LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – OCTOBER 2014

APPENDIX 1 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY

Contents page

Appendix 1 Section A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health 85

A1: Cost effective care packages 85

A2: Reduction in cost of Learning Disability provision 89

A3: Changes to sensory services provision 94

A4: Remodelling building based day services 98

A5: Charging for Adult Social Care services 102

A6: Public Health programme review (I) 105

A7: Cost effective care for Mental Health 111

A8: Public Health programme review (II) 115

A9: Review of services to support people to live at home 122

A10: Proposal in respect of recouping health costs 126

Appendix 1 Section B - Supporting People 130

B1: Reduction & remodelling of Supporting People housing & floating support services 130

Appendix 1 Section C - Shared Services

Appendix 1 Section D - Efficiency Review

Appendix 1 Section E - Asset Rationalisation 137

E1: Re-organisation of Regeneration & Asset Management division 137

E2: Optimisation of operational estate 140

E3: Creating income from asset portfolio 144

E4: Improving rent collection for commercial assets 148

E5: Energy efficient measures 152

Appendix 1 Section F – Corporate & Business Support Services 156

F1: Centralisation of business support services 156

Appendix 1 Section G – Income Generation 160

G1: Increasing income from services to schools, debt collection & investment strategy 160

Appendix 1 Section H – Enforcement & Regulation 165

H1: Restructuring of enforcement & regulatory services 165

Appendix 1 Section I – Corporate and Management Overheads 169

I1: Reduction in corporate management and professional support services 169

Appendix 1 Section J – Schools Effectiveness 177

J1: Increasing income from Educational Psychologists and Learning Difficulties teams 177

Appendix 1 Section K – Crime Reduction 181

K1: Retendering & targeted reduction in Drug & Alcohol services 181

K2: YOS reorganisation, changes in interventions & reduction in contracts 185

K3: Reduction in funding for Integrated Offender Management service 189

Appendix 1 Section L – Culture & Community Services 193

L1: Review of main voluntary & community service grants programme 193

L2: Libraries staff reorganisation 197

Appendix 1 Section M – Housing & non-HRA funded services 200

M1: Transfer of non housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund 200

Appendix 1 Section N – Environmental Services 204

N1: Reduction in maintenance of some small parts, highways & reduced management 204

N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequency & management costs 207

Appendix 1 Section O – Public Services 210

O1: End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme 210

O2: Reduction in staffing for parking contract client team 214

O3: Set up an internal 'enforcement agency' to collect Council Tax & other debts 217

Appendix 1 Section P – Planning Service 220

P1: Restructure of the planning service 220

Appendix 1 Section Q – Safeguarding & Early Intervention Services 224

Q1: Improve triage for Children's Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer 224

Q1 – supplementary - Improve triage for Children's Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer 230

Q2: Reduction in Youth Service provision 233

Appendix 1 Section R - Customer Transformation

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

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

A1: Cost effective care packages

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

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal
Both the assessment of need and a more creative and flexible approach to support planning and the use of resources will be consistently applied across all client groups. This will ensure that new and ongoing packages of care which are provided to adults to meet their needs are done so in a more cost effective way. The laundry service contract is coming to an end. This is a discretionary service provided where we are putting in domestic care services. The proposal is not to renew this contract and to meet this need in a more cost effective way by using personal budgets/direct payments to pay for the domestic care worker to use the person's own washing machine or launderette facilities, that most people are able to access. The Meals on Wheels contract will not be renewed and individuals in receipt of this service will be offered alternative options for the provision of a meal. For example, arranging for them to access supermarket home delivery services using personal budgets.
Saving proposal description
During an assessment or review, all packages of care will be reviewed to ensure that they continue to meet eligible needs and support plans identify the most creative, flexible and cost effective way of meeting those needs. This will include taking account of personal assets and the contributions an individual can make to ensure their needs are met. In addition, the service will continue to encourage more people to take up the use of direct payments and use that funding to procure their own support and care.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Where a person's needs no longer meet the eligibility criteria, or where it has been identified that the need could be met in a way that does not require the Council to procure a service to meet that need, following an assessment or review, eligible needs may be met in a different and cheaper way. This means that for some people a service that they were receiving may change or be discontinued or that an alternative provision to the one they had been receiving be introduced. However the support plan will ensure that their eligible needs are still met. Staff who develop and monitor support plans will work with the individual user to explore community and voluntary options that could be used to meet their needs. We will continue to work with the community and voluntary sector to identify gaps in the current market and help them to develop their offer. We will continue to encourage people to help themselves by promoting access to universal services. There will be no impact on staff from this proposal.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Service users will have choice and control in the development of their support plans to meet their eligible needs within their personal budget. However any change to a package of care following an assessment or review, may cause stress to the service user. However eligible users will continue to receive support from care management staff and will be supported to make the transition to their new plan. In addition, we will continue to work with Services Users and their Carers to give appropriate advice and information on universal/community options. Assessing staff will ensure that people have received up-to-date benefits checks. Commissioners will work with the local market providers to develop new services. Whilst Direct Payments are steadily increasing, we need to continue with increasing the number of Personal Assistants to work with users in Lewisham. A personal assistant can be employed directly by the service user and provide them with flexibility and choice over the services they receive.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

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

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?		No

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

A2: Reduction in cost of Learning Disability provision

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
This service provides support to residents with a learning disability who meet FACs eligibility criteria.
Saving proposal description
Proposal 1 This proposal is to save £900K through a negotiated reduction in placement costs. There are 300 plus service users with a learning disability who require 24 hour care either in residential care settings or in supported living accommodation. At present, this high level of care is costed on the basis of a significant level of 1:1 care. We have estimated that this proposal will affect the care costs of 70 people in this group. (i) Some pilot work has demonstrated that the needs of some individuals do not need to be met on a 1:1 basis throughout the 24 hours. The pilot has shown that revised support plans can provide periods where staff support can be shared by increasing the number of group activities that service users can participate in. (ii) In addition, some savings are also being identified through challenging the level of provider corporate overheads and fixed costs. **Proposal 2** This proposal is to save £500K by appropriately transferring the responsibility for some service users care management and funding responsibility to other health and social care systems. This transfer will save the whole of the current cost of service (i) There are 15 service users who have been living in other geographical areas for a considerable length of time who are now settled with a tenancy, and have capacity to choose where they live. The costs of their care will therefore be appropriately transferred to the relevant host borough. (ii) In addition, there are 6 people who officers believe are now eligible for fully health funded care. The costs of their care and case management will be transferred to the appropriate host Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). (iii) Officers are reviewing the needs of older adults with a learning disability to ensure that they are offered the opportunity to benefit from the development of the extra care housing the Council is investing in, and for the appropriate residential and nursing care services.

3. Description of service and proposal
Proposal 3 This proposal is to generate income of £100K by extending the charging policy to users of the in borough supported living service. Historically, some of these services were funded through Health as part of the long stay hospital closure programme and were therefore outside of local authority charging policies. Local authorities are now responsible for this provision and therefore the Lewisham charging policy needs to be equitably applied. This will affect 150 people.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Proposal 1 There will be a reduction in the level of 1:1 support for some individuals. However, there may also be an increase in the number and type of shared activities that people will have an opportunity to participate in. **Proposal 2** (i) Some families may be concerned about the transfer of care management and funding responsibility to another authority/ CCG (ii) Some families may be concerned that extra care housing services may not fully meet the needs of their family member. **Proposal 3** Service users directly affected will potentially experience a reduction in the amount of disposable income that people have available to spend.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
The level of savings in the learning disability service assumes that there are no unknown demands on the overall learning disability service. The majority of demand on the learning disability service comes through transition from children to adult services. Adult services are working with colleagues in the Children and Young People's Directorate to understand these costs and proactively plan to meet the needs in the most cost effective way. These proposals are based on some intensive assessment and reviews of individual care packages, managing the financial assessment process, and carrying out the financial negotiations with providers . Community services is looking with other Council colleagues, at configuring the capacity of the workforce to ensure that this can be managed. **Proposal 1** relates to direct negotiations with providers about service design and how needs will be met differently. An external organisation with in-depth knowledge of costs paid by other councils has been recruited to help sustain focus on fee negotiations with out of borough providers. The authority will also work in collaboratively with providers to ensure that they do not threaten eviction as part of this saving. We already have a strong partnership with local providers who have signalled that they will be able to deliver the savings identified. As a Council we have responsibility for managing and developing the market, and in this role we will work with local provider, the majority of which are SMEs (small medium enterprises) to support their stability. In the rare case where it is not possible for the service user to remain where they are, it may be necessary to identify alternative provision. We have a number of provider partners who will help us manage this with sensitivity and support the service user and their family to visit alternatives and offer support with the move itself. Service users and their families may well feel concerned about the change in management responsibility in **Proposal 2. W**e will work in partnership with them through the different parts of the process. **Proposal 3** will require formal consultation with those individuals affected by the extension of the charging policy. The authority will ensure that advocacy support is available for all affected individuals.

4. Impact of proposal
Each proposal carries its own specific risk as outlined above. There is, however, a potential for some service users to be affected by more than one of the savings proposals. This impact will need to be identified as part of the review of each service user's care needs. With a significant savings target that relates to direct service provision, there is always the potential for savings to be perceived as a reduction in service quality and choice. It is essential, therefore, that the care assessment and review process fully engages service users and their families to ensure that their concerns are addressed.

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:		Medium	
Gender:		Medium	
Age:	High		
Disability:	High		
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/ Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/ Neutral
Sexual Orientation:			Low/ Neutral
Gender reassignment			Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
The savings relate to one specific group of people with disabilities, people with a learning disability. There is no specific mitigating steps that can be taken on this point.			

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:
Because of the demographic nature of the group, there is a specific impact on older adults and also younger adults People with complex learning and multiple other disabilities will feature as among some of the highest cost packages. The savings negotiations will ensure that complex needs are fully considered and that providers can evidence how service users needs can be met. The pathway design for older people with a learning disability includes consideration of generic extra care housing as well as appropriate residential and nursing homes for older people. Responding to the needs of older people with a learning disability is an expanding and relatively new area of work. Their level of daily living skills can deteriorate earlier and faster than the general population and, therefore, this needs to be considered in the review of their care needs. The local services into which young people in transition may move, if not handled well, could potentially result in a focus on their maintenance and safety needs, rather than a full focus on maximising their daily living and independence skills. Adult services are working in partnership with CYP to use the total resources available to deliver a more coherent approach to transition planning so that there is a careful balance between the quality of provision and the pricing of provision. This includes representation from families, through the SEND (Special Educational Needs) Implementation Board. The young people in transition most likely to be affected by these savings proposals are young men from African and African-Caribbean backgrounds. Of the older adults likely to be affected by the savings, the majority are likely to be white British.

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
There is an absolute duty upon Local Authorities to assess individuals for possible care and support needs. However, Local Authorities do have a high level of discretion as to how to meet assessed eligible needs, both in the application of approved eligible needs criteria and in terms of the reasonable application of resources. They can charge for social care services. However, on an individual basis, no service user may have their care package altered without a further assessment of need. Statutory consultation is required in relation to Proposal 3 relating to charging.

Is staff consultation required (Y/N)	No	**Is public consultation required (Y/N)?**	Yes for proposal 3

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

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

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

A3: Changes to sensory services provision

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16	**2016/17:**	**2017/18**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18**
150	0	0	150

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	No	**HRA**	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

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

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

4. Impact of proposal
change so there is confidence in new service delivery models. The opportunity to develop new approaches with other boroughs, voluntary/private sector partnering will be based on new outcome focused specification co-produced by service users.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Market testing has taken place and tendering will be required to support some externalisation. The service will then be able to demonstrate evidence of a " person centred approach " that promotes choice and control for service users. The service will actively promote service user involvement in service development.

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:			Low/ Neutral
Gender:		Medium	
Age:		Medium	

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	YES			

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

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

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

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

7. Human Resources							
Vacant**				1	1		
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:** 1		**Male:** 1	
Ethnicity:	**BME:** 1	**White:** **X**	**Other:** 1	**Not Known:** 3
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:** N/K		**Not Known:** N/K	

A4: Remodelling building based day services

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal

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

A review of all in house service provision is required to meet statutory requirements to increase the use of direct payments and develop the external market, as council provided services cannot be purchased via a Direct payment.

Day centre provision is often used to meet the needs of vulnerable people who are at risk of isolation, to develop life skills and to provide meaningful activities. There are four centres within the borough, provided by in-house services. They are the Leemore centre, Narborhood Centre, Ladywell and Mulberry.

Additional services have been developed within the external provider market and with the voluntary sector. This proposal is to remodel the in-house service so that opportunities are offered to customers in smaller community based groups. As outlined in other proposals, service users will be actively encouraged to make greater use of existing community, leisure and educational facilities and social venues in and outside of the borough. Partnership work with external providers will be further developed to make more creative use of centres and reduce the need for the existing number. In addition, the equitable application of resources through the use of the Resource Allocation System is expected to reduce the demand for in house day services.

The new model for day opportunities will need to ensure that there continues to be facilities that can provide support to carers, particularly for service users who have high dependency needs.

It is anticipated that the promotion of self directed support, travel and life skill training will reduce the reliance on in house transport for some individuals, particularly those currently being transported to in house day services.

There will need to be a joint approach with customer services to reduce the adult social care expenditure on transport service which is currently £3m. We are projecting a substantial saving, further financial modelling will be required to quantify this saving exactly.

Saving proposal description

3. Description of service and proposal
The proposal is to consolidate the use of the building based day centres and to release some of the associated transport costs. Support plans for existing Service users will consider a wider range of options to meet their needs thereby giving them more choice and control. . A review of staffing will be undertaken to reduce expenditure as day service provision is consolidated and transport requirements are reduced.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Consultation will be required with staff, service users and carers. The service has high numbers of agency workers which will be reduced. Changes to service users' support plans will only take place once a statutory review of needs is undertaken . Reducing the need for transport to in house day services will need a joint approach with Customer Services as there is likely to be an impact on the Council's D2D services. Service users and carers will need to be engaged and consulted on any changes to the way their assessed needs are met. An EAA will need to be completed to look at the impact of changes on Service Users and staff.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Consultation will be needed with both Services Users carers and Staff. Consultation may need to be extensive and all actions may not be completed by end March 2014. Market testing has taken place and tendering will be required to support externalisation of some service provision.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
Changes to service users' support plans will only take place once a statutory review of needs is undertaken**.** EAA assessments will be required. Changes to transport services will require consultation. In relation to any potential reorganisation of staff, the general employment legal implications will apply and the Council's Management of Change Guidelines. A full Report will be required.

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

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

7. Human Resources							
						SMG3	
FTE	0.76	35.87	1	10.85	1	0	0
Head Count	1	42	1	11	1	0	0
Vacant*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vacant**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vacant***	N/A	covered by agency FTE: 40.59 HEADCOUNT: 44	N/A	Vacant post not covered by agency FTE: 1.5	N/A	N/A	N/A

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female: 34**		**Male: 20**	
Ethnicity:	**BME: 19**	**White: 31**	**Other: 2**	**Not Known: 2**
Disability:	**6**			
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known: 15**		**Not Known: 39**	

A5: Charging for Adult Social Care services

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal

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

The Council provides a range of services to adults with social care needs.

The council has a discretionary power to levy charges (or contributions) towards the costs of Adult Non-Residential Care services, such as home care and day care. Charges for adult social care must be in line with the Government's "Fair Access to Care Service" national guidance.

Saving proposal description

Subject to the Mayor's agreement, officers propose to consult on a number of proposals to increase changes for non-residential adult social care. These proposals include:

- Reducing the current income support buffer from 35% to 25%. Government guidance ensures that charges do not reduce any user's income below basic Income Support levels or the Guarantee Credit element of Pension Credit plus a buffer of 25% and Lewisham is unusual in allowing a higher income buffer (35%). We will consult on reducing this to 25% with an estimated increase in income in 2015/16 of £200k. This will bring an estimated 300 service users into charging.
- Removing the maximum charge for non-residential services (currently £500 p.w.). This will affect approx 20 service users and will generate additional income of approx £75k p.a.
- Removing any exceptions from charging which are discretionary such as respite and services in supported accommodation.

We will also consult known self funders over the introduction of a charge for administration of the Care Account, which is a new requirement of the Care Act.

4. Impact of proposal

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

If, following consultation, the proposed amendments to the charging policy are agreed, the changes will affect any

4. Impact of proposal
service user who, in line with the amended charging policy, is deemed to have the financial means to contribute to the cost of their care.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
If, following consultation, changes to the charging policy are agreed, each service users must be reassessed against the new thresholds before the increased charges can be applied.

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:			Low/ Neutral
Gender:	High		
Age:	High		
Disability:	High		
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/ Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/ Neutral
Sexual Orientation:			Low/ Neutral
Gender reassignment			Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
The users of these services are vulnerable adults, usually on low incomes. Any increase in charges will reduce the disposable income of some clients although the buffer of 25% will continue to provide a level of protection to those on the lowest incomes.			

