to develop creative solutions that will provide access to facilities or services in the local community.

Partners

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

The programme of reassessments will require work with partners, such as, GP’s, District Nurses, community therapy teams and housing to work individuals to improve their independence and wellbeing.

There is likely to be an increase of referrals to the NHS for Joint funding or fully funded Continuing health care if national thresholds are met.

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High Positive	Medium Positive	Low Negative	Neutral
Age		Positive, as the working age adults in receipt of care and support will be engaged in discussion about how their needs are met.		
Disability		As above		
Ethnicity				No Impact
Gender				No Impact
Gender reassignment				No Impact
Marriage and civil partnerships				No Impact
Pregnancy and maternity				No Impact
Religion and belief				No Impact
Sexual orientation				No Impact
Socio-economic inequality				No Impact

Is a full EAA required? No

How do the proposed changes align with the Council’s Corporate Strategy?

Corporate Priorities	High (Positive	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low(Positive	Neutral
Open Lewisham				No Impact
Tackling the Housing crisis				No Impact
Giving children and young people the best start in life			Young Carers needs will be considered as part of the assessment process if they are caring for a working age parent	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Building an inclusive local economy				No Impact
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support	Assessed needs will be met in accordance with legislation requirements.			
Making Lewisham greener				No Impact
Building safer communities	Any safeguarding concerns will be considered as part of the process.			
Good governance and operational effectiveness	Support plans will consider both health and social care needs.			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	N/A		
Planning	Agree Cohort	Mary Farinha	September 22
Implementation	Agree Reassessments plans with Teams	Joan Hutton	October 22
Review	Monitor reviews and outcomes	Kate Pottinger	October 22 – until all re-assessments completed

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Empowering Lewisham
Reference:	COM_SAV_04_Empowering-Lewisham
Lead officer:	Joan Hutton / Kenneth Gregory
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
This will have impact the homecare budget that sits with the ASC division. Currently the service is delivered by three main lead providers and a few smaller ones.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	120,500	-57,100	63,400	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	120,500	-57,100	63,400	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	N/A			
Scale 6 – SO2	N/A			
PO1 – PO5	N/A			
PO6 – PO8	N/A			
SMG1 – SMG3	N/A			
JNC	N/A			

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
Implementing Empowering Lewisham Programme which focuses on design and implementation of new ways of working and service configurations based upon quantified opportunities. These sustainable financial opportunities within Adult Social Care are to realise a target for annual ongoing savings of £8.6m, with a stretch target of £12m. Summary table below provides further detail on various workstreams and savings each one should be delivering.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

		Lewisham	
Area	Summary of Opportunity	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Decision Making OA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better decision making at reviews and assessments to ensure settings and packages of care accurately reflect tierings and level of need Target reduced areas of spend: OA Residential, Nursing, Home care 	£1.6 *	£1.9m *
AWLD – Moving On	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting more young adults in a more independent setting outside of Residential care and supported living by identifying and supporting people to move settings Target reduced areas of spend: AWLD/transitions Residential care & Supported Living 	£2.5	£3.7m
Enablement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals driven independence support for those in the community and being discharged from acutes settings to enable long term independence Target reduced areas of spend: OA Home care 	£3.9	£4.3m
Progression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better matching support to needs using a strength based approach focusing on independence and by reducing the need for formal support over time Target reduced areas of spend: AWLD/transitions Home Care & Supported Living 	£0.6	£1.5m
<p>* The acute homecare opportunity is realised through the utilisation of additional enablement, therefore the current target would double count the benefit. As such, we expect – goal to be delivered through achieving stretch+ performance in either a combination of Residential starts opportunity, and enablement.</p>		£8.6m	£11.5m

£4.3m was taken as a saving in FY 2021/22 and 2022/23 from the ASC budget. By FY 2024/25 the programme should deliver £7.5m and the gap of £1.1m will be delivered in future years. Expected early delivery should enable £1m to be delivered in 23/24 and another £1m in 24/25

Financial Year	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	Total
Diagnostic	£13,387	£1,372,047	£3,565,750	£2,145,926	£848,613	£538,548	£140,717	£16,501	£8,641,488
Current savings profile	£357	£925,122	£4,102,575	£2,513,376	£950,195	£149,863	£0	£0	£8,641,488
Difference	-£13,030	-£446,925	£536,826	£367,450	£101,582	-£388,685	-£140,717	-£16,501	£0

Are there any specific staffing implications?		No		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	£1m	£1m	0	£2m
TOTAL	£1m	£1m	0	£2m
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>Reductions to expenditure are dependent on having sufficient and experienced workforce capacity to undertake the assessments required and to deliver the levels of short-term intervention, such as Enablement, that reduces or delays the costs of longer- term care.</p> <p>Also, to have sufficient in borough facilities that reduce the need for more expensive out of borough placements, particularly for young people with a learning disability, who are transitioning to adult services.</p>				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<p>To mitigate these risks, weekly monitoring of the metrics associated with the workstreams are in place.</p> <p>Escalation governance is established to trouble shoot any barriers that will have a negative impact on progress.</p> <p>New social care reforms such as the Fair cost of care and increases to utility costs may impact on increasing costs of care provision going forward. There is uncertainty as to how much of these increases will be covered by Government funding.</p>	
<p>Are there any specific legal implications?</p>	
<p>To be completed with Legal input.</p>	
<p>Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?</p>	<p>No</p>