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

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

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:**		**Male:**	
Ethnicity:	**BME:**	**White:**	**Other:**	**Not Known:**
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:**	

A6: Public Health programme review (I)

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

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal		
Programme Area	**Saving**	**Savings Proposal**
Sexual Health	£275,600	1. Re-negotiation of costs for Sexually Transmitted Infection testing with Lewisham and Greenwich Trust (LGT) 2. Application of 1.5% deflator to the contract value with LGT as efficiency saving 3. Reduction of 30% in the sexual health promotion budget
NHS Health checks	£117,800	1. Removing Health checks facilitator post 2. Pre- diabetes intervention will not be rolled out 3. Reduced budget for blood tests due to lower take up for health checks than previously assumed 4. Reducing GP advisor time to the programme
Health Protection	£12,500	Stopping recall letter for childhood immunisations
Maternal and Child Health	£30,000	1. Reducing sessional funding commitment for Designated Consultant for Child Death Review 2. Removal of budget for school nursing input into TNG
Public health advice	£19,200	1. Decommissioning diabetes and cancer GP champion posts.
Obesity/Physical Activity	£92,400	1. Decommission Hoops4health (£27,400) 2. Changing delivery of Let's Get Moving GP & Community physical activity training (£5,000) 3. Cardiac rehab exercise instructors (£10,000) 4. Decommission Physical Activity in Primary Schools (£50,000)
Smoking and Tobacco Control	£20,000	Decommission Cut Films work in schools with young people to prevent uptake of smoking
Dental Public Health	£24,500	Saving based on underspend
Mental Health/Wellbeing	£25,000	1. Decommissioning project to support people with Mental health problems to access CEL courses 2. Withdraw funding for clinical input to Sydenham Gardens
Health improvement training Programme/ library service	£38,000	1. Decommission Health Promotion library service 2. Reduce budget for health improvement training
Health Inequalities	£266,500	1. Reconfiguring Health Access services to deliver efficiencies (£21,500) 2. Remove separate public health funding stream to VAL (£28,000) 3. Decommissioning Vietnamese Health Project (£29,000) 4. Reducing funding for Area Based Programmes (£40,000) 5. Decommissioning CAB Money Advice in 12 GP surgeries (£148,000)
TOTAL	**£921,500**	
Uplift	**£547,000**	This money has not been allocated to programmes in anticipation of required savings.
Unallocated	**£31,500**	
Final Total	**£1,500,000**	

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Sexual Health: there is a risk that the reduction in contract value for sexual health, and review of lab screening costs

4. Impact of proposal
will make it difficult for the current provider to maintain the level of access for sexual health services. However, it is anticipated that new ways of delivering the services for example through online testing could help to deliver these savings. There is reasonable evidence that current charges for laboratory activity do not reflect changes in contracting arrangements and should be reduced. On this basis it is anticipated that the impact of the saving proposed on service delivery will be minimal. **NHS Health checks Programme**: the indicative saving from this programme comes from not implementing the roll out of an intervention for people identified as "pre-diabetic" as part of the NHS Health check programme. Current levels of uptake for Health checks require a smaller budget than previously assumed. The NHS Health check facilitator role has been removed and the GP support to the programme could be reduced to make the proposed saving with minimal impact on the programme. **Health Protection:** it is likely that stopping the sending of reminders for childhood immunisations centrally will have a minimal impact as GPs also tend to contact parents to remind them about immunisations. **Maternal and Child Health :** The work of the Designated Consultant for Child Death Review is currently being considered; there is clear scope for a reduction of the funding of this post of about one third as the sessional commitment is lower than is currently being paid for. School Nursing input to TNG (youth provision in Sydenham) will be considered within the priorities for the whole of the School Age Nursing Service contract, and will not be funded separately in future. **Public Health Advice:** The advice provided by GPs to Public health for diabetes and cancer has been proposed as a saving. GPs are paid for this support on a sessional basis and not employed by public health. The cancer post has already been decommissioned as the post holder has moved. There has been a discussion with the CCG regarding them picking up the funding for the diabetes post. **Obesity/ physical activity:** Two physical activity programmes commissioned by public health for delivery in schools are being decommissioned (Hoops4Health from 2015/16) and Fitness for Life (decommissioned from 2014/15). Schools now have access to a physical activity premium and it is anticipated that they will continue to commission these programmes directly using the premium. Fifteen schools have already opted to do this (there were 5 in the Fitness for Life pilot). A reconfiguration of the Let's Get moving programme and community physical activity will release an efficiency saving of £5,000. The cost of cardiac rehabilitation previously identified separately is covered by the community services contract with Lewisham and Greenwich Trust so this budget is not required. **Smoking and Tobacco Control**: Reducing the budget for working with young people and raising the awareness of the risks of smoking may impact negatively on the prevalence of smoking in the future and on individual's risk of disease. **Dental Public Health:** Whilst some funding has been retained to support delivery of dental health promotion in the borough there is a risk this will be inadequate. In the last year there has been minimal activity in relation to dental public health and reducing this budget reflects this. **Mental Health/Wellbeing:** A project which supported people with mental health difficulties to access CEL arts courses was decommissioned in June 2014. This was due to concerns about how the project linked to other services and governance and supervision of the delivery of that support. The impact of this change is minimal as a voluntary sector service recently commissioned by Lewisham CCG offers similar support for this client group. It is proposed to withdraw funding for the GP clinical support to Sydenham Gardens. Sydenham Gardens accesses the LBL grants programme and could apply for funding through this route. **Health Improvement Training/health promotion library services:** Access to library services is now available to health

4. Impact of proposal
improvement staff through their NHS employment so this will be decommissioned from 2015/16. There is an under spend against health improvement training budget and giving this is up as a saving is not anticipated to have a negative impact. **Health Inequalities:** A number of organisations are funded to work with communities to reduce health inequalities. This includes supporting people from migrant communities to access health services more effectively. A review of this provision combined with a change in the specification for the Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network and Community Health Improvement Service to deliver some of this provision will enable savings to be made from this budget area. The Public Health Contribution to the VAL Health Inequalities and Social Care Officer is included in these proposals. VAL will be funded through a single funding stream from the general grants programme. The Citizens Advice Bureau currently provide benefits advice in 12 GP practices. This provision will be decommissioned. Citizens Advice will be provided across the 4 neighbourhoods to ensure access to money advice continues. There is a risk that reducing funding to some of these organisations will destabilise them financially and have a negative impact on the populations they support. Affected organisations include: **Forvil; Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) and Voluntary Action Lewisham (VAL).** Consultation will be undertaken with these organisations. **Unallocated:** There is a small amount of unallocated money in the public health budget as a result of a previous uplift to the allocation at the point of transition from the NHS.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
The risks associated with the savings identified are minimal. Part of the public health review included ensuring that where possible any decommissioned services which would have an adverse impact on public health outcomes can be delivered through alternative funding or commissioning arrangements. The main risk areas identified are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

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

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?		No

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

A7: Cost effective care for Mental Health

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

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

9. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16	**2016/17:**	**2017/18**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18**
250	0	0	250

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				

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

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

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

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

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

12. Service Equalities Impact						
What is the expected impact on equalities?					**Low/ neutral**	

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

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

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

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

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

14. Human Resources					
Gender:	**Female:**		**Male:**		
Ethnicity:	**BME:**	**White:**	**Other:**		**Not Known:**
Disability:					
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:**		

A8: Public Health programme review (II)

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18**	**Total 2015-2018**
1,153.8	0	0	1,153.8

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
Public Health has reviewed the programmes it funds to identify those areas of current public health spend where efficiencies can be achieved with no or minimal impact on the delivery of public health outcomes. An initial £1.5M was identified through this review for re-investment in other areas of council spend where disinvestment would have a negative impact on public health outcomes. Achieving the additional disinvestments from the public health budget outlined in this proforma for further re-allocation will have a direct impact on service delivery of public health programmes. Any re-allocation in other areas of council spend must have an equally clear public health outcome.. The Public Health Budget is ring fenced until at least the end of 15/16. The Council is required to file annual accounts to Public Health England on how the Council's public health allocation is spent against pre-determined spending categories linked to public health outcomes and mandatory functions. The programmes where additional Disinvestments are proposed include the following: Dental Public Health; Health Inequalities; Mental Health (adults and children); Health Protection; Maternal and Child Health; NHS Health Checks; Obesity/Physical Activity; Sexual Health.; Smoking and Tobacco Control; Training and Education. Substance misuse services (which are funded from part of the ring fenced budget) have been reviewed separately.
Saving proposal description
Disinvestments identified here are in addition to the previously identified £1.5M. A further review of spend has identified a potential further £1.15M.

3. Description of service and proposal				
Public Health Programme Area	**Total Budget**	**Additional Disinvestments**	**Total Saving (including initial 1.5M)**	**Additional Disinvestments proposal**
Sexual Health	£7,158,727	£46,000	£321,600	1. Reduce sex and relationships funding by half (£20k) 2. Stop funding chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening in GP practices (£26k)
NHS Healthchecks	£551,300	£40,000	£157,800	1. Reduction in funding available to support IT infrastructure for NHS healthchecks
Health Protection	£35,300	£-	£12,500	No further savings proposed
Public Health Advice to CCG	£79,200	£-	£19,200	No further saving proposed
Obesity/ physical activity	£650,000	£81,000	£173,400	1. Further reduction in funding for community development nutritionist (£30k) 2. Remove funding for obesity/ healthy eating resources (£10K) 3. Withdraw of funding for clinical support to Downham Nutritional Project (£9k) 4. Efficiency savings from child weight management programmes. (£12k) 5. Reduce physical activity for healthchecks programme
Dental public health	£64,500	£20,000	£44,500	Release funding from dental public health programmes
Mental Health	£93,400	£34,200	£59,200	Further reduce funding available for mental health promotion and wellbeing initiatives (including training)
Health Improvement Training	£88,000	£20,000	£58,000	Limit health improvement training offer to those areas which support mandatory public health services.
Health inequalities	£1,460,019	£315,000	£581,500	1. Reduce the contract value for community health improvement service with LGT by limiting service to support mandatory Public health programmes such as NHS Healthchecks only and reduce other health inequalities activity. (£270k) 2. Further reduce funding for area based public health initiatives which are focused on geographical areas of poor health with in the borough. (£20k) 3. Reduce funding for 'warm homes' (£25K)
Smoking and tobacco control	£860,300	£328,500	£348,500	1. Reduce contract value for stop smoking service at LGT by £250k (30%) 2. Stop most schools and young people's tobacco awareness programmes 3. Decommission work to stop illegal sales
Maternal and child health	£187,677	£38,400	£68,400	1. Reduce capacity/funding for breast feeding peer support programme & breast feeding cafes 2. Reduce capacity for child death review process by reducing sessional commitment of child death liaison nurse.
Department efficiencies	£1,938,000	£230,700	£262,200	To be identified but likely to include staff restructure and further review of all internal budgets and any unallocated funds
2014/2015 Uplift (uncommitted)			£547,000	

3. Description of service and proposal				
TOTAL	**£14,995,000**	**£1,153,800**	**£2,653,800**	

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Sexual Health: Sexual Health is a mandatory service commissioned by Local Authorities. Currently Sexual health services are provided by GPs and through sexual health clinics, with some limited provision in pharmacies and online. GPs receive payments for sexual health screening. It is proposed to withdraw this payment. Financial support for the delivery of sex and relationships education would be reduced by half. Previously identified Disinvestments include an efficiency saving which reduces the funding available to the Lewisham and Greenwich Trust to deliver sexual health services. A London wide sexual health transformation programme is being developed in partnership with 20 boroughs, which in the longer term is expected to deliver savings against sexual health services budgets. Any further savings committed before this programme is implemented are likely to jeopardise the delivery of the programme. For this reason further sexual health savings previously put forward have now been withdrawn. Changes proposed here may result in a decrease in GP engagement regarding sexual health, which will put more pressure on clinics. Currently clinics are struggling to manage capacity in their services, frequently turning patients away. This situation will therefore require monitoring. **NHS Healthchecks Programme**: This is a mandatory programme. The initial saving identified from this programme related to not implementing the roll out of diabetes screening as part of the NHS healthcheck, but also assumptions that the targets for activity will not be achieved. There is a target to screen 75% of the healthcheck eligible population. Currently around 40% are screened. Further Disinvestments are predicated on the Local Authority being able to procure a more cost effective IT system for the call/recall of NHS Healthchecks and managing NHS Healthcheck records. It should be noted that an essential component of the NHS Healthchecks programme is delivered through the Community Health Improvement Service. This service is also proposed for a reduction in funding but will be reorganised to improve its efficiency. **Public Health Advice to CCG:** No further saving has been identified from this area **Obesity/ physical activity:** Disinvestments have been identified previously from decommissioning physical activity programmes for children. It is hoped that schools themselves will continue to fund this activity. Further Disinvestments are identified by removing the budget for obesity resources and reducing funding for community development nutrition programmes mainly delivered by the voluntary sector. As public health provide the vast majority of funding to support the obesity/healthy eating initiatives in the borough withdrawing this funding would remove the opportunity to develop local resources or awareness campaigns to support obesity and health eating work in communities. Reducing funding available to support physical activity in people identified at high risk of cardio-vascular disease following a Healthcheck would reduce the number of individuals who could access these programmes. This undermines the impact of the programme in supporting the identified “at risk” population to make changes to reduce their risk of CVD. **Dental Public Health:** Because of changes to the NHS and to Dental Public Health and the resulting lack of clarity as to which organisation is now responsible for different aspects of this function, there has been no spending commitments on Dental Public Health Promotion for the past two years. The impact of this will not be seen in terms of changes to public health indicators for at least another three years as the first important measure is the average number of decayed missing and filled teeth at the age of five. PH will however continue to fund a dental health infection control function and a dental public health programme delivered by Lambeth and Southwark Public Health. Overall a 69% cut

4. Impact of proposal
to this budget is proposed. **Mental Health/Wellbeing:** Initial Disinvestments have been identified through decommissioning a project which supported people with mental health difficulties to access CEL arts courses (this has now been done). Support for this client group is now available through the voluntary sector contract with Lewisham and Bromley Mind. Further Disinvestments are proposed against children's mental health promotion and adult mental health promotion. This resource has been used to deliver mental health awareness training and support to front line staff in public and voluntary sector organisations (including, health, housing, police, youth services), foster carers and supported housing. **Health Improvement Training:** A further reduction in the health promotion training budget will deliver a saving. The health improvement training programme is open to all public and voluntary sector workers whose work contributes to public health outcomes. This programme provides essential training for the delivery of public health programmes including Brief intervention training, sexual health training, training to support the healthchecks programme. A much reduced programme of training would be offered by retaining a small proportion of this budget. **Health Inequalities:** In addition to Disinvestments identified from decommissioning benefits advice in GP surgeries and reducing the contribution to VAL, a 25% reduction in the funding of the Community Health Improvement Service has been suggested. This would have a major impact on the work on health inequalities work across the borough unless the reduction is accompanied by a service redesign. The LGHT who currently manage this programme have indicated a willingness to work collaboratively to redesign and position this service within the community. It is envisaged that this will lead to efficiencies and better coordination with other community based provision. Further Disinvestments would come from reducing warm homes funding and area based health improvement programmes (which have been shown locally to improve health outcomes). It will be essential therefore to ensure that the best elements of those programmes are not lost. A number of organisations are funded to work with communities to reduce health inequalities. There is a risk that reducing funding to these organisations could destabilise them financially and have a negative impact on the populations they support. **Smoking and Tobacco Control:** Further Disinvestments identified by significantly reducing the budget available for the stop smoking service, reducing work with young people to prevent uptake of smoking , reducing funding for work on Smokefree homes and work on illegal sales. These Disinvestments are likely to have a significant impact on the delivery of the SmokeFree future plan and the ability of Lewisham to reduce the prevalence of smoking and ensuing impact on health and social care. **Maternal and Child Health :** Further Disinvestments identified from these budgets include reducing the support for the delivery of Free vitamin D, reducing funding for breast feeding peer support and breast feeding cafes, reducing funding commitment for the child death review function (although as this is a statutory function aspects of this must remain in place). Currently 25 breast feeding peer supporters are recruited and trained on an annual basis supported by the breast feeding peer support coordinator. Reducing this support and the funding for the breast feeding cafes would lead to a reduction in the amount of support to breast feeding women in Lewisham and have a potential impact on rates of breast feeding in the borough. It should be noted that the impact of the peer support programme for breast feeding mothers is likely to extend beyond the breast feeding outcomes and support mental health and child development outcomes by supporting new mothers. The work of the Designated Consultant for Child Death Review is currently being considered; there is scope for a reduction of the funding of this post of about one third without impacting the work of the child death review function and this was included in the first set of proposed Disinvestments from the Public Health budget. A further reduction is included in this paper, which will reduce the sessional commitment of the child death liaison nurse, but this will

4. Impact of proposal
reduce the development of what can be done to improve support for bereaved parents in the borough. A budget allocated for additional School Nursing input to flagship "The Next Generation" (TNG) will be considered within the priorities for the whole of the School Nursing contract, and will not be funded separately in future.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Most public health provision is targeted at the most at risk populations, and is predicated on both primary prevention and secondary prevention of adverse health outcomes. Some of this work can continue to embedded in other services which access similar populations, but with reduced funding available across the sector it is likely the impact will be felt in other parts of the system. Any reinvestments identified must be spent in line with the requirements of the Public Health Allocation. Once the Health Premiums are developed an inability to deliver on public health outcomes may have an adverse effect on income which could be available to the borough.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Health Programmes are targeted at those who experience the greatest inequalities in health outcomes. By definition these are often those groups with protected characteristics. For example Heart disease and diabetes are far more prevalent in the Black population. The remaining public health programmes will need to be more narrowly focused on these groups to help mitigate in the reduction of overall programme funding.

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			Yes	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
A number of the contracts held in public health require a minimum notice period of 6 months (and 12 months is good practice for the larger value NHS contracts).

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?		**Yes**

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

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	**Scale 3 - 5**	**Scale 6 - SO2**	**PO1 – PO5**	**PO6 – PO8**	**SMG1 – SMG3**	**JNC**

7. Human Resources							
FTE		1.9	2.0	5.7	2.8	7	
Head Count		2	2	6	3	6	
Vacant*			0.6	0.6	1.2		
Vacant**							
Vacant***					1		

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:** 15		**Male:** 5	
Ethnicity:	BME: 7	White: 13	**Other:**	**Not Known:**
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:** 20	

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

Review of services to support people to live at home	
Lead officer	Joan Hutton
Directorates affected by proposal	Community Services
Portfolio	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Select Committee	Healthier Communities
Reference no.	A9
Short summary of proposal	Remodelling and consolidation of Floating Support, Enablement Care Team, Special Duty and Linkline

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16	**2016/17:**	**2017/18**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18**
250	0	0	250

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
This Proforma covers four services (Linkline, Special Duty, Enablement Care and Sheltered Floating Support Services). These teams provide services that help people live independently in their own homes. a) The Sheltered Housing Floating Support Team supports vulnerable adults to live independently. The support includes assistance with budgeting, claiming benefits and ensuring people are safe and secure in their properties for example identifying trip hazards. This does not include personal care. b) The Enablement Care Team work with people being discharged from hospital or people who are at high risk of being admitted to hospital. Enablement is about helping people to become more independent and improve their quality of life. Enablement is different from traditional homecare, the focus is on helping people to learn or relearn skills to maintain independence. For example, when people have acquired a disability, it helps them rebuild confidence in making a meal or hot drink, getting out of bed, moving about and doing it yourself especially after spell in hospital. The main benefit is that it encourages people to become more independent and can reduce the need for more intensive higher cost care or residential services. c) The Special Duty Team provide a rapid response so that older or more vulnerable services users can be discharged from hospital safely. The Team ensures that properties are cleaned, de-cluttered habitable and safe to occupy so that care can take place in the home. d) The Linkline service is a community alarm service that monitors people at home who are vulnerable and at risk of falls. Sensors and pull cords are installed in the service user's home, and are monitored 24/7. The service is split into staff who monitor the alarm system and staff who go to the person's home if an urgent response is needed.

3. Description of service and proposal
Saving proposal description
This following proposal seeks to make better use of existing staffing resources and supports the further integration of services. These services focus on keeping people independent and in their own homes, minimising hospital stays, wrapping services around the person and employing the right skills, in the right place at the right time. **Sheltered Floating Support Service**. Sheltered Housing and Extra Care Housing provision has been reviewed in recent years. This review has resulted in the development of new Extra Care Housing Services in the borough and the current consultation on existing Extra Care schemes. With Housing colleagues, we are assessing the long term housing and support needs for older people and developing options for future delivery. This work will take into account existing external housing and support providers and look at developing different models of delivery. Possible models include aligning this service to similar housing support services that are provided externally. Discussions are currently taking place with other RSL providers to continue developing this proposal. **Linkline (Community Alarm Service).** The proposal is to separate out the alarm monitoring function from the response function. The call monitoring function (answering the telephone calls) can be delivered through alternative providers/mechanisms. It is intended to integrate the Linkline Response Service and the Special Duty Team into the Reablement Care Team. This will create a home response service that will wrap the most appropriate support around the person in their home. It allows the flexibility for rapid response 24 hour / 365 days a year. The savings will be delivered through: 1. An alternative delivery model for floating support and Linkline, which will include consideration of the use of external providers. 2. Introducing a charging model for floating support linked to rents. 4. Reduction in management and monitoring staff. The enablement care team has recently been reorganised and goes live on 3rd November 2014. The posts that are currently being covered by agency staff are now being advertised and permanent recruitment is underway.
4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
This proposal will impact on staff within all four service areas and will require full staff consultation. As service users will continue to receive these services, the impact will be neutral except where there is a proposal to introduce a charge. Changes to charging policies are subject to full consultation. However, the intention is to make access to services easier, and align services that support the prevention and early intervention programme. It is expected that this would have a positive effect on service users.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
There are no anticipated risks to services users as the services will still be provided. Any charging implications will be consulted on as part of the fairer charging policy, that will takes peoples personal circumstances into account.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:		
Main Priority – Most Relevant	**Secondary Priority**	**Corporate Priorities:-** **A. Community Leadership and**

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

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

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		36.5	21	2			
Head Count		41	21	2			
Vacant*							
Vacant**		21	17	2			
Vacant***		15.5	4				

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:** 55		**Male:** 9	
Ethnicity:	**BME:** 34	**White:** **28**	**Other:** 2	**Not Known:**
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:** 64	

A10: Proposal in respect of recouping health costs

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16	**2016/17:**	**2017/18**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18**
600	0	0	600

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

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

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

4. Impact of proposal
be met.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
There is a risk that the CCG will not consider this transfer of responsibility affordable the joint funding agreement will need to be supported by both organisations

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:			Low/ Neutral
Gender:			Low/ Neutral
Age:			Low/ Neutral
Disability:			Low/ Neutral
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/ Neutral

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

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

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information		
Gender:	**Female:**	**Male:**

7. Human Resources				
Ethnicity:	**BME:**	**White:**	**Other:**	**Not Known:**
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:**	

Appendix 1 Section B - Supporting People

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

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

Reduction and Remodelling of Supporting People Housing and Floating Support Services	
Lead officer	Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney
Directorates affected by proposal	Community Service, Customer services, CYP
Portfolio	Health, Wellbeing & Older People
Select Committee	Healthier Communities
Reference no.	B1
Short summary of proposal	The savings across supported housing and floating support services will be achieved through a variety of methods including: • Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity • Reductions in service capacity • Service closures • A review of mental health services across the board lends itself to changes in what is currently commissioned via the SP programme. This will involve a range of decommissioning/ re-commissioning/ closing units and identifying different provision. • A complete reconfiguration and re-procurement of all remaining floating support services. This will mean that there is no longer any specialist floating support services funded through SP but one generic service that would response to low level needs for older people, those with learning disabilities, single adults and young people.

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal
Support takes place across different accommodation settings: high-support hostels, shared supported housing and in the community via floating support. As well as funding a number of schemes providing generic support for vulnerable adults such as sheltered housing Lewisham runs specialist projects for individual client groups, such as drug and alcohol users, women experiencing violence and exploitation, offenders and rough sleepers.
Saving proposal description
The savings in this area will be achieved through a variety of methods including: • Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity • Reductions in service capacity • Service closures A detailed breakdown of the services involved and the impact is listed below: Older People with Support Needs : • LBL Sheltered, • Greenwich Telecare • Abbeyfield Deptford • Anchor Trust Tony Law House • Anchor Trust Knights Court People with Learning Disabilities: • Look Ahead Floating Support Single Homeless with Support Needs • Thames Reach Lewisham Reach • Thames Reach Lewisham Reach - Hostel Diversion • Thames Reach Lewisham Reach - Hostel Diversion (PbR) • Thames Reach Lewisham Supported Housing • St. Mungo's Homelessness services Offenders/People at Risk of Offending • Hestia Young People at Risk • Centrepoint Young People's Assessment Centre Service • Single Homeless Project - Tandem Support Frail elderly • LBL - Very Sheltered Accommodation (Social Care & Health) People with Mental Health Problems • One Support -Honor Lea/Floating Support • Equinox - Mental Health Sydenham Tredown Road • Quo Vadis Community Group Homes

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
The reduction in funding will lead to a significant reduction in capacity across a range of services. This will mean that individual service users will no longer receive a service in their own homes and some will need to be decanted from accommodation based services. This removal of service will be targeted to ensure that those with most needs will still remove interventions but ultimately the threshold for services will have to rise. Sp funded services are generally preventative services and this reduction of capacity may well impact on higher level

4. Impact of proposal
services such as residential care. However, the exact level of this impact is difficult to quantify as individuals will react differently to the withdrawal of services with some coping well and other deteriorating. The vast majority of the funding reductions will be passed to the voluntary sector as they hold contracts to deliver the frontline provision.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

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

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

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

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

Impact on Corporate Priorities:						
						and equity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

		individual reductions rather than overall		

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
All services are delivered via contracts which will require decommissioning/ re-commissioning. Reductions. Negotiations

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?		No

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:**		**Male:**	
Ethnicity:	**BME:**	**White:**	**Other:**	**Not Known:**
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:**	

Appendix 1 Section E - Asset Rationalisation

E1: Re-organisation of Regeneration & Asset Management division

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
600	0	0	600

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
In order for the division to be sustainable and fit-for-purpose looking in to the future, the divisions leadership are working on a root and branch re-structure of the services to ensure it is 'outcomes' focused and capable of delivering significant Regeneration and Investment programs across the borough.
Saving proposal description
• Designing a flexible and future-ready organisational structure. • Retaining core skills and management information, and move further to a commissioning model. • Ensuring that staff are skilled and able to work flexibly across functions. • Moving towards shared processes and systems in order to standardise and streamline functions. • Providing better alignment with other service areas in order that together we can help define and deliver against the authority's corporate priorities. • Develop a 'go to' organisation for assets and the 'built environment'. The £600k identified is a continuation of the £250k identified for delivery in 2014/15, meaning that the re-organisation will save £850k in total, any potential overlap with the Business Support Review which is already underway is being considered and discussed.

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

4. Impact of proposal
planning, housing and CYP. Whilst only minimal direct impact on these services is expected, the transition to an 'outcomes' focused service will impact how this division interacts with the wider organisation. No significant impact on service users or the voluntary sector.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
• There may be delays in delivery due to the scale of the re-organisation and the number of staff affected, this is being mitigated through close working with HR to ensure that the process is as streamlined as possible • The Council will be competing for professionally qualified resources in the general market place, the new organisational structure has been designed to attract appropriate resources.

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:			Low/ Neutral
Gender:			Low/ Neutral
Age:			Low/ Neutral
Disability:			Low/ Neutral
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/ Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/ Neutral
Sexual Orientation:			Low/ Neutral
Gender reassignment			Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline			

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

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

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

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

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

E2: Optimisation of operational estate

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
150	305	670	1,125

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

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

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

4. Impact of proposal
Optimising the current operational estate, which will enable the Council, over time, to provide lower cost, fit for purpose buildings that meet the service needs of the local community: Staff – some impact on staff as they may be re-located to other operational buildings for service delivery. Service Users – some impact on service users as they may need to access different operational buildings to receive services Council Services – some impact as they may be co-located with other services and delivered from other operational buildings Voluntary sector – some impact as they may be co-located with other services from other operational buildings or even transferred to other assets (e.g. Schools). There will be greater transparency with regards to the net cost to Council of these services.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
- dependant on policy decisions, negotiations and variations to the FM contracts will be required. - FM service delivery standards may be affected - savings may not be fully realised. - dependant on internal & external negotiations and allocations of resources and finances. - It may not be possible to relocate some services into one core building such as Laurence House because of the nature of service provided - Lease surrender negotiations could prove difficult - Optimising the use of office space through flexible working or desk sharing may not work in all instances as this is heavily influenced by the nature of service being delivered. - Potential for duplication of savings with other options as there is significant crossover with for example, extended use of schools and co-location or shared use of operational estate. - Sensitivities regarding links to the re-profiling of the delivery of Service areas. - Schools not willing to engage in the process - Community and youth services not willing to relocate some of their services to school sites (sensitivities around re-shaping service provision generally). - Building closures through this option would not necessarily result in full savings on the running costs as intensified use of other buildings at some cost would be required. - There may be some once-off capital expenditure required in some buildings to make them fit for purpose. - Services or users may not fully engage making any delivery of such an approach difficult - Changing status of the School estate may impact on Council's ability to utilise School estate

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

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

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

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

7. Human Resources							
***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)							
	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

E3: Creating income from asset portfolio

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16 – 2017/18*** ***Note – this strand is assumed to generate £5.7m in total by 2021, with £0.2m by 2018**
0	0	200	200

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal

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

Whilst in the past a number of the Authority's assets have been disposed of to assist development opportunities, generally by generating a one off capital receipt, this programme will investigate ways that assets can be utilised to generate a sustainable long term revenue income. Although not part of this formal project assessment, it should also be noted that in bringing forward such planning and development investment projects, they should contribute to the delivery of the borough's regeneration strategy and further enhance capital and revenue growth.

The 'New Income Projects' work strand will contribute towards R & AM's commitment to deliver a new net revenue position of £9m/year by 2021 (£5.7m/year) (although only £200k is deliverable by 2018 due to the requirement to construct assets) and support the delivery of Lewisham's Regeneration Strategy enabling its sustainable growth, linked to current GLA population growth predictions for London. There is the need to pump prime the delivery of this strand and it is anticipated that circa £0.5m will be required per annum for the first 3 years. A capital receipt/s from surplus disposals could be used to fund these works as it is anticipated that they will be eligible for capitalisation.

Saving proposal description

- Looking at new ways to generate a revenue income from assets, rather than previous default position of disposal to assist development opportunities (meaning the Council can also share in transformation £ uplift).
- Work has started to identify key sites that could be developed as potential PRS sites, hotel provision or student accommodation, instead of/as well as additional housing and school places.
- Work is also ongoing to research suitable delivery vehicles for these programmes together with some soft market testing amongst potential delivery partners.
- A smart, 'One Housing programme' approach (that can assist in the delivery of affordable housing as well).

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Staff – no impact on staff although some temporary resources (including consultancy) will be required for the delivery of this savings proposal Service Users – may need to access different operational buildings to receive services if sites are identified as within the scope for this strand Voluntary sector – there may be an impact if sites currently used by the VCS are identified as within the scope for this strand Other Council Services - may be co-located with other services and delivered from other operational buildings if sites are identified as within the scope for this strand
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Amongst others associated with individual projects: • The role of the Authority as 'property developer' may attract adverse commentary particularly if it operates within the Private Rented Sector (PRS) whereas historically it has been associated with social housing. • Whist the PRS market shows attractive returns currently these may differ when any schemes delivered by the Authority come to market (need to develop a mixed-portfolio of property investment assets, that also assist in delivering the broadest corporate priorities). • Scalability – insufficient numbers of PRS units to make the projects worth while on a site by site basis which would need to be addressed possibly by packaging smaller sites together (mitigated by good design approach, flexibility and creative / efficient management approach). • Insufficient return to the Council after management and lifecycle costs. A suitable management agreement model will need to be agreed in advance amongst all potential partners which identifies suitable threshold numbers of units and returns (could balance risks by focusing on guaranteed returns as opposed to maximum returns, passing on risk). • Competing interests for land - The school places programme may interfere with the investment income delivery. (can mitigate this by having a clearly identified set of school places projects, focused on existing CYP sites. Some appropriate housing may also be possible on some of these as an added benefit). • Many of the risks associated with such investment can be mitigated by ensuring that the authority contracts with the best / most effective partners where necessary – with natural alignment of interests. • Timing - the delivery of these new incomes requires significant negotiation and the construction of new assets, and each project is likely to take a number of years before income is generated, any delay in securing support and funding to enable the start of the programme will delay the achievement of income. Furthermore as new entrants enter the market place returns may be driven down.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Is staff consultation required (Y/N)	No	**Is public consultation required (Y/N)?**	No
7. Human Resources			
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?			No
Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE			

equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
***(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim**
****(covered by council employee)**
*****(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state**

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

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

Workforce Profile Information

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

E4: Improving rent collection for commercial assets

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
- Developing a consistent approach to the use of Council assets – both operational and commercial estates. - Introducing a new Asset Management Plan and AM system / governance arrangements to strengthen the corporate decision-making processes. - Generating increased income, based on up-to-date market rates, better use of properties and effective rent collection - Better alignment of the commercial estate with corporate service delivery priorities. - Driving transparency. NOTE: there is a saving for R&AM within the Housing strand for transferring HRA commercial properties to the GF.
Saving proposal description
Optimise the Commercial Estate – Increase the 'Commercial' estate through the correct identification of all assets owned. (£200k) Review of Commercial Estate to Increase Market Rentals to Increase Income (£250k) Improvements in the debt recovery of the commercial estate rent roll. (£50k) Optimisation of the transferred HRA non-housing stock (£50k) Optimising the Commercial Estate – moving the Voluntary & Community Sector organisations into more appropriate assets (reduce the opportunity cost of them occupying potentially expensive / valuable retail units) (£25k) Advertising income from both on and off highways. (£20k)

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

4. Impact of proposal
Voluntary sector – there may be an impact as the use of the Commercial Estate by the voluntary sector is reviewed to ensure VCS organisations that currently occupy potentially valuable commercial property are moved out of these into units that are more appropriate for their needs; and in so doing reducing the commercial cost burden on these VCS organisations. There will be greater transparency with regards to the net cost to Council of these services. Other Council Services - no impact as Council Services are not delivered from the Commercial Estate.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
• in relation to either gaining vacant possession and/or putting new commercial leases in place these processes can take a considerable amount of time, some lag has been accounted for and resources will be required to mitigate. • Rent review process can also be protracted particularly if the matter has to be referred to a third party in accordance with the leases, some lag has been accounted for and resources will be requires to mitigate. • Resistance from lease holders to the introduction of direct debit payments – resulting in a reduced market for commercial properties, this is being tested and is generally being accepted by the marketplace; • Lack of training for debt collection team results in poor implementation of the direct debit payments process, training is being designed and deployed; • Inconsistent application of approach to introducing direct debit payments for rentals reduces effectiveness, training is being deployed to mitigate; • Reputational issues with regards to advertising on or near the highways, mitigated by careful selection of advertising content and formats. • Planning policy restricts scope of advertising income, close liaison with planning to mitigate where possible. • May need additional resources to assist with securing possession of the premises and then re-letting to ensure new revenue streams are derived, the re-organisation of R&AM should provide sufficient resource.

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

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

5. Service Equalities Impact						
What is the expected impact on equalities?			**Medium**	Note – it is possible that through the review of the VCS		

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

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

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
All properties owned by Lewisham must be statutorily compliant. These are essential requirements under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. Also, from April 2018, the proposed legislative changes would make it unlawful to let residential or commercial properties with an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) Rating of F or G (i.e. the lowest 2 grades of energy efficiency). Therefore as part of this strand we will ensure that the Commercial Portfolio remains statutorily compliant. A further legal implication that will be addressed is to ensure that all commercial tenants have a suitable and formal tenancy agreement in place and that this complies with S123 of the Local Government Act 1972. With regards to the transfer of non housing assets from the HRA to the GF, Council's opinion is as follows: "In principle, both commercial premises and garages which are let separately from any residential property can be re-appropriated and transferred out of the Council's HRA without the consent of the Secretary of State, on the grounds that they are not a house, part of a house, belonging to a house or enjoyed together with a house. However, the status of each individual property should be verified against those criteria before it is transferred."

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?		No

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

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

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

7. Human Resources							
						SMG3	
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

E5: Energy efficient measures

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
109	10	15	134

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

If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below

L&G, Phoenix & Affinity Sutton are part of the street lighting PFI and if they choose to participate in a dimming programme, they could make some savings, as they currently pay their energy bills

3. Description of service and proposal

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

The street lighting PFI, also includes a Central Management System (CMS) that allows us to vary the lighting levels, both up and downwards. The British Standard allows for lighting to be lowered by one lighting class. This would reduce our energy consumption and thereby reduce our overall energy bill and our carbon footprint

Saving proposal description

Energy and utility management from the ending of the requirement on the Council to purchase allowances under CRC (£109k)
Energy consumption reduction in street lighting through dimming and trimming (£25k)
[Note – an earlier saving for energy generation and supply through the installation of PVs on Council assets (£100k) has been removed due to the upfront capital investment required. The Service is seeking external funding sources and may bring this item back]

4. Impact of proposal

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

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

4. Impact of proposal
Voluntary sector – no impact. Other Council Services - no impact, other than Housing, will need to carry out their own review to ascertain their residents views should they wish to dim their lighting assets.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Cessation of the requirement on the Council to purchase allowances under CRC • A consultation has now been issued by HMT on the 15/16 local government settlement, which includes proposals to recover the lost income through an adjustment in the settlement https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-finance-settlement-2015-to-2016-technical-consultation • For Lewisham this has been calculated at £150,727. **Dimming and Trimming Street Lighting** • Consumption reductions may be offset by tariff increases, resulting in no net cost savings, but would provide a protection against increased tariffs should we not dim. • A trimming and dimming policy will need to be developed and in conjunction an assessment of impact to address equalities and environmental implications in order to manage any resultant public concerns – achievement of the saving will be dependent on this policy**.** • Public concerns regarding the adoption of the policy, around fear of crime and road safety • Ability to reduce light levels where residents are concerned that lighting level are to high. • A draft policy will be produced in good time for 16/17, that will be reviewed by Sustainable Development Committee and then approved by M&C. This is likely to involve public consultation, although this will be dependant on any Impact Assessments that are carried out.