5. Impact & Outcomes

<p>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</p>				
<p>Service Users</p> <p>The programme will have a positive impact on outcomes for service users, as it will ensure they are receiving the right level of support. The workstreams in place have a focus on Enablement, Strength based practice, multi-disciplinary working, Support planning that promotes independence and progression for people with a Learning disability or for young people transitioning to adulthood.</p>				
<p>Staff</p> <p>The approach has provided learning & development opportunities for staff as they undertake their respective roles and has strengthened multi-disciplinary approaches.</p>				
<p>Other Council Services</p> <p>There may be a need for more accessible housing options. A forum has been established to deal with any housing referrals.</p>				
<p>Partners</p> <p>The work engages a range of partners from across the health, social care, Mental health, and the voluntary sector as it requires a collaborative approach when supporting individuals.</p>				
<p>Are there any specific equalities implications?</p>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High Positive	Medium (Positive)	Low/ Positive Negative	Neutral
Age				No Impact
Disability			Positive. As approach promotes Increased Independence. However, there could be an Increased risk of complaints if provision is	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

			changed or reduced.	
Ethnicity				No Impact
Gender				No Impact
Gender reassignment				No Impact
Marriage and civil partnerships				No Impact
Pregnancy and maternity				No Impact
Religion and belief				No Impact
Sexual orientation				No Impact
Socio-economic inequality				No Impact
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High Positive /	Medium Positive	Low Positive	Neutral
Open Lewisham				No Impact
Tackling the Housing crisis			As People are supported to remain living at home	
Giving children and young people the best start in life		Young people with a disability supported with care and support as they prepare for adulthood.		
Building an inclusive local economy				No Impact
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support	The approach will ensure that health and social care response is proportionate in how it meets eligible needs			
Making Lewisham greener				No Impact
Building safer communities	Any Safeguarding concerns will be considered as part of the assessment or review process			
Good governance and operational effectiveness	Approach is in accordance with legislation. There			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

	is regular oversight of impact and any delivery risks.			
--	--	--	--	--

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Diagnostic to identify opportunity	Joan Hutton	FY 2021/22
Planning	Financial due diligence	Joan Hutton	FY 2022/23
Implementation	Rollout of trial to test identified opportunity	Joan Hutton / Mary Farinah	FY 2022/23
Review	Develop benefit tracking model	Andrea Benson / Abdul Kayoum	FY 2022/23

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Realign Supported Housing Social Work activity
Reference:	COM_SAV_05_Supported-Housing-Staff
Lead officer:	Joan Hutton / Kenneth Gregory
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	Y

3. Contextual Information
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?
<p>The post of Senior Social Worker (Supported Housing) was established as part of the SLaM community transformation programme with a primary aim of improving flow by facilitating step-down of service-users in the MH supported housing pathway from CMHTs to Primary Care.</p> <p>The key responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintaining regular contact with supported housing providers and attending housing forums carrying out follow-up visits for discharged service-users undertaking safeguarding work undertaking crisis reviews and facilitating rapid transfer back to CMHTs where required supporting move-on to general needs housing safeguarding currently undertaking s.117 reviews for people discharged from CMHTs with a view to discharge <p>The post was established in April 2021, there is little evidence that the role has met its intended goal of increased stepdown due to low demand. The functions of the post could be re-allocated with minimal impact on services.</p>
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	120,500	57,100	63,400
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL	120,500	57,100	63,400

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

PO1 – PO5	1	1		
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

It is proposed that this post is taken out of the establishment. It is not a statutory duty/requirement and could be deleted with minimal impact on the community.

Are there any specific staffing implications? Y

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
TOTAL	£55,000			£55,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N

If yes, please describe impact: Savings

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?

Potential for constructive dismissal/disability discrimination claim by postholder

- Business case based on outcomes data
- Always adhere to policy and manage employee relation issues in partnership with HR

Are there any specific legal implications?

HR consultation procedures will be followed.

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)? No

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Potential negative impact

- Service-users will not have a dedicated worker to help facilitate step-down and to pick up social care duties such a safeguarding.

As set out above these functions could be met by others with minimal impact on service delivery.

Staff

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Redeployment to another suitable social work role within the Adult Social Care Division				
Other Council Services				
Functions can be re-distributed to other Council staff within the integrated AMH service – no wider impact of Council services.				
Partners				
The role is embedded within the SLaM community transformation model.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				
Ethnicity				
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy? Please provide a response for each corporate priority, even if the impact is neutral.				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				No impact
Tackling the Housing crisis				No impact – move-on can be supported by other team members
Giving children and young people the best start in life				No impact
Building an inclusive local economy				No impact

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				No impact – CMHT discharge/Care Act interventions can be supported by other team members
Making Lewisham greener				No impact
Building safer communities				No impact
Good governance and operational effectiveness				No impact

6. Delivery Plan

Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of outcomes data on discharge from CMHTs since 2020 	Evelyn Semple	September 2022
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff consultation Consultation with SLAM partners 	Evelyn Semple	October – December 2022
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	Evelyn Semple	January - March 2023
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Reduction in MH Home Care Panel budget
Reference:	COM_SAV_06_Mental-Health-Homecare
Lead officer:	Joan Hutton / Kenneth Gregory
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>The adult mental health home care panel agrees packages of care for Lewisham residents open to working age SLaM services to enable them to live more independently in their homes.</p> <p>The panel authorises and scrutinises applications for packages of care and reviews to ensure Care Act assessments are strengths-based, access to cost-neutral universal services has been optimised, and the right level of package is in place for the individual.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	120,500	57,100	63,400	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	120,500	57,100	63,400	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	N/A			
Scale 6 – SO2	N/A			
PO1 – PO5	N/A			
PO6 – PO8	N/A			
SMG1 – SMG3	N/A			
JNC	N/A			

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The panel is responsible for ensuring that the right level packages of care in place, and that regular reviews are in place for individuals. A savings target of £50k had been put in place for 2022/23 and is on track to deliver these savings. It is projected on the basis of current demand that with ongoing work to embed strengths-based assessments and robust reviews to eliminate over-provision an additional £50k could be saved from this budget during 2023/24. 				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			No	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
	£50k			£50k
TOTAL	£50k			£50k
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>Risk is that these savings will not be realised as a result of increased demand (number and/or complexity of need) for people requiring packages of care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be mitigated by ensuring regular reviews of people receiving packages of care take place. <p>Risk that robust scrutiny of assessments and reviews may lead to under-provision of services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be mitigated by closer working with providers ensuring rapid review where there is an identified need for increased service provision 				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
None				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			No	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

- Service users will receive packages of care that are tailored to their needs, promote independence and minimise dependence on service
- Service-users will be financially assessed and liable to contribute to the cost of services not eligible for funding under S117

Staff

- Council staff will be subject to robust scrutiny of assessments and reviews required to clearly evidence need and eligibility

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council staff will be required to undertake more regular reviews 				
Other Council Services				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligible WAMH service-users will be able to access Enablement Service to minimise future need 				
Partners				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLaM staff will be subject to robust scrutiny of assessments and reviews required to clearly evidence need and eligibility SLaM staff will be required to undertake more regular reviews 				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				No impact
Disability			Positive – increased independence Negative – increased risk of negative outcomes linked to reduced provision	
Ethnicity				No impact
Gender				No impact
Gender reassignment				No impact
Marriage and civil partnerships				No impact
Pregnancy and maternity				No impact
Religion and belief				No impact
Sexual orientation				No impact
Socio-economic inequality			Negative – increased charging for services	
Is a full EAA required?			N (with Corporate Policy input)	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy? Please provide a response for each corporate priority, even if the impact is neutral.				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				No impact
Tackling the Housing crisis			Positive – supporting residents to remain in their homes	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Giving children and young people the best start in life				No impact
Building an inclusive local economy				No impact
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support			Positive – enhanced quality of assessments	
Making Lewisham greener				No impact
Building safer communities				No impact
Good governance and operational effectiveness		Positive – enhanced accountability through performance monitoring		

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All home care packages of care logged onto LAS 	Evelyn Semple	August 2022
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviews are in place scheduled throughout the year Review of panel processes 	Evelyn Semple	December 2022
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure changes to packages of care are notified to ACT Ensure reviews take place 	Evelyn Semple	April 2023
Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review on a 6 monthly basis 	Evelyn Semple	October 2023

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	NHS Health Checks
Reference:	COM_SAV_09
Lead officer:	Catherine Mbema, Director of Public Health
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and social care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>NHS Health Check programme is provided through the GP federation. The service follows the NHS model and screens the Lewisham registered population aged over 40 years to identify early any long-term conditions such as diabetes or kidney disease.</p> <p>The current provider works with GP's in Lewisham and undertake the health checks on behalf of GP's. No staff are impacted by the proposed cuts as it is more efficient and cost effective than the provider paying GP's to perform health checks.</p> <p>The current provider, when negotiating the extension of this contract for 2021/22, proposed a model to officers which included a greater proportion of direct delivery of health checks by the federation, which allowed a small saving for delivery at the same overall level and more reliably given the challenge in GP services' recovery after COVID. This is the saving being presented</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	17,000	17,800	-800	
HRA				
DSG				
Health	17,000	17,800	-800	
TOTAL	17,000	17,800	-800	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?				
<p>The NHS health checks service is currently being re-procured with a smaller financial envelope, which could impact on the number of health checks undertaken and earlier diagnoses of acute/chronic illnesses.</p> <p>No staff are impacted from the proposed cuts as the current provider submitted two options as part of the authorised extension and are able to deliver the current provisions at approximately £300k as they can deliver health checks at a lower cost than GP's.</p>				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			Y/N (with HR input)	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
NHS Health Checks	15,000			15,000
TOTAL	15,000			15,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	Y
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>The public health grant is already under considerable pressure managing the unknown NHS pay uplifts for several contracts and meeting gaps in funding for initiatives where national contributions have been withdrawn.</p> <p>Risks associated with taking underspends from the budgets above are not catastrophic but relate to the opportunity costs of not taking forward activities in each of the areas identified above. This includes (but is not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failing to improve the provision of services • Increasing demand on additional service areas i.e. wider sexual health services • Not providing ethnically sensitive interventions • Continued increases in the inequalities found between the worst and best off in the borough. • Damaging relationships with partners by withdrawing funding for services • Redundancies and impacts on employment of local residents • 				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
<p>The Health and Social Care Act 2012 (“the Act”) introduced changes by way of a series of amendments to the National Health Service Act 2006. The Act gives local authorities a duty to take such steps as it considers appropriate to improve the health of the people in its area. In general terms, the Act confers on local authorities the function of improving public health and gives local authorities considerable scope to determine what actions it will take in pursuit of that general function.</p> <p>Secondary legislative provision, such as the Local Authorities (Public Health Functions and Entry to Premises by Local Healthwatch Representatives) Regulations 2013 require local authorities to provide certain public health services. The public health services which local authorities must provide are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Child Measurement Programme • Health checks • Open access sexual health services • Public health advice service to Clinical Commissioning Groups 				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?	N
---	---