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:			Low/ Neutral
Gender:		Medium	
Age:		Medium	
Disability:		Medium	
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/ Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/ Neutral
Sexual Orientation:		Medium	
Gender reassignment			Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact:			
The street lighting dimming and trimming proposal may be subject to a form of general public consultation / communications exercise where we would have to set out the facts and the direct and indirect impacts based on an impact analysis which took the environmental and service user impacts into consideration. Until such time as this analysis is completed we are assuming that some of the groups with protected characteristics will be impacted at a medium level. An equalities analysis assessment will need to be undertaken as part of the work to develop a policy on the dimming and trimming of street lighting.			

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	**Yes**			

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

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

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

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

7. Human Resources					
Workforce Profile Information					
Gender:	**Female:**		**Male:**		
Ethnicity:	**BME:**	**White:**	**Other:**		**Not Known:**
Disability:					
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:**		

Appendix 1 Section F – Corporate & Business Support Services

F1: Centralisation of business support services

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

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

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

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

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

4. Impact Of Proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other Council services:
The establishment of a centralised business support service will: ▪ Introduce a consistent approach to the level of business support provided across the organisation so that variable needs are met with limited resources in a transparent, strategic manner ▪ Ensure that the structure is more responsive to the changing shape and requirements of the organisation ▪ Enable generic functions (such as invoicing, post distribution and document scanning) to be rationalised and streamlined ▪ Generate efficiencies of scale (in terms of cover for leave and sickness absence) ▪ Provide a clear career structure for business support staff, with opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge as well as access structured training packages However, the breadth of business support tasks delivered by the centralised service may be limited and some tasks will no longer be provided or will need to be undertaken in a reduced form.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these:
• The most significant process efficiencies during the first year of operation will only be achieved following the implementation of key technical enablers, such as iProcurement, corporate scanning and workflow solutions – if these projects are not delivered effectively and on time, then the in-year savings for 2015/16 may not be fully realised   ○ In order to mitigate this risk, we will need to align such projects with the Customer Transformation review and the delivery of the ICT and Customer Services Strategies, as well as working closely with corporate teams to ensure priorities are understood and the pace of change is maintained • There is a risk that potential savings may have been overestimated and that some business support posts across the organisation were not identified during the review process – however, this risk is likely to be low given the detailed, robust approach taken to determine the final number of posts in scope and associated savings. In addition, there will be further opportunities to identify and review other business support posts during the implementation process and once the new service is in place

5. Impact On Corporate Priorities:		
Main Priority – Most Relevant	**Secondary Priority**	**Corporate Priorities:-** **A. Community Leadership & Empowerment** **B. Young People's Achievement**
J.		

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

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

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

Level Of Impact – State The Level Of Impact On The Protected Characteristics Below:			
Ethnicity			Low/Neutral
Gender			Low/Neutral
Age			Low/Neutral
Disability			Low/Neutral
Religion Or Belief			Low/Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/Neutral
Sexual Orientation			Low/Neutral
Gender Reassignment			Low/Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic, please explain why and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact:			
N/A			

Is A Full Equalities Analysis Assessment Required?			**No**	

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

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

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

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

***(not covered by Council employee e.g. interim)**
**** (covered by Council employee)**
***** (including posts covered by agency – if nil, please state)**

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

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

Appendix 1 Section G – Income Generation

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

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

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

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

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

3. Description of service and proposal
Schools SLA – (£200k) By increasing the range of charged for services and decreasing the number of "free" services then schools will find that their delegated budgets do not enable the same amount of services to be procured as previously. The following services will be increasing their charges: • Estate Management Unit – Fire Risk Assessment service. This service is not currently recovering full cost and therefore an increase in prices to recover overheads will be introduced. • Estate Management Unit – Asbestos management and removal. This involves the audit of asbestos, the maintenance of registers, identifying works and undertaking the removal of encapsulation or removal. Voluntary Aided schools are currently meeting the costs for this service; this proposal would introduce the costs to all schools. • Mail Delivery Service – The mail delivery service provided to schools is a unique service and one which is not offered across all other boroughs. Currently Lewisham is not recovering the full cost of this service with the current pricing model. This proposal is to increase charges to reduce the current levels of subsidy. The following areas will be introducing new SLAs available for Schools to purchase: • Free School Meal Eligibility – The Local Authority currently provides a subsidised service to schools in checking whether pupils meet the Free School Meal eligibility. This proposal would be to reduce this subsidy for schools through charging from April 2015. • Estate Management Unit – Statutory Maintenance Audits. The Estates Team undertake subsidised annual audits of schools statutory maintenance performance. This proposal would reduce this subsidy through charges. • Media and Communications – Currently support is provided by the Communications Team to schools within the borough for free. It is proposed that a new SLA is developed, which give schools the opportunity to buy into a set of services directly with the team. • Occupational Health (OH) - This service is currently provided free of charge to schools with additional services being purchased from other OH providers. The current contract is being renewed and discussions are ongoing to look at how the contract can be structured in order to meet the full needs of Schools. It is expected that the percentage impact on a school's budget is 0.1%. **Council Tax Collection (£500k)** As part of the work to drive up Council Tax collection rates Lewisham is working with the Behavioural Insights Team (BIT) ,formerly at the Cabinet Office, to review current interaction with residents such as notices (initial demand, follow up reminders, text messages, bailiff letters etc.), as well as the less tangible elements of the recovery cycle, like timing and channel. This work will build upon the behavioural insights literature taken from fields such as Social Psychology and Behavioural Economics, alongside the practical application that BIT has gained from working with organisations such as HMRC and Manchester City Council on tax and council tax. In the case of HMRC a randomised control trial on using revised tax collection letters highlighted a 15 percentage point increase in tax compliance from the new style compared to the old style letters. This work draws heavily from national and international work on tax paying and decision making, for further information please see: WALSH, Keith. Understanding Taxpayer Behaviour – New Opportunities for Tax Administration. The Economic and Social Review, [S.l.], v. 43, n. 3, Autumn, p. 451–475, Feb. 2013. ISSN 0012-9984. Available at: <http://www.esr.ie/article/view/46>. The revenue aims to increase Council Tax collection by £500k equivalent to a 0.5% increase in Council Tax collection rates. **Investment Strategy (£250k)** This review is focused on the level of return the Council receives on its current investments with an aim to increase this by £250k. Further details on this proposal can be found in the investment strategy paper.

3. Description of service and proposal
Blue Badge Administration Fee (£24k) This proposal is to charge £10 per Disabled Peron's Blue Badge issued. This would cover the cost of the badge (£4.60) and some of the administration costs.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
None of these proposals would impact upon staff, voluntary sector or other council services. **Schools SLA** There is expected to be a 0.1% impact on schools budget. **Council Tax Collection** Reshaping of correspondence with residents over council tax reminders. **Investment Strategy** No impact. **Blue Badge Administration Fee** The customer would have to pay a £10 fee each time they renewed their badge. There are 7,200 Blue Badges in use. The renewal cycle is every 3 years. There would be no staff impact.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
The key risk is that we fail to meet income targets as a result of a drop in service demand or other factors such as economic climate, legislation or changes to government funding. Analysis has been undertaken to model potential impacts to mitigate this risk and a project board has been established to keep oversight on the impact of the changes.

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	**YES**		**NO**	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
School SLA The Council has power to provide these services to schools and there are no specific legal implications save those set out in the general legal implications **Council Tax Collection** There are no specific legal implications for this proposal. **Investment Strategy** Full legal requirements are set out in the financial strategy. **Blue Badge** The Blue Badge (Disabled Persons' Parking) Scheme was introduced in 1971 under Section 21 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 ('the 1970 Act'). The regulations governing the Blue Badge scheme (The Disabled Persons (Badges for Motor vehicles) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2007 provide local authorities with the discretion to charge a fee on the issue of badge. This fee cannot exceed £10. (This savings proposal is accordingly compliant with statutory provisions.) Local authorities should note that only successful applicants should be asked to pay the badge issue fee. The fee may also be charged if badge holders request replacements for badges that have been reported as lost or stolen or because they are not clearly legible or have been damaged.

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?		No

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

Appendix 1 Section H – Enforcement & Regulation

H1: Restructuring of enforcement & regulatory services

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
800	0	0	800

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
A range of services have been considered to sit within a number of hubs: The first stage of the review has been to develop a model which will allow synergies between services and management savings to be achieved. The model has identified the following groupings of services: • Managing the public realm hub – this will include existing cleansing, waste management and green scene functions together with the clean streets enforcement function and the street markets service which were previously managed as part of the environmental health and trading standards functions respectively. • Community and health protection hub – this will combine the current community safety/anti-social behaviour functions with licensing of licensed premises, trading standards, and existing environmental health and protection functions. These services are seen as core to health protection as well as community protection. • Built environment hub – the key services which contribute to the development of the built environment in Lewisham are Regeneration and Asset Management and Planning. Building Control, which previously was part of housing enforcement functions, has been combined with Regeneration and Asset Management. In addition, aspects of Environmental Protection may appropriately be combined with other functions within the Planning Service. Following this model a restructure of services within the Community and Health protection hub is proposed.

3. Description of service and proposal
Saving proposal description
A restructure of all service areas within the community and health protection hub is proposed. A reduction of staffing and a change in roles will be required, with ensuring that staff in the new structure have the appropriate training and skills to deliver across a number of activities.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
There will be an impact in relation to the following: • ability to cover all aspects of current roles and activities of these service areas. • A reduction in the Councils ability to provide provision other than on a reactive and intelligence based / risk based model. • A reduction in staff numbers
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
A revision of the Councils enforcement policy will be undertaken to provide clarity of role and requirements. Appropriate training for roles in the new structure will be supported by the Council.

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

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

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

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

	Scale 1 – 2	**Scale 3 – 5**	**Scale 6 - SO2**	**PO1 – PO5**	**PO6 – PO8**	**SMG1 – SMG3**	**JNC**
FTE	0	3	5.2	54	2	2	0
Head Count	0	3	6	54	2	2	0

7. Human Resources							
Vacant*	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Vacant**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vacant***	0	0	1	2.4	0	0	0

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:** 36		**Male:** 36	
Ethnicity:	**BME:** 17	**White:** 49	**Other:** 3	**Not Known:** 3
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:** 28		**Not Known:** 44	

Appendix 1 Section I – Corporate and Management Overheads

I1: Reduction in corporate management and professional support services

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

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

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

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	**(Y)**	**HRA**	**(N)**
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
Approximately £77,000 of the base budget identified covers DSG.				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Finance – a statutory accounting function; financial, business and management accounting advice to management as well as a payroll and pension function.

- Legal Services – legal advice and representation in all Council matters including social care; contracts; education; employment law; property; planning; environment; prosecutions; debt recovery; and governance; for internal clients.

- Audit & Risk – responsible for the Council's corporate internal audit, counter fraud, insurance, risk management and health & safety arrangements. It provides assurances on and contributes to the safe, efficient and effective delivery of Council's Services, acting as an agent to challenge where the need and opportunity for improvement is identified.

- IMT Division – Information Management and Technology (IM&T) services. This includes the client role and system support for all major contracts for corporate technology and all larger "line-of-business" systems. It also includes provision of print services, records management services for Social Care, telephony, remote and mobile technologies. The service also provides all information management services, including management of FOI, Data Protection, information risk management and ICT security.

3. Description of service and proposal
• Human Resources – The division commissions approximately 2,000 training places. Some 50% of these are aimed at employees in the private and voluntary sector. The programmes include: health and safety, leadership, safeguarding, and technical social care training.
Saving proposal description
Direct and Indirect costs of governance (Saving £120k) and Membership of LGA and London Councils (Saving £20k) The Council's basic governance will not change over the next four years. The Council's governance enables public decisions to be made in an open and accountable manner by elected politicians who themselves are accountable to the public at election and between elections. The Council's governance model, since 2002, is comprised of a Directly Elected Mayor and an elected Council of 54 members. The model also now includes the cost of functioning for the 18 local assemblies (some £0.3m). These local assemblies have become critical for the development of councillors' roles in their wards. Additionally a small budget of some £0.1m is dedicated to supporting the Young Mayor programme. There are no proposals for budget savings in respect of the direct costs of corporate governance. However, a proposal is included that incorporates savings from more efficient means of supporting the business management of the Council, the office of the Mayor & Cabinet, as well as the Scrutiny function (some £40,000 in each area producing an aggregate saving of £120,000, from a combined budget of just over £1m). In addition, efficiencies made by the local government bodies to which the Council is in membership enables a saving of £20,000 to be made in this area. **Corporate management (direct cost savings of £190k; and support service costs of £160k)** The purpose of corporate management is to ensure that the Mayor and Council receive the best professional advice; that services are effectively designed and efficiently secured; that the organisation as a whole operates in a directed, coordinated and coherent fashion; that local partnerships function effectively; and that the Mayor and Council are assured that the Council's duties are performed adequately and that agreed policy priorities are delivered. What's more corporate management is not a layer of managerial coordination, but a capacity to generate and implement agreed changes. It is crucial that the Council maintains an effective corporate management capability and already there is evidence that, in some areas, the Council's corporate managers are over-stretched. The Council has a moderate sized executive management team and a reasonable number of senior staff on JNC terms and conditions (i.e. Heads of Service, Directors and Executive Directors). That noted, we will need to reduce our senior management staffing numbers. We consider that a 5 per cent efficiency saving should be made in this area (equivalent to £190,000) for 2015-16 prior to any further transformation of the Council's management arrangements. Secretariat functions will be re-organised and managed in a more streamlined way to achieve the proposed savings (equivalent to £160,000). New working arrangements will impact on the way work is managed and the level of support available across directorates. **Policy, Performance, Service Review and Intelligence – saving £900k** The functions include the policy development, performance monitoring , service review, consultation and research & intelligence capacity of the organisation. The savings proposal represents around 50 per cent savings on the salaries spend across the identified activities currently located in Laurence House. Opportunities to remodel the function have been evaluated and proposals will be brought forward for staff consultation to effect a significant reduction in salaries costs. The functions exist across the respective directorates in a fairly inconsistent and uneven manner. By reflecting further on the purpose of these activities and their grouping there is the potential to streamline activities and reduce the potential for duplication. **Commissioning – saving £260k** The proposed review of strategy and commissioning activities across the Council is expected to deliver savings in the region of £260k. This is a small (5 per cent) efficiency saving, although it needs to be recognised that this activity rests

3. Description of service and proposal

on the overall cost of service purchased at some £300m and it is in this area that the bulk of supply costs will be reduced. Staffing support is currently fragmented across a range of service areas. A review is underway to make an immediate salaries savings whilst working towards a new model better co-ordinating and streamlining activities for future delivery of this important function.

Corporate Communications – saving £50k

A review of the Council's corporate communications function is expected to deliver a budget saving of some £50k (on overall spend of some £770k) for 2015/16.

Professional Services – Saving £390k

The Finance Division has recently concluded a staffing re-organisation in order to achieve savings of £600k and the new structure has had some budget flexibility built into it particularly to provide for senior level support arising from capacity risks. This together with a consolidation and review of non salaried budgets following the restructure has identified that a saving of £150k is achievable.

The Legal Services Division saving of £50k will be achieved through a review of the staffing structure and the deletion of a post.

The Audit & Risk Division saving of £90k will be achieved by the release of budget currently used to fund additional Health & Safety support on specific tasks which will be absorbed by the permanent team and a review of the Anti-Fraud and Corruption Team priorities to coincide with the transfer of Benefit Investigators to the Department for Work and Pensions on the 1 April 2015.

The IMT Division saving of £50k will be achieved through a review of the Council's landline and mobile phone budgets. Costs on these have reduced particularly as a result of the recent mobile contract retender however capturing the minor amounts of savings arising has been difficult as these relatively small budgets have been spread Council wide. It is proposed to centralise these budgets and thereby capture these savings.

HR Division saving of £50k will be achieved through a review of the training courses. This will identify whether some courses can either be stopped or provision reduced or be configured and delivered in a different way and focus on ensuring that the Council only provides the more strategically important training.

Summary of proposals

Service Area		
Direct and indirect costs of governance	**£120,000**	**1. Member allowances** **2. Members direct support (IT and training)** **3. Members support (business, scrutiny and the Mayor's office)** **4. Local Assemblies** **5. Young Mayor's Team**
Membership of the LGA and London Councils	**£20,000**	**1. Local Government Association** **2. London Councils**
Direct and support costs of corporate management	**£190,000** **£160,000**	**1. Chief Executive, Executive Management Team and Heads of Service** **2. Administrative and Executive Offices Secretariat Support**
Performance and strategy	**£260,000**	**1. Strategy, Commissioning and Performance**

3. Description of service and proposal		
	£900,000	2. Policy and Performance
Core corporate functions	£50,000	Corporate Communications (digital)
Professional Services	£390,000	Legal Services, Information, Management & Technology, Finance and Human Resources
TOTAL	£2,090,000	

5. Impact of proposal

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

The savings proposal for £120k on member related services breaks down as follows: £40k Business & Committee (responsible for council business & committees, civic events, educational appeals, international partnerships); £40k on scrutiny (responsible for OSC , six select committees and member development); and £40k on the Mayor's office (responsible for support to the Mayor & Cabinet, Young Mayor's Team and Lewisham Congress). The savings proposed will marginally impact on staffing and operational budgets. For Business & Committee a vacant post is proposed to be deleted: formerly the post of the political assistant to the Liberal Democrat Group. The Overview & Scrutiny saving is proposed, subject to staff consultation, to be delivered by a reduction in the salaries budget. The Mayor's Office savings are proposed on a simple corresponding efficiency basis.

The £900k savings arising from the policy and performance function will impact significantly (it is a 50 per cent reduction) on the staffing that supports a range of activities including: policy development, performance management, consultation, as well as corporate research & intelligence. Some work in this area will cease and other activities will have to be curtailed. Standards set formerly for a proactive and responsive service will have to be kept under constant review.

Other savings in corporate management and professional services are not anticipated to have a significant impact on the Council's ability to achieve its aims.

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

The modeling of new management arrangements will seek to promote the benefits of a more streamlined approach to the respective work areas. The aim is to eliminate unnecessary specialties and foster more generic capability. A process of prioritisation will be required across all work areas, and though some activities will cease, others will have to be done in a different way and the associated risk to standards of performance will have to be kept under constant review. The pervasive impact of Internet based research and data analytics offers the prospect of doing some policy and performance work more efficiently.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

Main Priority – Most Relevant	Secondary Priority	Corporate Priorities:-
J	J	A. Community Leadership and

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

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

6. Service Equalities Impact						
What is the expected impact on equalities?	High		Medium	☑	Low/ neutral	

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Sexual Orientation:	High	Medium	Low/ Neutral
Gender reassignment	High	Medium	Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
Medium impact arising in relation to policy development and monitoring duties under the Equalities Act 2010.			

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	YES		NO	☑

7. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
Need to maintain statutory commitment in terms of relevant performance returns to Whitehall Departments and the development of, and support for statutory equalities duties (policy development, monitoring & reviews, overall approach to equalities analysis assessments and specific assessments due).

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count		4	15	25	9	3	25

8. Human Resources							
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female: 48		Male: 33	
Ethnicity:	BME: 22	White: 57	Other: 1	Not Known: 1
Disability:	5			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known: Gay / Lesbian – 5 Straight / Heterosexual - 25		Not Known: 51	

Appendix 1 Section J – Schools Effectiveness

J1: Increasing income from Educational Psychologists and Learning Difficulties teams

Increasing Income from Schools SLAs	
Lead officer	Sue Tipler
Directorates affected by proposal	Children and Young People
Portfolio	Children and Young People
Select Committee	Children and Young People
Reference no.	J1
Short summary of proposal	**School Effectiveness Services – Educational Psychologists and Specific Learning Difficulties Teams** This strand is looking at all aspects of services to schools to identify opportunities to increase income (most of which are set out in the income generation strand above). In addition, savings proposals of £751k have been identified through reducing the central funding for Educational Psychologists and through grant substitution from the DSG around the management of our early years function and from the Basic Needs Grant for staff working on the expansion of school places. Currently all Education and Health Care Plans (EHCP) must include 'psychological advice'. The Education Psychologist Team covers costs for supporting EHCPs, a core offer for each school, a traded offer of additional services, plus an amount for management, administration and building capacity case work in schools. The proposal is to trade more of the core service while helping to build capacity in schools. **Use of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and Basic Needs Grant to fund activity** Expenditure on planning school places can be met in the future from the Basic Needs Grant and provision for 2,3, and 4 year old provision in the borough can be met from the Dedicated Schools Grant.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure£000's	**Income£000's**	**Net Budget£000's**
1,420	(282)	1,138

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
751	0	0	751	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	Yes	**HRA**	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
The proposal to increase the income from the Service Level Agreement which will increase the costs for schools which will need to be paid for from the Individual Schools Budget block of the DSG**.**				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
Education Psychology The Education Psychologist Team covers costs for supporting statements, a funded core offer for each school and additional traded services, plus an amount for management, administration and building capacity case work in

3. Description of service and proposal
schools. **Planning School Places** The team provides the project management to meet demand for primary school places expansion across the borough. **Provision for 2,3, and 4 year old provision** This funding forms the support to secure sufficient places within the Local Authority to deliver the entitlement for 3 & 4 years olds and the more recent expansion of places for 2 year olds from disadvantaged families.
Saving proposal description
Education Psychology It is proposed to reduce the amount of funding for Education Psychologist support to a statutory minimum, continuing support for ECHPs. All other activity will become traded. This will result in a saving of £300k either through increased income or reduced staffing, if schools do not take up the offer. **Place Planning** The project management costs of the school place planning team are currently provided for within the General Fund budget. It is now proposed to charge costs against the basic need capital grant allocation for the delivery of additional school places. The costs proposed are £200k. **2, 3, and 4 year old child care places** The costs of ensuring a sufficient provision for 2, 3, and 4 year old child care places in the borough are provided for within the General Fund with an estimated cost of £251k. The government allocates grant for the funding of free entitlement processes and managing the two year old scheme through the Dedicated Schools Grant. It is now proposed to fund this general fund expenditure through the early years grant allocation within the DSG.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
The proposals will give greater choice to schools with regard to the Education Psychology services they require. Those services that are not valued by schools will decline while the services that schools value will grow. This may impact on the number of staff employed in different areas. The charging of place planning project management costs to the basic need grant will have the effect of reducing the capital funds available for the delivery of additional places. The funding of early years responsibilities through the DSG can be done with no impact on the service delivered.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Schools do not take up the Education Psychologists offer and support for Special Education Needs reduces. This will be mitigated through monitoring of school performance. There is a risk that the Dedicated Schools Grant conditions in the future may preclude these free entitlement management costs being met from the grant.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:		
Main Priority – Most Relevant	**Secondary Priority**	**Corporate Priorities:-** **A. Community Leadership and empowerment** **B. Young people's achievement and involvement**
B	**G.**	
Impact of saving on corporate	**Impact of saving on corporate**	

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
X

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

7. Human Resources	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Potentially if schools do not take up traded offer.

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information

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

Appendix 1 Section K – Crime Reduction

K1: Retendering & targeted reduction in Drug & Alcohol services

Retendering and Targeted Reduction in Drug and Alcohol Services.	
Lead officer	Geeta Subramanian-Mooney
Directorates affected by proposal	Community Service, Customer services, CYP
Portfolio	Community Safety
Select Committee	Healthier Communities
Reference no.	K1
Short summary of proposal	The current drug and alcohol treatment system in Lewisham is currently performing well with a range of outcome measures consistently amongst the best in London. In order to build on this success while delivering savings we will be tendering a number of services to increase efficiencies while reducing and targeting provision such as residential rehabilitation.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: 5,688 Public Health (PH) Main Grant Allocation 2014-15: 4,900 Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Funding: 511 LBL: 277		
Expenditure£000's	**Income£000's**	**Net Budget£000's**
5,688	(5,411)	277

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
574	30	0	604	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	No	**HRA**	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The Prevention and Inclusion service within LB Lewisham currently deliver and commission a range of services to meet the needs of those with a drug and/or alcohol problem and to reduce harm to society as a whole. The team works to align with the ambition of both Public Health England and the Government's Drug Strategy to increase the number of individuals recovering from addiction. It works to reduce drug and alcohol related offending as it is well demonstrated that cessation of drug use reduces re-offending significantly. This in turn will have benefits to a range of wider services and will address those who cause the most harm in local communities. The National Drug Strategy 2010 puts a key focus on recovery. Whilst recognising that recovering from dependent substance misuse is an individual person-centred journey, there are high aspirations for increasing recovery outcomes. Drug and alcohol recovery systems are increasingly being geared towards the achievement of the following outcomes • Freedom from dependence on drugs or alcohol • Prevention of drug related deaths and blood borne viruses • A reduction in crime and re-offending

3. Description of service and proposal
• Sustained employment • The ability to access and sustain suitable accommodation • Improvement in mental and physical health and wellbeing • Improved relationships with family members, partners and friends • The capacity to be an effective and caring parent The services being reviewed as part of this work include: • All drug and alcohol treatment services in the borough including substitute medication prescribing and residential treatment services for ages 10 years upwards • Borough-wide training and awareness raising function relating to drug and alcohol abuse including workforce development and work in schools • Prevention campaigns
Saving proposal description
1. Revitalising and improving the shared care arrangements (GP services) including a new approach to alcohol services - £250k 2. Refocusing our work with young people to more efficiently meet their needs – redesign to realise savings elsewhere 3. Contract efficiencies - £100k 4. Targeting of tier 4 residential services - £150K 5. Reduction of service user involvement funding - £40K 6. Restructure of the team - £64K (split over 15/16 & 16/17)

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
• Reduction in some levels of the service such as residential rehab beds – we may need to increase the threshold for service to accommodate this. • Despite lower levels of investment, the current treatment system is providing the best outcomes and the best value for money of the comparator boroughs. Value for money is calculated by amount invested divided by number of successful completions – reductions in funding have the potential to impact on this performance. It is important that we maintain this current level of performance around successful completions as this is due to become one of the three 'health premium' indicators in 2015/16 which **will attract funding** from Public Health England. • Provision in some GP surgeries will be reduced to ensure that all services have sufficient capacity and expertise to meet the needs of clients in Lewisham.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
• **Reduction in level of service available in some areas (e.g. residential rehab):** Mitigated through a detailed and thorough service re design – including service users – to target services at those most in need and make innovative use of alternative provision • **Service disruption during reconfiguration may impact on outcomes:** Mitigated through on-going contract monitoring and robust performance management running alongside re-commissioning process • **Match funding implications for Drugs Intervention Programme (match funding required to obtain funding from MOPAC**: Mitigated through regular review and dialogue • **Changes in Probation may add demand and need into the system on a statutory basis:** Mitigated through frequent dialogue and flagging of issues with MOJ and MOPAC

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

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage	
All Wards :	If individual Wards, please state:
All	Not yet clear – it is proposed that the refocusing of work with GPs will mean that some provision is not available in all services. It is unclear exactly which surgeries will not be providing these services but we will ensure there is an equitable geographic spread.

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

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

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

In general it is expected that the new treatment system will have a positive impact across all equalities strands by bringing more services into non-stigmatising settings and reducing the need to access a single service offer that can hamper engagement. However, there are a number of areas which require attention including access for women with children, ensuring that the services reach out to BME communities and that DDA requirements are met at all services.

Generally, given the likely nature of the service users – EAA assessments will be required to be worked in to the proposals in more depth.

In relation to the restructure of the team, the general employment legal implications will apply and the Council's Management of Change Guidelines.

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

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

Is staff consultation required (Y/N)	Yes	Is public consultation required (Y/N)?	No – service users and stakeholder consultations already undertaken.

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE			1	14	1	1	
Head Count			1	14	1	1	
Vacant*							
Vacant**				1			
Vacant***			0	0	0	0	

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female: 10		Male: 5	
Ethnicity:	BME: 7	White: 7	Other: 1	Not Known: 0
Disability:	1			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known: 5		Not Known: 10	

K2: YOS reorganisation, changes in interventions & reduction in contracts

YOS reorganisation, Changes in Interventions Delivered and a Reduction in Contracts	
Lead officer	Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney
Directorates affected by proposal	Community Services
Portfolio	Community Safety
Select Committee	Children & Young People
Reference no.	K2
Short summary of proposal	Lewisham YOS will be making the following savings: • Reduction in general overhead costs • Reduction in reparation projects • Reduction in externally funded programmes • Deletion of staff post

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: 1,591.2		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
1,636.1	(44.9)	1,591.2

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
200	0	0	200

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	No	**HRA**	**No**
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				

3. Description of service and proposal

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

Youth Offending Teams have been in operation since 1998 and have delivered positive results in reducing offending and re-offending by children and young people under the age of 18. Lewisham YOS is a high performing team (HMIP 2012) and are currently rated green for all three performance indicators including re-offending where in the last quarter the reduction was the largest in London.

Lewisham YOS is responsible for a range of services to the public and a wide range of stakeholders including:

- Prevention and diversion in collaboration with other children's services and directly at the police station
- The delivery of interventions for out of court disposals (Triage, Youth Cautions, Out of Court Disposals and Youth Conditional Cautions)
- Court duty at Bromley Youth Court. Attendance at Crown Courts for sentencing
- Assessment, Planning, Intervention and Supervision for children and young people subject to court orders according to National standards for Youth Justice 2012.
- A service to all victims of youth crime including restorative justice.
- Parenting interventions aimed at supporting parents and carers to prevent their children re-offending . and working alongside other Family support services.
- Sentence Planning and resettlement services for those young people who receive custodial sentences to reduce the negative impact of incarceration and improving resettlement pathways such as accommodation and education.
- Working in the custodial establishment. Undertaking LAC assessments for Remanded Young people.
- A range of evidence based interventions to change behaviour (CBT, Family approaches, group work interventions aimed at tackling particular offences e.g. knife crime)
- Specialist Forensic Mental health and Drug and Alcohol service

3. Description of service and proposal
Saving proposal description
Lewisham YOS are proposing £200,000. This level of savings is being proposed from the core budget as external funding via the YJB grant is unpredictable and may fall in future years in line with local reductions. The YJB contribution to remand costs is unlikely to be sustained as full responsibility of commissioning remand beds is transferred to the local authority. This budget pressure remains a concern. Savings will be met through the following: **£15,000 Reduction in general overhead costs** This will be achieved through a move to a paperless office, and through streamlining of processes. This work programme has commenced with full implementation for 1st April 2015. **£40,000 Reduction in reparation projects** Externally funded programmes will cease to be funded. **£100,642 Reduction in externally funded programmes and contracts** Re- negotiation of contracts including the Appropriate Adult Service with Catch 22 and cease to deliver a range of external programmes including Arts activities, employment and training programmes and targeted intervention. Interventions will be developed by existing staff and will be delivered by staff across the team, in line with their revised JDs following the 2013 restructure. **£42,500 Deletion of 1 vacant post in the YOS**

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Whilst overall cases have decreased over time (due to the triage provision-diverting young people out of the criminal justice system) the proportion of medium and high risk have remained level. Risk is measured through both static (type of offences) and variable (Education / mental health status) factors as assessed by the YOS officer. Risk is fluid and can and does change. Vulnerability has seen an increase in scores of 2 and 3 (on a scale from 0-4). Vulnerability is measured against a range of criteria including self-harm/ feelings of depression. Lewisham YOS has seen a steady decline in the number of first time entrants since 2009. The Triage initiative has helped divert low level offenders from receiving a criminal conviction and has reduced the number of young people coming in to the service. It is unlikely that the decline will be maintained and there is evidence of leveling of new entrants. Taking this into account, staff will be required to absorb the work of the deleted posts with additional cases to manage, plus additional duties such as running groups, delivering early intervention and wrap around family support. The service will have to stop the delivery of certain aspects of the service, referring young people to partner agencies.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
In order to manage the risks posed by the savings, we will increase focus on management oversight and reduce the amount of time that Operational Managers and Senior Practitioners are allocating to work with delivery partners, we will be streamlining service meetings and increasing office based time. There will be increased focus on Quality

4. Impact of proposal
Assurance in line with the anticipated HMIP inspection. Young people will not be able to attend the diverse range of programmes that are currently in existence which will be tailored to their offending behaviour. Instead, young people will attend more generic programmes which will aim to address their needs. Overhead costs will be reduced through the introduction of a paper free office. Discussions with the CPS and Courts are taking place to ensure that we comply with legislative requirements.

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:		Medium	
Gender:		Medium	
Age:		Medium	
Disability:		Medium	
Religion/Belief:			Low
Pregnancy/Maternity		Medium	Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships		Medium	Neutral
Sexual Orientation:		Medium	Neutral
Gender reassignment		Medium	Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
The YOS works with a high number of young people who are from disadvantaged backgrounds, many of whom are also from BAME backgrounds. Young men make up 80% of the cohort. Therefore any cuts are likely to affect young BAME boys more than other groups of individuals.			

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:
We will aim to address this through the development and delivery of a targeted in house programme aimed at reducing the reoffending of BAME boys. An EAA assessment will be required. Any variation to existing contracts can only be by agreement between the parties although there is a right of voluntary termination if the parties cannot agree to necessary changes.

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
Staff consultation will be required for changes to the current structure. Any changes/ ceasing of contracts will need to give appropriate notice to providers.

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

	Scale 1 – 2	**Scale 3 – 5**	**Scale 6 - SO2**	**PO1 – PO5**	**PO6 – PO8**	**SMG1 – SMG3**	**JNC**
FTE		3	6	25	3	1	
Head Count		3	6	25	3	1	
Vacant*			1	2			
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:** 27		**Male:** 11	
Ethnicity:	**BME:** 20	**White:** 13	**Other:** 2	**Not Known:** 3
Disability:	1			
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:** 6		**Not Known:** 32	

K3: Reduction in funding for Integrated Offender Management service

Reduction in Funding for Integrated Offender Management Service	
Lead officer	Geeta Subramanian-Mooney
Directorates affected by proposal	Community Service, Customer services, CYP
Portfolio	Community Safety
Select Committee	Safer Stronger
Reference no.	K3
Short summary of proposal	Ending of the case management element of the borough's Integrated Offender managen service.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: 277 Public Health (PH) Main Grant Allocation 2014-15: 4,900 Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Funding: 511 LBL: 277		
Expenditure£000's	**Income£000's**	**Net Budget£000's**
5,688	(5,411)	277

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
200	0	0	200	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	No	**HRA**	**No**
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The Prevention and Inclusion service within LB Lewisham currently deliver and commission a range of services to meet the needs of those with a drug and/or alcohol problem and to reduce harm to society as a whole. The team works to align with the ambition of both Public Health England and the Government's Drug Strategy to increase the number of individuals recovering from addiction. It works to reduce drug and alcohol related offending as it is well demonstrated that cessation of drug use reduces re-offending significantly. This in turn will have benefits to a range of wider services and will address those who cause the most harm in local communities. The National Drug Strategy 2010 puts a key focus on recovery. Whilst recognising that recovering from dependent substance misuse is an individual person-centred journey, there are high aspirations for increasing recovery outcomes. Drug and alcohol recovery systems are increasingly being geared towards the achievement of the following outcomes • Freedom from dependence on drugs or alcohol • Prevention of drug related deaths and blood borne viruses • A reduction in crime and re-offending • Sustained employment • The ability to access and sustain suitable accommodation • Improvement in mental and physical health and wellbeing

3. Description of service and proposal
• Improved relationships with family members, partners and friends • The capacity to be an effective and caring parent The team seeks to meet some of these outcomes through the commissioning of an Integrated Offender Management (IOM) service which seeks to identify drug using offenders in the criminal justice system and then provide additional support to help them engage with drug treatment services. It is this IOM service that is the subject of this proposal.
Saving proposal description
The proposal is to withdraw funding from the case management/support element of the IOM service. This means that although individuals with a treatment need will still be identified in the criminal justice system there will be no additional support to assist to help them engage. There is no statutory requirement to have an Integrated Management of Offender Service. It forms part of the Home Office and Ministry of Justice strategy to prevent crime and reduce reoffending. It provides a degree of control by multi agency providers including local government over offenders who are at a high risk of reoffending, even when they are not subject to statutory supervision. Proposals for changes to this service are being put forward at national level to provide support through other organisations to be set up as part of the national Transforming Justice changes.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Those who are involved in the criminal justice system are notoriously difficult to engage in drug/alcohol treatment services. Without additional support this engagement is even less likely which means that their criminal activity is likely to continue with all the associated impacts on other Lewisham residents.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
This work is to be delivered via the new Probation and Community Rehabilitation Companies through the Transforming Justice changes for managing adult offenders. It is still unclear as to the service offer/ delivery models and therefore impact of these changes overall. We are working closing with the Ministry of Justice, The Mayors Office for Policing and Crime and our local leads for this area to ensure that we input into the redevelopments and future planning in this area.