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Reduction in availability/amount of health checks offered: could exacerbate health inequalities especially residents of non-white heritage and/or those of high risk:

- Lewisham has high premature mortality rates from circulatory diseases compared with London and England and cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a major contributor to the life expectancy gap between Lewisham and England. However, Lewisham has low levels of detected disease.
- Reductions to this programme could impact equity of access across the borough, and improve the reach of the programme and negatively affect outcomes particularly for those at highest risk of heart disease, which includes those from lower socio-economic groups and some Black and Minority Ethnic communities

Staff

No impact

Other Council Services

No impact

Partners

No impact

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age		Negative implications		
Disability			Negative implications	
Ethnicity		Negative implications		
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity			Negative implications	
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation		Negative implications		
Socio-economic inequality		Negative implications		

Is a full EAA required?

Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)

How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham	Negative implications (access to services will be hampered)			
Tackling the Housing crisis				x
Giving children and young people the best start in life				x
Building an inclusive local economy			Negative impact (many of our services employ local residents)	
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support		Negative impact (all cuts to the PH budget will impact on the health of the population long term)		
Making Lewisham greener				x
Building safer communities				x
Good governance and operational effectiveness				x

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	N/A		
Planning	N/A		
Implementation	Procurement of NHS Health Checks programme	Catherine Mbema/Iain McDiarmid	November 2022 – January 2023
Review	Quarterly contract monitoring with provider	Catherine Mbema/Iain McDiarmid	Ongoing

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Sexual and Reproductive Health Services in Primary Care
Reference:	COM_SAV_10
Lead officer:	Catherine Mbema, Director of Public Health
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>Sexual and reproductive health in primary care is currently provided by a combination of GPs, practice nurses and pharmacists. They offer a range of contraceptive advice and interventions including long-acting reversible contraception, condoms and pregnancy tests.</p> <p>Sexual and Reproductive Health Services in Primary Care includes free condoms and pregnancy tests, HIV testing in GP surgeries, GP Long-Acting Reversible Contraception service at Pharmacy Emergency Hormonal Contraception and quick start on the Pill.</p> <p>The proposed cuts will not impact a commissioned service.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	17,000	17,800	(800)	
HRA				
DSG				
Health	17,000	17,800	(800)	
TOTAL	17,000	17,800	(800)	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
This proposal is to reduce the Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH) Service budget by £46k.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

The strategic aim for sexual health services in primary care is to increase and improve access to contraception in primary care. The post pandemic recovery has been slow and this has led to a small underspend in the budget.

To encourage growth, budget had been set aside to support 2 champion roles – a GP and a practice nurse. These have not been appointed to and so would be added to the savings contribution for sexual health.

Lewisham would continue to fund existing levels of GP LARC activity and continue to work with all women across Lewisham to ensure they feel able to access LARC through their GP within their Primary Care Network. We would also seek to increase LARC activity but overall activity across SRH services in Primary Care would be limited to the new reduced budget.

The proposed cut of £30k is from a current underspend position rather than an existing services and the proposed £16k is from a proposed work stream to improve SRH delivery in Primary Care. Whilst there is an opportunity cost in the reduction in any service budget, it will not result in a reduction in the current offer.

Are there any specific staffing implications?	N
--	---

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
--	--	--	--	--

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Primary care sexual health underspend	30,000			30,000
GP champion	10,000			10,000
Practice nurse champion	6,000			6,000
TOTAL	46,000			46,000

% Net Budget				
---------------------	--	--	--	--

Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	Y

If yes, please describe impact:	
--	--

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?
--

Risks

The public health grant is already under considerable pressure managing the unknown NHS pay uplifts for a number of contracts and meeting gaps in funding for initiatives where national contributions have been withdrawn.

Risks associated with taking underspends from the budgets above are not catastrophic, but relate to the opportunity costs of not taking forward activities to help improve service delivery. Reducing budgets makes it difficult to permit innovation in service delivery, which is where future cost savings would be realised. This includes (but is not limited to):

- Failing to improve the provision of services
- Increasing demand on additional service areas i.e. wider sexual health services
- Not providing ethnically sensitive interventions
- Continued increases in the inequalities found between the worst and best off in the borough.
- Damaging relationships with partners by withdrawing funding for services

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redundancies and impacts on employment of local residents 	
Mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sexual Health in Primary Care training for GP and pharmacy to improve awareness and signposting to existing services PCN or GP Federation pilot to increased LARC availability Focussed work by the BAME Health Inequalities Working Group and SH Health Promotion Partnership to reduce inequalities in access, treatment and outcomes for people of Black ethnicity. 	
Are there any specific legal implications?	
<p>The Health and Social Care Act 2012 (“the Act”) introduced changes by way of a series of amendments to the National Health Service Act 2006. The Act gives local authorities a duty to take such steps as it considers appropriate to improve the health of the people in its area. In general terms, the Act confers on local authorities the function of improving public health and gives local authorities considerable scope to determine what actions it will take in pursuit of that general function.</p> <p>Secondary legislative provision, such as the Local Authorities (Public Health Functions and Entry to Premises by Local Healthwatch Representatives) Regulations 2013 require local authorities to provide certain public health services. The public health services which local authorities must provide are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Child Measurement Programme Health checks Open access sexual health services Public health advice service to Clinical Commissioning Groups 	
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?	N

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

LARC prescribing data is a key indicator on the Public Health England Sexual and Reproductive Health national dashboard. Borough-level performance data is publically available.

Reduction in availability of LARC may exacerbate unmet contraceptive need and widen BAME reproductive health inequalities:

- LARC prescribing in Lewisham is lower than the national average and as seen little improvement in the last four years. (46.8 vs 49.5 prescriptions per 1000. PHE 2018) NICE Guidance states that women should have a choice of all contraceptive methods including LARC methods. The 2019 LSL Contraceptive Needs Assessment highlighted a need to increase LARC prescribing in Lewisham in order to comply with NICE guidelines.
- Use of Emergency Hormonal Contraception (EHC – “the morning after pill”) in Lewisham exceeds both the national and London average, as do rates of abortion. One third of abortions in LSL are subsequent abortions. 87.6% of women prescribed EHC have used it before. This data provides strong evidence of unmet contraceptive need in Lewisham.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women of Black ethnicity are the highest users of both EHC and termination services in Lewisham, suggesting particular unmet contraceptive needs in this population. 				
Staff				
No impact				
Other Council Services				
No impact				
Partners				
No impact				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age		Negative implications		
Disability			Negative implications	
Ethnicity		Negative implications		
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity			Negative implications	
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation		Negative implications		
Socio-economic inequality		Negative implications		
Is a full EAA required?			N	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham	Negative implications (access to services will be hampered)			
Tackling the Housing crisis				x
Giving children and young people the best start in life			Negative impact	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Building an inclusive local economy			Negative impact (many of our services employ local residents)	
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support		Negative impact (all cuts to the PH budget will impact on the health of the population long term)		
Making Lewisham greener				x
Building safer communities				x
Good governance and operational effectiveness				x

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	PH Weight management savings
Reference:	COM_SAV_11
Lead officer:	Catherine Mbema, Director of Public Health
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>LBL contracts a number of providers to offer a range of weight management services. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal Tier 2 Weight Management services delivered by WW and slimming world for those in risk groups • a contribution to the NHS for a tier 3 weight management service delivered as part of the ICS commissioned dietetics service. • A targeted pilot offer to residents from Black African and Caribbean who are unrepresented in the universal offer <p>Tier 3 weight management services are the responsibility of integrated care systems. This cut comes from the withdrawal of the Council's contribution to the community dietetics service for the provision of tier 3 weight management.</p> <p>No staff are impacted the proposed cuts as the proposal is form an identified underspend position from the PH contribution.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	17,000	17,800	-800	
HRA				
DSG				
Health	17,000	17,800	-800	
TOTAL	17,000	17,800	-800	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

4. Cuts Proposal				
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?				
<p>This proposal is to reduce the PH weight management programme budget by £13k.</p> <p>In regard to Tier 3 weight management, the reduction in funds will result in a reduction of Lewisham' contribution to the borough's dietetics service run by the ICS.</p> <p>The proposed cuts are from an underspend position.</p>				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			N	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Weight management	13,000			13,000
TOTAL	13,000			13,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	Y
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
Risks				
<p>The public health grant is already under considerable pressure managing the unknown NHS pay uplifts for a number of contracts and meeting gaps in funding for initiatives where national contributions have been withdrawn.</p> <p>Risks associated with taking underspends from the budgets above are not catastrophic but relate to the opportunity costs of not taking forward activities to help improve service delivery. Reducing budgets makes it difficult to permit innovation in service delivery, which is where future cost savings would be realised. This includes (but is not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failing to improve the provision of services • Increasing demand on additional service areas i.e. wider sexual health services • Not providing ethnically sensitive interventions • Continued increases in the inequalities found between the worst and best off in the borough. • Damaging relationships with partners by withdrawing funding for services • Redundancies and impacts on employment of local residents. 				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
<p>The Health and Social Care Act 2012 ("the Act") introduced changes by way of a series of amendments to the National Health Service Act 2006. The Act gives local authorities a duty to take such steps as it considers appropriate to improve the health of the people in its area. In general terms, the Act confers on local authorities the function of improving public health and gives local authorities considerable scope to determine what actions it will take in pursuit of that general function.</p> <p>Secondary legislative provision, such as the Local Authorities (Public Health Functions and Entry to Premises by Local Healthwatch Representatives) Regulations 2013 require local</p>				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

authorities to provide certain public health services. The public health services which local authorities must provide are:

- National Child Measurement Programme
- Health checks
- Open access sexual health services
- Public health advice service to Clinical Commissioning Groups

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?

N

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Reduction in availability of the service provision/support offered: could exacerbate health inequalities especially residents of lower socio-economic backgrounds and/or those of high risk.

- Lewisham has high premature mortality rates from circulatory diseases compared with London and England and cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a major contributor to the life expectancy gap between Lewisham and England. However, Lewisham has low levels of detected disease.
- The Health Profile for Lewisham 2019-20 estimates that 53.6% of Lewisham adults aged 18+) were overweight or obese. The Population Health Management Tool indicates that 51,369, or 16%, of our registered GP population are obese with a BMI over 30.