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

Impact on Corporate Priorities:						
						equity

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:		Medium	
Gender:		Medium	
Age:		Medium	
Disability:			Low/ Neutral
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/ Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/ Neutral
Sexual Orientation:			Low/ Neutral
Gender reassignment			Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
Generally the impact of the service will be on those who would otherwise receive it. As young men from BME communities are over represented in the criminal justice system the impact there is likely to be increased. There is also a general impact on those who are victims of crime and the same group are again over represented.			

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
This will require notice and ending of a contractual arrangement.

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

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

7. Human Resources							
(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)							
	Scale 1 – 2	Scale 3 – 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

Appendix 1 Section L – Culture & Community Services

L1: Review of main voluntary & community service grants programme

Review of Main VCS Grants Programme	
Lead officer	Liz Dart
Directorates affected by proposal	Community Services
Portfolio	Third Sector and Community
Select Committee	Safer Stronger
Reference no.	L1
Short summary of proposal	Review of main VCS grants programme. A new set of priority themes and criteria for the main grants programme are currently being consulted on. The consultation includes a proposal to reduce the grants budget by up to £1.5m

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: 5889.4		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
5,955.4	(66.0)	5,889.4

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
1,125	375	0	1500

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The current main grants programme was agreed by Mayor and Cabinet Contracts in July 2011. Funding was awarded for two and a half years from October 2011 to the end of March 2014 to 73 organisations. Funding was provided over four themes; Children and Young People, Building Social Capital, Gateway Services including Advice and Communities that Care. An extension to the programme for a further year was agreed in December 2013 taking the current funding to 31 March 2015. In addition to the £5.9 million grants budget Lewisham Council has contracts to a value of over £20 million with voluntary and community sector organisations to provide a wide range of services. These include youth activities, children's centres, supported housing and public health initiatives. The types of organisations that Lewisham is contracting with ranges from large national charities to small local community based organisations.
Saving proposal description
Officers have reviewed the criteria that were used for the programme in 2011 taking into account changes in local and national policy and the changing needs and priorities in Lewisham. In establishing the priority themes for the grants programme they have considered: • The level of need locally • The contribution the third sector can make to meeting the priority • The availability of other sources of funding locally The proposed programme themes are: 1. Strong and Cohesive Communities 2. Communities that Care 3. Access to Advice

3. Description of service and proposal
4. Widening access to Arts and Sports Consultation on the proposed criteria, application process and indicative saving level opened on 30th July and closes on 29th October. A report will be going to Safer Stronger Select Committee and Mayor and Cabinet in November 2014 seeking approval to open the new programme to applications. The deadline for applications is proposed as 4th Feb with draft recommendation reports and 3 month notice of change to current grants where applicable being issued by 30th March 2015. The draft recommendations and any appeals will be presented to Mayor and Cabinet Contracts in April 2015 for decision and new grants will commence from 1st July 2015.

4. Impact of proposal			
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:			
The level of reduction proposed is likely to lead to some organisations losing significant levels of funding. This could mean the closure of some groups and the loss of some services that are no longer deemed to be a priority. However the remaining grants budget will be able to provide a good range of VCS support ensuring that the sector is able to remain an active partner in meeting the needs of Lewisham residents.			
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.			
1	Legal challenge – risk of JR's from VCS organisations losing funding.	Careful design of process, appropriate consultation, consideration of equalities impact	
2	Slippage – ensuring that information presented to members at each stage of process is complete enough to enable decisions to be taken.	Careful programme management to ensure preparation done at every stage. Engage with members early to ascertain areas of concern and address them. Issue notice to all funded organisations prior to April decisions to meet 3 month compact obligation.	
3	Capacity – open process could bring large volumes of applications	Not possible to extend assessment period without further delays to saving implementation so extra capacity may need to be identified.	

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

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:			Low/ Neutral
Gender:			Low/ Neutral
Age:		Medium	
Disability:			Low/ Neutral
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/ Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/ Neutral
Sexual Orientation:			Low/ Neutral
Gender reassignment			Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
The proposed new programme does not include a dedicated Children and Young People theme although organisations delivering services for CYP will be able to apply to other themes where their activity meets those theme criteria. In all other areas services are likely to be provided but this will only be known once final decisions on the applications have been made.			

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	**Yes**			

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
The giving of grants to voluntary organisations is discretionary. The Council must act reasonably in relation to funding decisions taking into account only relevant considerations and disregarding irrelevancies. Regard has to be had to the outcome of the consultation upon the new proposed criteria for eligibility for grant funding. Generally, given the likely nature of the residents that benefit from the services – EAA assessments will be required to be worked in to the proposals in more depth.

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

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

7. Human Resources							
(covered by council employee) *(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)							
	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

L2: Libraries staff reorganisation

Libraries Staff Reorganisation	
Lead officer	Liz Dart
Directorates affected by proposal	Community Services
Portfolio	Third Sector & Community
Select Committee	Safer Stronger
Reference no.	L2
Short summary of proposal	Libraries staff reorganisation

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: £4,459.6		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
5,000.7	(541.1)	4,459.6

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
280	0	0	280	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	**No**	**HRA**	**No**
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The libraries service consists of 7 directly provided libraries and 6 community libraries delivered in partnership with voluntary sector organisations. This saving proposal relates to the staffing provision within the libraries service. Staff salaries represent 84% of the service budget.
Saving proposal description
The libraries service underwent a significant reorganisation in 2011/12 with the introduction of community libraries and a new way of working for the service. This new model is now well embedded and allows the service to look again at its capacity to seek further efficiencies. It is proposed to make a saving of £280k from the libraries salaries budget through a staff reorganisation while ensuring that duties are being carried out at the most cost effective level.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
The proposal is not intended to affect numbers of libraries or opening hours and should have a limited impact on service users.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
There is a risk of a reduction in the quality of service through the loss of 'professional' capacity. The new structure will need to ensure that remaining posts are deployed effectively and that roles are carefully designed to ensure that tasks are carried out at the appropriate level.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			**No**	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
The general employment legal implications will apply and the Council's Management of Change Guidelines.

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE	29.31	33.51	5.22	22	0	1	0
Head Count	89	43	10	22	0	1	0
Vacant*	0.6	0.2	0.6	2	nil	nil	nil
Vacant**	1	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Vacant***	nil	3	0.04	nil	nil	nil	nil

Workforce Profile Information

Gender:	Female: 80		**Male:** 61	
Ethnicity:	**BME:** 48	**White:** 81	**Other:** 3	**Not Known:** 9
Disability:	7 disabled, 134 not disabled			
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:** 29 straight/heterosexual		**Not Known:** 112	

Appendix 1 Section M – Housing & non-HRA funded services

M1: Transfer of non housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund

Transfer of Non-Housing Stock from the HRA to the General Fund	
Lead Officer	Genevieve Macklin/Tim Thompson
Directorates Affected By Proposal	Customer Services/Resources and Regeneration
Portfolio	Housing / Growth and Regeneration
Select Committee	Housing
Reference Number	M1
Short Summary Of Proposal	Transfer of non-Housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund

1. Financial Information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000s)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
13,700	(10,900)	2,800

2. Value Of Proposals Per Year (£000s)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
700	200	100	1,000

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

If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe this impact below:

As above, it is proposed to transfer non-Housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund, thus providing an income stream to the General Fund. It will also reduce the amount of debt in the HRA, enabling further investment in existing or new stock.

3. Description Of Service And Proposal

Description Of The Service, Functions Or Activities Which Are Being Reviewed:

Non-housing stock (e.g. garages and commercial properties) is currently accounted for in the HRA. The proposal is to transfer the income and running costs to the General Fund. This brings the current surplus generated into the General Fund and will, as a part of the Council's commercial asset stock, offer opportunities to :

- Develop a consistent approach to the use of Council assets - operational and commercial estates, no 'grey'.
- Introduce a new Asset Management Plan and AM system / governance arrangements to strengthen the corporate decision-making processes.
- Generate increased income, based on up-to-date market rates, better use of properties and effective rent collection
- Better align the commercial estate with corporate service delivery priorities.
- Drive transparency.

Saving Proposal Description:

To transfer the management of the Council's non-Housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund, which would deliver a saving of £1,00k over 3 years. £0.7m of the saving will be attributed to the Housing budget savings target in 2015/16 and will be achieved by changing how the council account's for the stock.

The savings of £0.3m, attributable to Resources and Regeneration will be achieved by the following:

Optimise the Commercial Estate – Remove the 'Grey' estate (& effectively increase the 'Commercial' estate);
Review of Commercial Estate to Increase Market Rentals to Increase Income;
Improvements in the debt recovery of the commercial estate rent roll;
Transfer of the Non-housing / Commercial assets into the General Fund (from the Housing Revenue Account);
Optimisation of the transferred HRA non-housing stock;
Optimising the Commercial Estate – moving the Voluntary & Community Sector organisations into more appropriate

assets (reduce the opportunity cost of them occupying potentially expensive / valuable retail units);
Advertising income from both on and off highways.

4. Impact Of Proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other Council services:
An initial financial analysis has indicated that the income generated as a result of transferring non-Housing stock (i.e. garages and commercial properties) to the General Fund would exceed the running and financing costs of these assets (this estimated surplus includes assumptions for a reduction in stock where garage sites have been identified for potential infill development and commercial properties are not viable or easily transferable e.g. where they form part of a residential block). This proposal would therefore deliver a saving of £1,000k via this surplus and improved portfolio management. Housing's proportion of the saving has been set at £700k. The additional £300k sits with the Commercial Assets team in Resources and Regeneration . The proposal also reduces the amount of debt in the HRA, thus increasing borrowing capacity to invest in new or existing housing. The intention is now that the transfer of these assets will be undertaken in autumn 2014, rather than the following financial year as planned. Part of the savings achieved from this transfer will then be used to offset the current budget pressure (£230k) within Housing Needs as a result of the delayed restructure, although this same amount will still need to be delivered in 2015/16.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these:
• in relation to either gaining vacant possession and/or putting new commercial leases in place these processes can take a considerable amount of time. • Rent review process can also be protracted particularly if the matter has to be referred to a third party in accordance with the leases. • Resistance from lease holders to the introduction of direct debit payments – resulting in a reduced market for commercial properties; • Lack of training for debt collection team results in poor implementation of the direct debit payments process; • Inconsistent application of approach to introducing direct debit payments for rentals reduces effectiveness; • Reputational issues with regards to advertising on or near the highways (negated by careful selection of advertising content and formats) • Planning policy restricts scope of advertising income • May need additional resources to assist with securing possession of the premises and then re-letting to ensure new revenue streams are derived • the transfer of non housing HRA assets to the GF will mean that this revenue stream will be lost to the HRA; • some commercial properties may prove physically problematic / impossible to divorce from the housing assets once transferred to the GF.

Impact On Corporate Priorities:						
Main Priority – Most Relevant			**Secondary Priority**			**Corporate Priorities:-** **A. Community Leadership & Empowerment** **B. Young People's Achievement & Involvement** **C. Clean, Green & Liveable** **D. Safety, Security & A Visible Presence** **E. Strengthening The Local Economy**
F.						
Impact Of Saving On Corporate Priority			**Impact Of Saving On Corporate Priority**			
Positive						

Level Of Impact			Level Of Impact			F. Decent Homes For All G. Protection Of Children H. Caring For Adults & Older People I. Active, Healthy Citizens J. Inspiring Efficiency, Effectiveness & Equity
High						

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

5. Service Equalities Impact						
What Is The Expected Impact On Equalities?					**Low/Neutral**	

Level Of Impact – State The Level Of Impact On The Protected Characteristics Below:			
Ethnicity			Low/Neutral
Gender			Low/Neutral
Age			Low/Neutral
Disability			Low/Neutral
Religion Or Belief			Low/Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity			Low/Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			Low/Neutral
Sexual Orientation			Low/Neutral
Gender Reassignment			Low/Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic, please explain why and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact:			
N/A			

Is A Full Equalities Analysis Assessment Required?			**No**	

6. Legal
State Any Specific Legal Implications Relating To This Proposal
Counsel's opinion on the transfer is as follows: "In principle, both commercial premises and garages which are let separately from any residential property can be re-appropriated and transferred out of the Council's HRA without the consent of the Secretary of State, on the grounds that they are not a house, part of a house, belonging to a house or enjoyed together with a house. However, the status of each individual property should be verified against those criteria before it is transferred."

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

7. Human Resources							
Will This Saving Proposal Have An Impact On Employees Within The Team? (Y/N)							No
Within This Saving Proposal, Please State The Number Of Posts In The Current Structure By Grade Band (FTE Equivalent, Headcount & Vacant) ***(not covered by Council employee e.g. interim)** **** (covered by Council employee)** ***** (including posts covered by agency – if nil, please state)**							
	Scale 1-2	**Scale 3-5**	**Scale 6-So2**	**Po1-Po5**	**Po6-Po8**	**SMG1-SMG3**	**JNC**
FTE							
Headcount							
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							
Workforce Profile Information							
Gender		**Female:**			**Male:**		
Ethnicity		**BME:**		**White:**		**Other:**	**Not Known:**
Disability							
Sexual Orientation		**Where Known:**			**Not Known:**		

Appendix 1 Section N – Environmental Services

N1: Reduction in maintenance of some small parts, highways & reduced management

Reduction in Maintenance of some Small Parks, Highways and Reduced Management Costs	
Lead officer	Nigel Tyrell
Directorates affected by proposal	Customer Services
Portfolio	Public Realm
Select Committee	Sustainable Development
Reference no.	N1
Short summary of proposal	Green scene 1) Explore the possibility of reducing direct costs by increasing community engagement and involvement in management and maintenance activities in a number of small parks, highways enclosures and closed churchyards. 2) Reduce management and management support costs/ posts

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
4,600	(700)	3,900

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
340	0	0	340

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The Parks and Open Spaces service within Green Scene.
Saving proposal description
1. Increase community and voluntary sector engagement and support to explore the possibility of reducing the costs of maintaining some of the boroughs small parks, highways enclosures and closed churchyards. Work with local community groups, residents, parochial church councils and civic amenity groups to identify potential areas. Explore the potential for community groups to source external funds to support new arrangements (£153 k) 2..Reduce management and management support costs/ posts (3 posts) £188k

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
- Would need a further renegotiation of elements of the Green Space contract which may put additional pressure on it's viability . - Depends on appetite and capacity of local groups to take on extra responsibilities - Possible legal challenge from affected Parochial Church Councils - Reduced maintenance regimes may lead to more visible litter, graffiti and increased fly tipping - Unmaintained footpaths , boundary walls , memorials & trees may become hazardous

4. Impact of proposal
Reduced management structures - Reduced capacity to engage with the community and user groups; - Reduced capacity to deliver existing community engagement projects and schemes . - Reduced capacity and ability to identify and attract new sources of external funding to improve parks and open spaces; - Reduced service development, contract monitoring and commissioning capacity.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Mitigations • Potential to increase community involvement and participation in management & maintenance activities • Parks and open space would remain open . • Individual Parochial Church Councils may be prepared to carry out some of the maintenance of closed church yards • Large parks regeneration projects would continue.

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

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
Council has a duty of care to ensure all land it manages is not the source of a statutory nuisance

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE	1.1	6	10	18	3	1	
Head Count	2	6	10	18	3	1	
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female: 14		Male: 26	
Ethnicity:	BME: 4	White: 36	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:	4			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known: 18		Not Known: 22	

N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequency & management costs

Reduction in Street Cleansing Frequencies and Cleansing Management Costs	
Lead officer	Nigel Tyrell
Directorates affected by proposal	Customer Services
Portfolio	Public Realm
Select Committee	Sustainable Development
Reference no.	N2
Short summary of proposal	Street Management - Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
7,600	(1,600)	6,000

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
400	0	0	400

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
Street sweeping service
Saving proposal description
1. Reduce street sweeping frequencies across the borough. No of posts affected 14 £0.34m - There will be a reduction in the frequencies that we sweep all residential roads which will result in a build up of litter, detritus and weeds. Streets will be unswept for longer periods. 2..Reduce senior management post £0.06m

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
1a. Increase in complaints and customer / residents dissatisfaction with service **1b.** Un-swept streets look unsightly and have an impact on the environment. There would be a heavy build up of litter and detritus. Cleanliness as standards could be significantly reduced. 1c. Possible increase in trips and falls leading to increase in insurance claims. **2.** Council will lose the services of experienced officer
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Possible increase in trips and falls leading to increase in insurance claims. Unswept streets look unsightly and have an impact on the environment. There could be a heavy build up of litter and detritus. Cleanliness as standards would be significantly reduced and the council may be unable to comply with set time frames within Environmental Protection Act .

4. Impact of proposal
Authorities that allow their land to fall below acceptable standards for longer than the allowed response time may be subject to a Litter Abatement Order (section 91) or a Litter Abatement Notice (section 92) issued under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Performance will decline pushing the authority into the bottom quartile. This will be because the work undertaken in high intensity use areas will have to be undertaken as a priority. Areas that are already under performing such as 'Other Highways', 'High and Low Density Housing' and 'Industry', are likely to suffer as a result. A full reorganisation of all sweeping beats in the borough would have to be carried out due to reduction in frequencies.