Estimates indicate that of the nursing/care homes residents comprised of 200 residential elderly frail, 80 residential elderly with dementia, 300 nursing elderly frail and 75 nursing elderly with dementia. The number of patients discharged from secondary care on ONS is approximately 960-1200 patients per year.

Staff

No impact

Other Council Services

No impact

Partners

No impact

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age		Negative implications		
Disability			Negative implications	
Ethnicity		Negative implications		
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity			Negative implications	
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation		Negative implications		
Socio-economic inequality		Negative implications		
Is a full EAA required?			Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham	Negative implications (access to services will be hampered)			
Tackling the Housing crisis				x
Giving children and young people the best start in life			Negative implications	
Building an inclusive local economy			Negative impact (many of our services employ local residents)	
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support		Negative impact (all cuts to the PH budget will impact on the health of the population long term)		
Making Lewisham greener				x
Building safer communities				x
Good governance and operational effectiveness				x

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Review of Elections Budget
Reference:	CEX_SAV_01
Lead officer:	Jeremy Chambers
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Strategy & Finance
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
This is a cost saving from the Elections service budgets.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	560	8	552	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal				
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?				
A detailed and thorough analysis of previous and actual spend within the Elections service budgets has identified that a small permanent reduction in the overall budget of £50k can be made to assist in the delivery of the wider Council savings programme. This will not impact on or reduce the service or its delivery.				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			No	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Budget saving	50			50
TOTAL	50			50
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
There are no risks associated with this proposal, a detailed review of spend and budget provides confidence that the £50k reduction will not affect service delivery.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
No				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			No	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

There will be no impact.

Staff

There will be no impact.

Other Council Services

There will be no impact.

Partners

There will be no impact.

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality			Positive	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council’s Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness			Positive	

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Invest in Legal Service to reduce external legal costs
Reference:	CEX_SAV_03_Legal-Invest-To-Save
Lead officer:	Jeremy Chambers
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Strategy & Finance
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	Y

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
An investment in the legal team will reduce the spend by other services on external legal support.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	2,241	312	1,929	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal	
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?	
By increasing the capacity within the in-house legal service expenditure on outsourced legal support for services can be reduced, resulting in a net saving for the Council as a whole. The cost of the investment to increase the in-house capacity is estimated to be £256k, with expected savings of £580k from external counsel and legal support.	
Are there any specific staffing implications?	N
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Legal invest to save	234			234
TOTAL	234			234
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
The risk is that the saving is not delivered in full, or that there is a potential double count between other services looking to reduce their external legal spend.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
No				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

No impact on service users.

Staff

This is an increase in staffing levels and staff will be consulted where this is required under the current HR policies.

Other Council Services

The saving on external legal spend will be realised in other service budgets, mainly CYP.

Partners

No impact on partners.

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness	X positive			X

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Employer Pension Contribution Cost Saving
Reference:	COR_SAV_01_Corporate-Budget-Pensions
Lead officer:	Director of Finance
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Finance and Strategy
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>Following the Pension Fund tri-ennial valuation, which is expected to conclude in December 2022, there may be the opportunity to reduce the Council's employer contribution rate. A 0.5% reduction would reduce the costs to the Council by approximately £0.5m. The opportunity to do this comes from the performance of the funds invested in recent years.</p> <p>No services are affected by this proposal; however all service staffing budgets will be reduced as they will no longer need to meet the higher contribution cost.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	25,000,000	(25,000,000)	0	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	25,000,000	(25,000,000)	0	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
Following the Pension Fund tri-ennial valuation which is expected to conclude in December 2022, there may be the opportunity to reduce the Council's employer contribution rate.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<p>The current employer pension contribution rate is calculated at 22.5%. A 0.5% reduction would reduce the costs to the Council by approximately £0.5m. The opportunity to do this comes from the performance of the funds invested in recent years.</p> <p>There will be NO impact on employee benefits and it's an officer decision based on professional advice of its actuaries, based on the fund's performance</p> <p>No services are affected by this proposal; however, all service staffing budgets will be reduced as they will no longer need to meet the higher contribution cost.</p>				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			No	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Change to pension contributions	500	0	0	500
TOTAL	500	0	0	500
% Net Budget	0.002%			0.002%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:	Service budgets for staffing costs will be reduced in line with the reduced contribution being made to the Pension Fund.			
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>There are two main risks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results of the valuation are not yet formerly known and there are a number of variables the s151 officer first needs to consider before deciding whether this reduction in employer contribution rate can be made. 2. The pension fund performance can vary over time impacting the funding levels needed to meet liabilities. This is assessed every three years and if at the next or future valuation higher contributions are needed this will create a pressure. 				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
No				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

None

Staff

None

Other Council Services

None

Partners

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

None				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			P	
Disability			P	
Ethnicity			P	
Gender			P	
Gender reassignment			P	
Marriage and civil partnerships			P	
Pregnancy and maternity			P	
Religion and belief			P	
Sexual orientation			P	
Socio-economic inequality			P	
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness	positive			