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

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage	
All Wards :	**If individual Wards, please state:**
All	Will have a larger impact on wards in North of the borough as these sweeping beats were less affected in the last reorganisation of sweeping frequencies.

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

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

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:
Impact will affect all groups equally

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	x

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
Yes – Environmental Protection Act 1990

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE	95.6	35	3	15		1	
Head Count	96	35	3	15		1	
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female: 4		Male: 146	
Ethnicity:	BME: 37	White: 100	Other: 3	Not Known: 10
Disability:	11			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known: 96		Not Known: 54	

Appendix 1 Section O – Public Services

O1: End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme

End the Discretionary Freedom Pass Scheme	
Lead officer	Ralph Wilkinson
Directorates affected by proposal	Customer Services
Portfolio	Resources
Select Committee	Safer Stronger
Reference no.	O1
Short summary of proposal	End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 5.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: Public Services (Benefits)		
Expenditure	**Income**	**Net Budget**
262.273 (253.762)	256.804 (246.789)	5.469 (6.973)

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
200	0	0	200

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The Council issues Freedom Passes (FP) to all residents who meet the national eligibility criteria in relation to age or disability. In addition, discretionary Freedom Passes are issued to those residents who do not meet the national criteria and currently 1,175 people are in receipt of such passes - 75% (or 878 clients) due to mental health difficulties and 25% (397) due to physical disabilities.
Saving proposal description
The proposal is to withdraw the discretionary FP with effect from 1 January 2015. As the cost is based on usage it is difficult to be precise about exactly how much could be saved but estimates suggest the saving would be in excess of £200k pa. Although withdrawing the discretionary FPs will impact on some households, there 2 are alternative schemes that would negate the impact and are at no cost to the Council. **JC+ travel discount card** – This is available to residents who have been unemployed for 3 months and over, received a qualifying benefit or must be working with an advisor for a return to work, they will be able to apply for a concession that gives them half-price travel; **60+ London Oyster card** – This is available to residents who live in a London borough, are over the age of 60 but who do not qualify for a FP and they will qualify fro free travel. A recent sampling of those residents currently receiving a discretionary FP suggested that 68% would qualify for an alternative concession, this being 63% who would qualify for the JC+ travel discount card and 5% for the 60+ London Oyster card. There are 17 London boroughs that have a discretionary FP scheme although some no longer issue any new passes.

The remaining 16 don't have a discretionary FP scheme. Locally, Lambeth withdrew their discretionary scheme in 2012 and Greenwich are reviewing theirs now.
4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Based on sampling 68% would have a change in their entitlement to free travel and 32% would lose their entitlement to free travel. The service is working with the Community Services Directorate to try and establish whether the loss of entitlement to free travel would impact on other services that might increase costs to the Council.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
The saving impacts on other services – this may happen where the withdrawal of the FP means the person becomes reliant on other Council services. To determine if this is likely to be the case a set of sample cases is with the Community Services Directorate for consideration. **The saving is not achieved because it was an estimate** – the saving is based on average usage so should be reasonably accurate. However, charging is done in arrears so there may be an issue with timing where the saving is not achieved in year 1. The timing / charging mechanism is being reviewed and discussed with London Councils who oversee the scheme. **Council reputation** – communications will need to explain the reason for the change in policy. Not all London boroughs offer a discretionary scheme and of those that do some have withdrawn them or are reviewing them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There will be a high impact on persons with a disability as it withdraws their current entitlement to free travel. Sampling shows that 68% of these will be entitled to alternative travel concessions. The remaining 32% will no longer have support. Information will be provided to all about alternatives and most economic ways to use public transport.

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	**Yes**			

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

The savings here being proposed are within the context of "discretionary" expenditure. The issue will therefore be to address the risks within the context of the service users. A full equalities review is needed if the Council is to avoid a successful challenge

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

7. Human Resources

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

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

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

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

Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:**		**Male:**	
Ethnicity:	**BME:**	**White:**	**Other:**	**Not Known:**
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:**	

O2: Reduction in staffing for parking contract client team

Reduction in Staffing for Parking Contract Client Team	
Lead officer	Ralph Wilkinson
Directorates affected by proposal	Customer Services
Portfolio	Resources
Select Committee	Public Accounts
Reference no.	O2
Short summary of proposal	Review Parking Contract Client Team

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure:	**Income £m**	**Net Budget £m**
2,300	(7,200)	(5,100)

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
50	0	0	50	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	No	**HRA**	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The Parking Client Unit monitors the council's parking contract.
Saving proposal description
Deletion of 1 post

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
The contract is now entering it's second year and will no longer be subject to the same level of risk by the time this proposal is implemented. There should be no impact on the effectiveness of the monitoring arrangements by this time. No impact on the management of the contract,
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:		
Main Priority – Most Relevant	**Secondary Priority**	**Corporate Priorities:-** **A. Community Leadership and empowerment** **B. Young people's achievement and involvement**
C.	**D.**	
Impact of saving on corporate	**Impact of saving on corporate**	

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
None

Is staff consultation required (Y/N)	No	Is public consultation required (Y/N)?	No
7. Human Resources			
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?		Yes	
Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)			

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information

Gender:	**Female**: 4		**Male:** 0	
Ethnicity:	**BME:** 3	**White:** 1	**Other:** 0	**Not Known:** 0
Disability:	N/A			
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:** 3		**Not Known:** 1	

O3: Set up an internal 'enforcement agency' to collect Council Tax & other debts

Set up an Internal 'Enforcement Agency' (bailiff) Service to Collect Council Tax and Other Debts	
Lead officer	Ralph Wilkinson
Directorates affected by proposal	Customer Services
Portfolio	Resources
Select Committee	Public Accounts
Reference no.	O3
Short summary of proposal	Set up an internal 'enforcement agency' (bailiff) service to collect Council Tax and other debts. The internal bailiff service will generate income from the statutory fees charged to debtors. The 'saving' is the net surplus income once operational costs have been taken into account.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: Division (Revenues)		
Expenditure	**Income**	**Net Budget**
262.273 (3.553)	256.804 (1.781)	**5.469 (1.771)**

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
400	200	0	600	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	No	**HRA**	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The Revenues Service is responsible for the annual collection of £105m Council Tax, £55m Business Rates, sundry debt and the payments centre. If a Council Tax/Business Rates payer does not pay the Council goes to court and obtains a liability order which allows further enforcement action. The default collection method for these cases is to pass the cases to a bailiff to collect. The Council has contracts with a number bailiff companies to collect the outstanding debt. The bailiff companies do not charge the Council for the service as they generate their income/profit from the fees charged to debtors. The service will also be extended to cover outstanding Parking PCN debt (£3m p.a.)
Saving proposal description
The Tribunal Courts and Enforcement Act 2007, together with the enabling regulations, came into force in April 2014 and brought major changes to the enforcement industry to make it simpler to understand and more transparent. The reforms introduce a new fixed fee regime for debtors and changed the name of bailiffs to enforcement agents. A review of the changes shows that a substantial amount of income will be generated from the new fixed fees which with the current arrangements would become additional profit for the bailiff companies. The saving proposal is to set up an internal 'enforcement agency' (bailiff) service which after taking into account running costs will generate a net surplus income. In addition to generating surplus income the service believes it can improve upon the current bailiff collection rate and provide a more sensitive service when vulnerable debtors are identified.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
A team of enforcement agents and support staff will be recruited to deliver the service that was previously delivered by a contractor. Service users will experience the same or a better level of service as the Council believes it will be better at identifying and dealing with vulnerable cases. There should be no negative impact on the voluntary sector or other services.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
Does not generate the income expected – the proposed income generation is a safe estimate. However, the Council will retain the existing bailiff services for out of borough cases and 'difficult' cases so will be able to revert to external service again at short notice. Staff employed will be on fixed term contracts until the service is confident in its future. Close monitoring of expenditure and income will be carried out throughout the process. **Does not improve Council Tax/Business Rate collection –** even if the new service only collects 20% of the debt referred the objectives of generating income from fees and being more sensitive will be achieved. The enforcement agents recruited will be experienced and currently delivering this type of service elsewhere. If the collection rate is less than 20% the option to revert to external bailiff company at short notice is possible. **Damages council reputation –** the Council is already associated with this type of service by contract. Bringing the service in house under the Council's direct management and introducing a more sensitive approach for vulnerable cases should ensure the Council's reputation is maintained or improved.

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			**No**	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
None (check does TUPE apply?)

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

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

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

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:**		**Male:**	
Ethnicity:	**BME:**	**White:**	**Other:**	**Not Known:**
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:**		**Not Known:**	

Appendix 1 Section P – Planning Service

P1: Restructure of the planning service

Restructure of Planning Service	
Lead officer	John Miller
Directorates affected by proposal	Resources and Regeneration
Portfolio	Planning Service
Select Committee	Sustainable Development
Reference no.	P1
Short summary of proposal	• Restructure of planning service (£128k) to enable us to build flexible, well trained Planning Casework teams that can respond to fluctuations in caseload. • Cutting funding for legal locum to deal with s106 agreements that is no longer required (£51k)

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
3,394	(1,577)	1,817

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
229	0	0	229	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	**No**	**HRA**	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The Planning Service forms part of the Resources and Regeneration Directorate and operates from 3rd Floor Laurence House. The Planning Service currently comprises: Forward Planning, Urban Design and Conservation, Development Management, Land Charges and Economic Development. This saving proposal affects the Development Management area of the Planning Service. *Development Management* deals with individual planning applications within the policy framework set by the development plan, as well as appeals against Council decisions, and enforcement action against unauthorised development. The Planning Service was last re-structured in September 2011 to facilitate a Development Management approach to the handling of planning applications and to integrate the administration functions within the Area teams to reduce fragmentation of the planning application process. The implementation of this vision required a more proactive and delivery focused approach, with more resources needed to be allocated to pre-application discussions with applicants and the local community. Closer and more flexible working was also required between the planning officer, technical support and enforcement functions to enable the service to be more efficient and effective.
Saving proposal description
Savings proposal is split into 2 areas: 1. A staff re-structure that will further embed the principles of Development Management and the recent changes to our "Development" pre-application services. Whenever possible, we will seek to influence the design of

3. Description of service and proposal
potential developments earliest possible stage, so that when an application is submitted it can be determined efficiently based our earlier advice. Applications will be processed effectively by the appropriately graded planning officers. Wherever possible, case officers will be fully responsible for all aspects of the processing of their application. 2. A management re-structure 3. Removal of £51k from the Development Management budget which was used to support a legal locum providing specific Planning advice on the setting up of legal agreements. Funding arrangements for provision of internal legal advice is now recovered via Section 106 Agreements.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
1. Planning Case Officers will have more input and control into the quality and processing timescales of their individual caseloads. A larger percentage of Planning decisions will be issued within published timescales. Residents and other professional bodies will be able to contact their Planning Officer for the majority of aspects of their application. Clearer career paths in place for Planning Service staff. 2. There is no impact on any stakeholders to the removal of the Locum support as internal legal fees will be recovered through Section 106 agreements.
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
No significant risks arise with these proposals.

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

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

5. Service Equalities Impact						
What is the expected impact			**Medium**			

5. Service Equalities Impact						
on equalities?						

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:		Medium	
Gender:			Low/ Neutral
Age:	High		
Disability:			Low/ Neutral
Religion/Belief:			Low/ Neutral
Pregnancy/Maternity:			Low/ Neutral
Marriage & Civil Partnerships:			Low/ Neutral
Sexual Orientation:			Low/ Neutral
Gender reassignment:			Low/ Neutral
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
The re-structure of the Planning Service is likely to impact the older members of the team. The current staff profile has 50% of the workforce aged 41 and over, with 25% aged 51 and over. 38% of the workforce is BME – all graded at PO1 and below.			

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	YES	As this savings proposal has staffing implications, the service will be required to undertake an equalities analysis assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process. This is stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies. As part of their operational business processes, the service will monitor the impact of any staffing implications on service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.

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

This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.

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

7. Human Resources							
(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)							
	Scale 1 - 2	**Scale 3 - 5**	**Scale 6 - SO2**	**PO1 – PO5**	**PO6 – PO8**	**SMG1 – SMG3**	**JNC**
FTE		7	11	21	3.93	1	
Head Count		2	8	17	3	1	
Vacant*		NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL		
Vacant**		4	1	2	NIL		
Vacant***		1	2	2	1		

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	**Female:** 20		**Male:** 17	
Ethnicity:	**BME:** 13	**White:** 22	**Other:** 0	**Not Known:** 2
Disability:	1			
Sexual Orientation:	**Where known:** 9 – Straight / Heterosexual		**Not Known:** 28	

Appendix 1 Section Q – Safeguarding & Early Intervention Services

Q1: Improve triage for Children's Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer

Improving Triage for Children's Social Care Services and Redesigning Children's Centre and Early Intervention Offer	
Lead officer	Ian Smith
Directorates affected by proposal	Children & Young People
Portfolio	Children & Young People
Select Committee	Children & Young People
Reference no.	Q1
Short summary of proposal	These proposals involve a re alignment of the Early Intervention and Social Care Referral and Assessment functions to create a new approach to our front door and triage for access to services. Early Intervention Services have been moved into Children Social Care (CSC) to ready both services for more integration leading to fewer assessments which should allow us to reduce staffing levels. This strand also proposes alternative delivery models and levels of provision across our early intervention providers in Children's Centres, Targeted Family Support (TFS) and the Family Intervention Project (FIP) to build in greater flexibility to work at lower costs. It proposes a reduction in the unit costs of working with families and a reduction by a third of the number of families we support. Greater use of the Troubled Families grant with these families will deliver further savings to the General Fund. The strand also proposes further savings to the Children's Social Care placement and other budgets. In this strand, savings proposals of £5.5m are set out, of which £4.18m is proposed for 2015/16; £1.2m for 2016/17 and £111k for 2017/18. In 2015/16, £3.2m of the savings in this strand is required in order to re-set the Children's Social Care placements budget as set out in CYP14/15.02b The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 6.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
26,215	0	26,215

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
4,181 of which 3.2m relates to the re-setting of the CSC Placements budget as set out in CYP14/15.02b	1,223	111	5,515

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
Early Intervention (EI) services work directly with families and/or practitioners in order to support the identification, assessment and addressing of key needs to improve parenting and outcomes for children. EI services also aim to prevent the escalation to specialist services, such as children's social care. Children's Social Care protect vulnerable children from harm and comprise services for LAC, placements, initial contacts, referrals and assessment, adoption, family social work – front line protection work, and children subject to a child protection plan. A recent realignment of EI and Children's Social Care (CSC) within the CYP directorate was undertaken to allow integration which will help to reduce the number of assessments that end in no further action and therefore reduce costs.
Saving proposal description
The proposals in this strand are five-fold: 1 Introducing Integrated Triage into Children's Social Care 2 Changing children centre contracts as they are re-procured to: A shift the costs of providing reception and administration B reduce the unit cost of working with each family C reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third 3 In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts re-configure Children's Centres to be more flexible and focused 4 Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work 5 Savings to other CSC budgets **1 Introducing Integrated Triage into Children's Social Care** This will require reform of the Front Door in Children's Social Care. Details are still being developed, including the necessary cultural change that will be required across the children's partnership. It is proposed to implement the changes so that they are effective by October 2015. The savings in this area will accrue from an expected reduction in the number of assessments that are undertaken for which there is no further action. This will allow the deletion of a social work team and the early intervention team supporting the partnership in the use of the common assessment form. In the future, cases will be more effectively "triaged" and passed directly to the right services, thereby reducing the number of assessments by about 15%. Currently, over 3000 assessments are done each year and 75% of these do not result in further action. This new approach is not without risk and will be closely monitored. It will also require additional work with partners in schools, Children Centres, health and the police to build capacity for the partnership to support children and families. The expected saving of £510k is spread over 2015/16 and 2016/17 with £255k expected in each year. **2 Changing Children Centre contracts as they are re-procured.** **2a removing the requirement for reception and administration** The Children's Centre contracts are due for renewal as at 31st March 2015. The LA currently retains responsibility for the administration and management of all 17 premises partly to ensure the hours of opening are consistent with a universal service as part of OFSTED expectations/ definitions. This costs £500k. By implementing a new model of delivery of Children's Centres (as described below) this cost will be saved through the more flexible use of the buildings. The expectation in tendering would be that the successful contractor(s) would not be required to have specific reception or administration offices and they could provide this in a more flexible way as they consider necessary. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015, a saving of £250k would arise in 2015/16 and £250K in 2016/17. **2b reduce the unit cost of working with each family** The providers under the current contracts have showed varied success in terms of meeting targets and demonstrating value for money. The overall average unit cost we currently pay is £579 per family. The average unit cost of the top 4 performing Children's Centres is £462, and it is proposed to reduce the unit cost across all sites to this amount, thus achieving a £644k saving. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015 a saving of £322k would arise in 2015/16 and £322k in 2016/17. **2c reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third**

3. Description of service and proposal
Given the savings required, it will not be possible to sustain work with the number of families currently receiving a service. The proposal is therefore to reduce the expected volumes of targeted families receiving a service. Using the above reduced unit cost of £462, a saving of £792k would mean that 3800 families could be reached. This is 1700 fewer targeted families than the 5500 who are currently targeted to receive a service. Although this is a reduction in number, it can be mitigated by maintaining and developing alignment of health visiting delivery to children's centre provision. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015 a saving of £396k would arise in 2015/16 and a further £396k in 2016/17. **3 In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts, re-configure Children's Centres to be more flexible and focused** For the above proposals to be taken forward, it would be necessary to change the existing model of delivery, in order that the Children Centres remain viable. Under the current Children Centre regime, all centres are required by OFSTED to : ▪ be open, and staffed, 9am-5pm, 5 days a week ▪ open 48 weeks a year ▪ be subject to inspection ▪ comply with an extensive set of data and monitoring requirements ▪ provide a range of services as specified by statute The proposal is to re-designate our Children's Centres so that some or all are freed from these requirements so that they can operate more flexibly and at lower cost. Collectively across the Estate, all services currently being offered would still be available but they could be configured differently. Proposals are still being designed and, the savings would need to be subject to consultation with parents, professionals and others, including the voluntary sector. The new model will require closer working with health visitors, in particular. **4 Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work** The FIP is used extensively with challenging families by CSC and in delivering work aligned with the Government's Troubled Families programme. The current cost of the service is £488k pa, £200k of which is already funded through Troubled Families. There is scope to fund the whole cost of the service – a further £288k - using Troubled Families grant. Similarly, the Targeted Family Support Service works with vulnerable families as part of early intervention. The new criteria for phase 2 of the Troubled Families programme is likely to align more with our approach and there is scope therefore to fund more of our early intervention work through the Troubled Families grant - an additional £1.1m. **5 Savings to other Children's Social Care budgets** **5 a) Section 20s** Half of our children becoming LAC result from s20 or parents giving up their children to social care (125 or half of the 250 that became LAC in 2012/13) and half of those who leave care are returning to their families (approximately another 125 of the 240 who left care in 2012/13 but not the same 125 each year). The proposal is to apply resources to crisis response activities that could avoid some of these particular children coming into the care system. The proposal is that 6 children each year are supported with this crisis response activity to remain with their families with an average cost avoided per case of £30k, a total of £180k for the proposal. **5 b) Residential Placements** Trying to reduce the more expensive residential placements has been a core strategy for CSC savings for a number of years. With cases becoming more complex, this has become more challenging with an increase in our residential placements in the last year. This proposal is to address the recent increase by using use care planning panel to review 12 cases and reduce residential placements costs to generate £500k in a full year. **5 c) Existing Internal Foster Carers and Expansion Programme** There is an ongoing strategy to increase the ratio of in-house as against Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) providers. The target is 20 in 2014/15. If the target is continued for 2015/16 but assuming 5 of those are specialist