6. Delivery Plan

Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	This saving will be delivered through	Director of Finance	In line with existing Pension Fund
Planning			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Implementation	<p>existing Pension Fund management arrangements. The proposal is possible due to better returns achieved by the fund. However these can fall as well as rise in the future and may require this saving to be undone.</p>		<p>management arrangements as performed by the finance service.</p>
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Treasury Management Efficiency
Reference:	COR_SAV_02_Corporate-Budget-Interest
Lead officer:	Director of Finance
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Finance and Strategy
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>This proposal is to increase the income budget by an additional £2m for the interest that the Council earns from the investment of its working capital cash balances held to fund service activities.</p> <p>This is possible due to the recent increase in interest rates and the continued levels of working capital cash balances held. No services are affected by this proposal.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	0	2,420	2,420	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	0	2,420	2,420	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
<p>This proposal is to increase the income budget by an additional £2m for the interest that the Council earns on investing its working capital cash balances held to fund its activities.</p> <p>This is possible due to the increase in interest rates paid on investments in the market and the continued levels of working capital cash balances held. The current budget of £2.42m will be increased by a further £2m.</p>

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

No services are affected by this proposal.				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			No	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Additional interest earned	2,000,000	0	0	2,000,000
TOTAL	2,000,000	0	0	2,000,000
% Net Budget	82%			82%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:	This increases the income available to fund services by £2m.			
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>The key risks are that interest rates fall again or that the Council does not hold sufficient working capital cash balances necessary to generate the additional £2m of investment income.</p> <p>There is no mitigation for the Council other than managing its treasury function in line with its agreed Treasury Management Strategy. If this increase in investment income is at risk in the future this will be managed within the Medium Term Financial Strategy Assumptions.</p>				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
No, the Treasury Management Strategy (TMS) is set within the parameters of the Local Government Finance Act and CIPFA regulations and agreed by full Council. The TMS allows for this increase to be generated provided interest rates and cash balances continue as forecast by the treasury service.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

None

Staff

None

Other Council Services

None

Partners

None

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			P	
Disability			P	
Ethnicity			P	
Gender			P	
Gender reassignment			P	
Marriage and civil partnerships			P	
Pregnancy and maternity			P	
Religion and belief			P	
Sexual orientation			P	
Socio-economic inequality			P	
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				x
Tackling the Housing crisis				x
Giving children and young people the best start in life				x
Building an inclusive local economy				x
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				x
Making Lewisham greener				x
Building safer communities				x
Good governance and operational effectiveness	positive			

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	This saving will be delivered through the existing TMS, approved by Full Council and reviewed	Director of Finance	In line with daily treasury activities conducted by the finance service.
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

	annually. The proposal is possible due to better investment returns being available in the market following the rise in interest rates.		
--	---	--	--

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Reduction in the Utilities Costs of the Catford Complex by reducing the opening hours of Laurence House and closed control of utilities at the Civic Suite
Reference:	COR_SAV_03_Catford-Complex-Facilities
Lead officer:	Maxine Gordon
Ward/s affected	Cllr De Ryk
Cabinet portfolio	Finance and Strategy
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	Y

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>The proposed cuts relate to Laurence House and the Civic Suite. These are buildings in the Catford Complex and Facilities Management manage these buildings. All service areas currently have access to both buildings.</p> <p>Laurence House is the main council building for Lewisham Council. Pre-covid most services worked from this building on floors 1 through 4 with Lewisham Homes occupying the 5th Floor. The building occupancy is at its greatest during the hours of 8am to 6pm with a small number of staff using the building on Saturday mornings. From 1st September office based staff have been asked to reoccupy the building for a minimum of 2 days (40%) a week.</p> <p>The Civic Suite is mostly used for committee meetings but is also used by staff for large group meetings. It is not used all day every day at present but despite these utilities are kept running every day.</p> <p>To implement this change, a recommendation in the relevant report (which is prepared for Mayor and Cabinet in November) will be required and an acceptance of the recommendation in the Council Budget setting meeting in March.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	5,208	230	4,978	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal				
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?				
We currently use Smart Sec Security at both sites, we anticipate a reduction of one guard at Laurence House if this change is implemented. Staff that use Laurence House would have to be notified of the pending change prior to the change being implemented, we will also review the staffing arrangements at Civic Suite and make changes accordingly.				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			N	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Laurence House	121,000			121,000
Civic Suite	29,000			29,000
TOTAL	150,000			150,000
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
N/A				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
N/A				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N	

5. Impact & Outcomes	
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?	
Service Users	
The cuts proposed do not affect service users because it relates to reducing the opening hours of the buildings to staff.	
Staff	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposal relates to reducing the opening hours of Laurence House on weekdays from 10pm to 8pm. Current footfall for this period is quite low. In doing so, savings are achieved in terms of utilities (lighting, heating /AC) but also security personnel. ii. The proposal also relates to better controlling the utilities for the Civic Suite to the periods when it is open only. 	
Other Council Services	

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

No service impact				
Partners				
No service impact				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				
Is a full EAA required?			Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X
Good governance and operational effectiveness		X		

6. Delivery Plan

Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
------------	-----------	--------------	------------

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

<p>Initiation</p>	<p>Laurence House – gather footfall details and finalise savings</p> <p>Obtain more detailed data for the Civic Suite - future hours opening against current daily plant running</p>	<p>Brian Colyer</p>	<p>October 2022</p>
<p>Planning</p>	<p>Notify service areas of proposed changes</p> <p>Notify Smart Sec or proposed changes</p>	<p>Brian Colyer / Maxine Gordon</p>	<p>November 2022</p>
<p>Implementation</p>	<p>Adjust access control in time for go live</p>	<p>Brian Colyer</p>	<p>1st December 2022</p>
<p>Review</p>	<p>Post go live follow up survey for Laurence House users</p> <p>Review impact of close control of utilities at Civic Suite</p>	<p>Brian Colyer</p>	<p>April 2023</p>

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Non award of £2m of unfunded salary inflation
Reference:	ALL_SAV_01_Staff-Pay-Award
Lead officer:	Executive Management Team
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Finance and Strategy
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
This proposal impacts every service in the Council with staffing budgets.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	137,208		137,208	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	137,208		137,208	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	612	556	608	
Scale 6 – SO2	585	575	agency	
PO1 – PO5	778	759	staff	
PO6 – PO8	249	248	across	
SMG1 – SMG3	104	105	the	
JNC	25	25	grades	

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
<p>The 2022/23 budget contained provision for £2.8m of salary inflation, which allowed for an award of 2% for all staff. Whilst the pay award for most staff (up to SMG3 level) is not yet agreed, the current proposal is for a flat award of £2,355 per person, which equates to an average circa 6.2% increase. If agreed this will result in an additional £4.5m of budget pressure in 2023/34 – to meet the total cost of £7.3m.</p> <p>It is proposed that £2m of this inflation (1.45% of total salary budgets) is not funded in the Budget. This will require each service to absorb their proportion of this via locally</p>

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

determined measures, such as vacancy factors, reduced use of agency / consultancy support, or any other budget reduction measures as required to ensure that salary budgets are not overspent in 2023/24.				
Are there any specific staffing implications?			No	
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Unfunded salary inflation	2,000,000	0	0	2,000,000
TOTAL	2,000,000	0	0	2,000,000
% Net Budget	1.45%			1.45%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>The key risks are that services fail to identify and implement tangible proposals to deliver the relative proportion allocated of the £2m, leading to overspends in 2023/24.</p> <p>This will be mitigated in part through engagement with budget holders for the detailed budget loading exercise to ensure that the savings are taken from the most appropriate budgets, and which correspond to identified measures to ensure that the staffing spend remains on budget.</p>				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
No.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

It is not expected that this saving will result in significant changes to service delivery or impact to service users.

Staff

It is possible that there may be an impact for staff, whilst it is not intended that there be a reduction in overall staffing numbers, services may look to streamline services and thus reduce the total staffing cohort over time - e.g. through extended vacancy factors.

Other Council Services

As individual services identify and implement savings measures to ensure that they can absorb their proportion of the £2m cut it is possible that there may be impacts on the interfaces between services that will require reconciling to ensure that there is no cost shunt.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Partners				
It is not expected that a saving of circa 1.4% of the total salary budget will impact on partners.				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X
Making Lewisham greener				X
Building safer communities				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Good governance and operational effectiveness			P	
--	--	--	---	--

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Proposal	Dir. of Finance	Dec 22
Planning	Setting cash limits		Mar 23
Implementation	Budget holders sign for their 23/24 budgets		Apr 23
Review	Finance monitoring		Through 23/24

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Senior Management Reductions, Realignments and Restructures
Reference:	ALL_SAV_02
Lead officer:	Kim Wright
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care, Finance and Strategy, Environment and Climate Action, Culture and Leisure
Scrutiny committee/s	

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	Y

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
The following Directorates are directly impacted by this proposal: the Chief Executives, Community Services, and Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund				
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL				
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
A review of senior management posts has been undertaken across the Directorates and the Chief Executive, Community Services, and Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm directorates have identified opportunities to reconfigure reporting lines to streamline certain services and reduce the senior management structure without affecting front line

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

service delivery. Where possible, and where they exist, vacant posts will be deleted in the first instance in order to minimise redundancies and the associated costs. However, the risk of some redundancies cannot be ruled out. Consultation with those staff affected in the Chief Executive's and Community Services Directorate is either just about to start or due to start shortly so it is not possible to list the posts confirmed for change yet as it will not conclude until later in November/December. Confirmed vacant posts identified for deletion are:

- Director of Culture, Learning and Libraries JNC3 – Community Services
- Head of Safeguarding & Quality, Adult Social Care SMG2 - Community Services
- Director of Integrated Care & Commissioning (part funded) JNC2 – Community Services
- Head of Strategic Transport SMG2 – Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm.

Are there any specific staffing implications?

Y

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
Senior staff reduction	500			500
TOTAL	500			500
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N

If yes, please describe impact:

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?

Several senior team structures and roles are being reviewed to ensure that the reasons for and impact of removing and reshaping roles is clearly understood and that service delivery can be maintained at adequate quality and assurance levels.

Are there any specific legal implications?

No

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?

N

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

As this is a senior management reduction there will be no direct impact on external service users or residents.

Staff

The re-organisation will be undertaken in line with current employment policies and processes, including proper and full consultation where required. If there are any redundancies, existing policies will be followed to seek redeployment opportunities for any individuals affected in the first instance.

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Other Council Services				
Whilst the affected roles and services do interface with other Council services, the changes are such that there will be no unintended 'shunt' of responsibility to services.				
Partners				
Whilst the affected roles and services do interface with some Council Partners, the changes are such that there will be no unintended 'shunt' of responsibility nor adverse impact on Partners.				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				X

Appendix 3 – Budget Reduction Proposals – Officers – 2023/24

Making Lewisham greener				x
Building safer communities				x
Good governance and operational effectiveness		Positive		

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation			
Planning			
Implementation			
Review			