3. Description of service and proposal
roles then that leaves 15 more to achieve a saving of c£25k per placement or £375k saving. **5 d) Long Term Challenging Placements** The recruitment of specialist professional foster carers could be a route to support more difficult young people in some of our most expensive accommodation. This proposal, as part of growing our in-house capacity, is to recruit 5 specialist foster carers who would support those young people with very expensive placements costing in the region of £3k a week. This alternative proposal would be to pay £800 for fostering costs plus say, £800 for additional support, giving a total of £1600 instead of the £3000. Assuming 4 placements using these specialist carers, then a £290k saving would result. This would be in addition to the activity on residential placements set out above. **5 e) Supported Lodgings** This is accommodation in a family home but not as a fostering placement. It tends to be for over 18s and some young people about to leave care. It is a much cheaper option than semi-independent units The weekly saving is estimated at £300 per week or £15k per annum. It is anticipated that 10 young people could be accommodated in this way resulting in a saving of £150k. The organisation that recruits in-house foster carers for the Council has indicated that they could assist in securing this accommodation. **5 f)** Additional savings have been identified in Children's Social Care – one ICS floorwalker post to be deleted on the basis of all new staff will be trained in an ICS system before they join Lewisham (£45k).The interpreting budget is also under spending by £30k so this will be added to the savings for 2015/15. **5 g)** The management of the FIP and TFS now also lie within Children Social Care (CSC) facilitating better transfer of cases between CSC and early intervention services. This will facilitate a reduction in Children in Need Plans held by social workers and a reduced cost. Initial work suggests that up to £111k could be saved. This saving will not be achievable until 2017/18. These are some of the most vulnerable children in Lewisham and in order to achieve a decrease in social workers working with these families, we would want to be confident that we have built capacity in the partnership including our commissioned services, to hold these cases.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Impacts from Children's Centre Proposals: • A reduction potentially of 1700 families supported by Children's Centres with fewer services available • The integrated triage should simplify the system for professionals and families to know where to get support
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.
• Reducing capacity in the CCs will increase demand / expectation in the health visiting services (the budget for which will transfer to LAs in 2015). • The partnership may not have the capacity to pick up cases leading to pressures Children's Social Care. This is to be mitigated by training and by linking social workers to provision in each children centre services area of the borough. • Children's Centres may see more demand following reduced contacts elsewhere such as CSC, FIP, TFS and the youth service, where there is also proposed resources cuts. To mitigate this the services will need to ensure that they are identifying and supporting the vulnerable families and those most in need of help. • Fewer assessments by social workers could bring an increased risk of safeguarding failure – ensure training and support available so that staff can identify the correct cases for referrals so system is safe rather than risk averse. • The use of Troubled Families Grant to support activity would potentially lead to the loss of these services if Government were in the future to end the Troubled Families programme and its funding rather than mainstream the funding within local government • If procurement changes are not achieved the budget for placements will significantly over spend in 2015/16 • Increased possibility of placement breakdown for more challenging children if specialist foster carers are not successful

4. Impact of proposal
• Loss of social workers may impact morale although it is intended to redeploy social workers internally.

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

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

6. Legal
X

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		8		10	1		
Head Count		8		10	1		
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

Q1 – supplementary - Improve triage for Children's Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer

Early Intervention and Safeguarding	
Lead officer	Ian Smith
Directorates affected by proposal	Children & Young People
Portfolio	Children & Young People
Select Committee	Children & Young People
Reference no.	Q1
Short summary of proposal	The budgets for Looked After Children placements, supporting adopted children and placements for Care Leavers needs to be re-set. While the numbers in these categories are not growing, the budgets do not reflect the actual numbers of children and young people who need to be supported. The Directorate for Children and Young People has, in previous years, covered the gaps through various management actions but the savings made in previous years mean that there is no longer the flexibility for those actions to cover the gaps. That has led to the current in-year overspend in the Children's Social Care placements budget. In order to re-set the budget, further savings of £3.2m have had to be found. It is proposed that these savings come from the early intervention and safeguarding review strand as set out in CYP14/15.02a The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 7.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget:		
Expenditure £000's	**Income £000's**	**Net Budget £000's**
23,194	0	23,194

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)				
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**	
3,208	0	0	3,208	
Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	**DSG**	No	**HRA**	**No**
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
The re-setting of the children social care placements budgets is being achieved by a review of the approaches to the procurement of places for looked after children, transformation of the front door for contact with social care and a re-organisation of the early intervention services as set out in Pro Forma XX.
Saving proposal description
The proposals in this strand are five-fold as set out in the Pro Forma relating to safeguarding and early intervention: 1 Introducing Integrated Triage into Children's Social Care 2 Changing children centre contracts as they are re-procured to: A shift the costs of providing reception and administration B reduce the unit cost of working with each family C reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third 3 In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts, re-configure Children's Centres to be more flexible and focused

3. Description of service and proposal
4 Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work 5 Savings to other CSC budgets The proposals to provide the resources for the re-setting of the Children's Social Care budget are set out in CYP14/15.02b. £3.2m of the £4.2 m set out there are proposed to be used in this area.

4. Impact of proposal
Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:
Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

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

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

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?			No	

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
X

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	YES	

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

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		8		10	1		
Head Count		8		10	1		
Vacant*							
Vacant**							
Vacant***							

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female:		Male:	
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

Q2: Reduction in Youth Service provision

Reduction in Youth Service Provision	
Lead officer	Mervyn Kaye
Directorates affected by proposal	Children and Young People
Portfolio	Children and Young People
Select Committee	Children and Young People
Reference no.	Q2
Short summary of proposal	Two options are presented for consideration. Both options propose savings of £1.4m initially. It is important strategically to set an end option for the youth service due to further Council funding reductions required in following years. Option 1 looks at an option of mutualisation of the youth service following savings. Option 2 considers a move straight away to a statutory service only model.

1. Financial information		
2014/15 BUDGET (£000's)		
Net Controllable Budget: £3,460.8		
Expenditure	**Income**	**Net Budget**
3,603	(143)	3,460

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)			
2015/16:	**2016/17:**	**2017/18:**	**Total 2015/16-2017/18:**
Option 1: 1,406 **Option 2**: 3,160	0 0	0 0	1,406* *A further saving of 1,754 from 2019/20 is proposed after 3 years of the mutual operating (See text for the risks) £3,160

Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA?	DSG	No	HRA	No
If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below				
N/A				

3. Description of service and proposal
Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed
Lewisham Council's Youth Service budget covers a two-pronged statutory obligation: facilitate access to positive activities for young people to build life skills, and track young people's current education and employment statuses in order to report to Central Government the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) and then ensure these young people receive appropriate support. The Youth Service provides and facilitates access to a range of activities for young people through a combination of direct delivery, support to access delivery provided by other organisations, and commissioning and partnering with the voluntary sector. The activities are now focused on developing young people's life skills as agreed in the previous reorganisation of the service. Provision includes positive activities for young people, offering them places to go and things to do, including social and cultural activities, sports and play, and early intervention services. The Youth Service also offers informal education, advice and guidance on career choices and healthier lifestyles, and information concerning the dangers of substance misuse. The Service's targeted support for young people in relation to education, employment and training consists of 9

3. Description of service and proposal
specialist one to one youth workers each holding an approximate caseload of 15 cases at any one time, with an annual service reach of around 270 young people. Alongside a one stop shop, Baseline, in Lewisham town centre and a variety of commissioned providers, the service provides one-to-one youth work for the Borough's most vulnerable, support to young fathers, young women and those considering their sexuality. Additionally, the Mayor's NEET Programme offers a 6 week traineeship programme for young people who are not in education, employment or training. All of these activities and support systems take place at 7 Council-run youth centres, 5 Council-run adventure playgrounds, through street based work, at Baseline – our one-stop support hub in Lewisham Town Centre – and at a variety of non-council run venues across the Borough.
Saving proposal description
In this section both options are described and the details of the initial £1.4m saving proposals are set out **<u>Option 1</u>** It is proposed that the Service reduces its controllable budget by £1.4m (41%) by making strategic adjustments to several service areas. The proposals set out below reduce the size and capacity of the service in order to release savings, but also leave a model which it is believed could be used as the basis of the development of a Staff Mutual proposal for the service. If a staff mutual proposal is pursued, it is estimated that a lead-in time of a year would be needed to establish a viable business plan, and then a period of three years of council funding. More work is needed on various aspects of the mutual as indicated. This includes whether it would be possible to taper the council's funding over three year period. The proposal is the Council should stop funding the mutual entirely after the third year, generating a further £1.7m saving. There is a risk that the mutual will not at the end of 3 years, be sustainable and therefore a risk, that without continuing Council funding at some level, services cannot be guaranteed. **<u>Option 2</u>** Given the extent of savings required by the Council and the risk that option 1 could still require Council funding after a mutual has been in operation for three years, option 2 proposes moving directly to a statutory service model only. Under the model, £100k would be needed to facilitate access to youth activity and £200k would be needed for the NEET tracking and engagement elements of the youth re-engagement services. This would produce a saving of £3.1m **<u>Proposals to achieve the initial savings of £1.4m</u>** **Staffing:** The Youth Service currently maintains 7 youth centres and 5 adventure playgrounds (APGs). At each of the youth centre sites the Service delivers 15 contact hours per week and 22.5 hours per week at each adventure playground (217.5 contact hours across all sites). In order to release savings across the Service it is proposed that the Service retains 5 youth centres and 5 APGs, while removing staff from 2 youth centres and reducing front-line staff headcount commensurately. Removing staff from these sites will allow the 2 centres to be operated by voluntary/community providers or to close. Recommendations as to which two centres should be closed or offered to the voluntary sector will be based on the location of the centre and the attractiveness of the facilities for mutualisation. Currently proposals are to close or pass on Ladywell and Rockbourne youth centres. From its youth centres, the Service operates a street-based outreach capacity comprised of 3.4 fte support youth workers with an ability to operate 15 hours of outreach work per week. It is proposed that the Service remove this capacity. Ending Council-run provision at 2 youth centres and ending the street-based outreach capacity will yield the following savings: • Reduction of Youth Workers from 17.5fte to 10 fte, and reduction of manager and business support

3. Description of service and proposal

capacity yields a savings of **£370,000**

- Youth Service provision budget will be reduced commensurate with the removal of staff from two clubs, and with activity already due to end, yielding a saving of **£20,500**

Commissioning:
In order to release further budget savings, but still maintain the Service's integral relationship with the community and voluntary sector, it is proposed that the commissioning fund be reduced by 31%. The commissioning fund is used to procure a broad range of activities focused on building life skills for young people from the voluntary sector that serve to supplement the Youth Service's direct delivery and ensure a range of youth provision across the borough.

Reducing commissioning funds by 31% will release savings of **£293,000.**

Database, IT & Logistics:

Further savings through reduced sites and further efficiencies can be made to IT and database costs, giving a figure of **£35,500.**

Income Generation

It is recommended that significant effort is made to rent space and bring in providers to use our sites during non-contact hours to generate income of **£100,000**

Re-engagement Service

There are three elements of our current service which we propose to bring together more strategically to form a youth re-engagement service. These comprise

a) Specialist 1:1 Service
b) The Mayor's NEET Programme
c) The NEET tracking service
d) Baseline

a) Specialist 1:1 Service:
The proposal is to re-specify this service which could be delivered as part of the Targeted Family Support Service. The Specialist 1:1 Service is operated out of Baseline in Lewisham Town Centre and is comprised of 9 fte Specialist Youth Workers and 1 fte Specialist 1:1 Coordinator, representing a total cost of £450,000. The previous savings outlined reduce management costs leaving Baseline with £390,000. The team works primarily with young people between the ages of 16-18 and offers individual key worker support in emergency situations, signposting to other services, advice, guidance and access to other community services. It is proposed that savings are made as set out and then the reduced services (for the 1:1 service and the Mayor's NEET programme) are funded through grant substitution from the troubled families grant and some income from other sources which are being currently investigated including the Education Funding Agency and Schools.

The **£390,000 will be grant substituted or covered by income from elsewhere.**

b) Mayor's NEET Programme:
The Mayor's NEET Programme (MNP) is operated out of the TNG and is comprised of 1 fte Specialist Group Work Coordinator, 1 fte Senior Youth Worker, 1.2 fte Support Youth Workers. Staffing and programme costs total £197,000.

In order to release savings to the Youth Service, it is proposed that the MNP is re-specified in accordance with Raising the Participation Age(RPA), and funded via alternative monies from schools, colleges and the Education Funding Agency.

The following changes are proposed to the MNP, which will reduce the total cost from £197,000 to £115,000:

3. Description of service and proposal

- Delete the post of Specialist Group Work Coordinator to realise a savings of **£47,000**
- Halve the MNP programme costs from £70,000 to realise an initial savings of **£35,000**
- The reduced MNP will be alternatively funded to release savings of **£115,000**

c) NEET services, including tracking

The Council has a statutory responsibility to monitoring and track NEETs and to support vulnerable NEETs. The revised cost of this activity is £200k.

This would leave a resource of £705k focussed on re-engaging young people.

The total budget reduction to the Youth Service is £1,406,000

The overall funding under the options are as follows:

	Current budget for youth service and re-engagement services	Proposed starting point for mutual after savings	Proposed budget for re-engagement service after savings		Proposed budget for statutory element of youth service		Total Savings
Option 1	£3,460	£1,754	705	*1	100	*2	£1,406
Option 2	£3,460	N/A	705	*1	100	*2	£3,160

Funding Sources

*1 The £705k will be funding from the general fund (£200k) and the remaining from grant substitution or income generation

*2 Funded from the general fund

4. Impact of proposal

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

- Reduction in directly provided and commissioned youth provision across both youth clubs and outreach/ street based work including the specific removal of Lewisham youth service universal provision at 2 youth clubs.
- One third reduction in the commissioning fund will lessen provision and also require a reprioritisation and reallocation across currently commissioned providers. There are various voluntary sector providers who rely on Council and Youth Service funding to sustain operations and it is likely that some providers will have to either reduce or suspend operations.
- Reduction in business support will lessen the service's capacity to respond to queries, manage invoices, facilitate commissioning processes and perform mapping exercises.
- Failure to find alternative funding would place specialist provision at risk and limit the Service's ability support partnership work and attend inter-agency meetings.

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

- Reducing youth worker and site capacity will cause demand to exceed supply, forcing certain sites to absorb the impact that stems from site closures. To mitigate this, the Service proposes that it retain 1 fte Support Youth Worker beyond the minimum in order to provide enhanced staffing when necessary.
- The Service will continue to look elsewhere for alternative ways to generate revenues including rental of space at youth sites and trading of services. Ultimately this could result in the creation of a staff mutual able to better income generate as well potentially lower costs.
- The need for Troubled Families monies to substitute Council expenditures on the MNP and Specialist 1:1 sub-

4. Impact of proposal
service may exceed supply. The Service will consequently look to make either one or both services income generating entities to supplement any grant money received from Troubled Families. • Reducing the commissioning funds may cause voluntary sector providers to cease operations. In order to mitigate this, it may be possible for officer time and business acumen to be lent to various sector providers in order to help them future plan, re-examine business strategy and look for alternative funding streams. • If the mutual option is taken there is a risk that it will not succeed in covering its costs at the end of the three years • As a mutual the council will have reduced control to specify activity. • There are HR and budget risks associated with establishing a mutual. • A mutualised service would have to take into account total cost including facilities management, IT, HR, finance support, etc which is currently within corporate budgets outside of the £3.4m controllable youth service budget detailed here. • If Option 2 were taken and the service reduced to a statutory minimum there could be a lack of opportunities for young people

Impact on Corporate Priorities:						
Main Priority – Most Relevant			**Secondary Priority**			**Corporate Priorities:-** **A. Community Leadership and empowerment** **B. Young people's achievement and involvement** **C. Clean, green and liveable** **D. Safety, security and a visible presence** **E. Strengthening the local economy** **F. Decent Homes for all** **G. Protection of children** **H. Caring for adults and the older people** **I. Active, health citizens** **J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
B.			**G.**			
Impact of saving on corporate priority			**Impact of saving on corporate priority**			
	Negative			*Option 2* Negative	*Option 1* Neutral	
Level of Impact			**Level of Impact**			
Option 2 High	*Option 1* Medium	Low		*Option 2* Medium	*Option 1* Low	

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage	
All Wards :	**If individual Wards, please state:**
All	Yes – to be agreed

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

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

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

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?	Yes			

6. Legal
State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal
x

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

7. Human Resources		
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?	Yes	

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
*(the current structure has 60.7 FTE posts)
**(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
***(covered by council employee)
****(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

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

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE*		21.06	18	14	2	1	0
Head Count		52	18	16	2	1	0
Vacant**		?	1	1	0	0	0
Vacant***		1	0	0	0	0	0
Vacant****		1	0	0	0	0	0

Workforce Profile Information				
Gender:	Female: 49		Male: 40	
Ethnicity:	BME: 61	White: 20	Other: 1	Not Known: 7
Disability:	5			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known: 89	