

<b>Mayor &amp; Cabinet</b>			
<b>Title</b>	Comments of the Public Accounts Select Committee on the 2015/16 Budget Report		
<b>Contributors</b>	Public Accounts Select Committee	<b>Item No.</b>	
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	11 February 2015

**Reasons for lateness: The report is late because the Public Accounts Select Committee had not held its meeting before the agenda despatch date for the Mayor & Cabinet meeting.**

**Reasons for urgency: The report is urgent because the views of the Select Committees need to be considered alongside the report from officers on the 2015/16 budget.**

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 This report informs the Mayor & Cabinet of the comments and views of the Public Accounts Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the officer report entitled 2015/16 Budget Report at the meeting on 5 February 2015.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 Mayor & Cabinet is recommended to note the views of the Public Accounts Select Committee as set out in section 3 of this referral; the views of the other Select Committees as set out in the appendices to this referral; and the views of the two working groups, also set out in the appendices to this referral.

## **3. Public Accounts Select Committee views**

- 3.1 On 5 February 2015, the Public Accounts Select Committee considered a report entitled 2015/16 Budget Report. The Committee resolved to advise Mayor and Cabinet of the following:
- 3.2 The Committee noted the referrals made by the Sustainable Development and Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committees (attached at Appendix A) and the final reports of the Public Health and Youth Service Working Groups (attached at Appendix B) and asked that the Mayor takes these referrals and reports into account alongside officer reports when taking a decision on the 2015/16 Budget Report. In relation to the final report of the Youth Service Working Group, the Committee noted that, at the meeting of the Children and Young People Select Committee held on 4 February 2015, it was recommended that, in relation to Recommendation 1 of the Working Group report, *all councillors* should be kept updated on progress, and not just the ward members for Ladywell and Perry Vale.
- 3.3 The Committee discussed and endorsed both the Working Group reports.

- 3.4 The Committee endorsed the Sustainable Development Select Committee referral and recommended that Mayor and Cabinet should take the concerns of the Sustainable Development Select Committee into consideration.
- 3.5 The Committee noted the Safer, Stronger Communities referral and, in relation to savings proposal **G1c: Blue Badge Administration Fee**, asked for a definitive note to be drawn up and circulated on the costs of producing blue badges, including the costs of administering the scheme, before Mayor and Cabinet makes a decision on this matter.
- 3.6 The Committee would like Mayor and Cabinet to consider savings proposal **L4: Broadway Theatre** further, in light of the comments made by Members, including:
- Making more innovative bookings (which require less technical support and backstage facilities)
  - Looking at external funding options
  - Preserving the Pantomime season if possible
  - Ensuring that BME productions will still have access to the theatre.
- 3.7 In relation to the “**A**” **savings** (smarter and deeper integration of social care and health) the Committee recommended that Mayor and Cabinet pay particular attention to the cumulative impact of the proposals and the method by which this will be addressed (individual service reviews for each user).
- 3.8 The Committee would like the Mayor to consider savings proposal **Q1: Improving Triage for Children’s Social Care Services and Redesigning the Children’s Centre and Early Intervention Offer** further; to ensure that vital early years services are not unnecessarily damaged.
- 3.9 The Committee recommends that the equalities impact in respect of savings proposal **O1: End of the discretionary freedom pass scheme** is particularly taken into account when making a decision on this proposal.
- 3.10 In relation to savings proposal **B1: Reduction and remodelling of supporting people service**, the Mayor is asked to consider the appendix 8b before making a decision on this proposal.

#### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 Should the Committee’s referral result in the budget being changed, this may affect the amount of savings achieved, potentially resulting in a savings shortfall that would mean that alternative proposals would have to be identified and built into the budget planning process. However, as these decisions are ultimately for the Mayor (in recommending his budget), and then the Council, there are no direct or immediate financial implications arising from this report.

#### **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

## **Background papers**

2015/16 Budget Report - Meeting of the Public Accounts Select Committee, 5 February 2015.

<http://tinyurl.com/lt6g7ef>

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Charlotte Dale, Interim Overview and Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49534).

<b>Public Accounts Select Committee</b>			
<b>Title</b>	Comments of the Sustainable Development Select Committee on the Lewisham Future Programme – 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings		
<b>Contributors</b>	Sustainable Development Select Committee	<b>Item No.</b>	
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	5 February 2015

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee on the Lewisham Future Programme – 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings report.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee as set out in this report.

## 3. Sustainable Development Select Committee views

- 3.1 On 20 January 2015, the Sustainable Development Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme. They considered four Budget Savings proposals that had been referred back to the Committee after its meeting on 29 October 2014. The four Budget Savings were as follows:

- E1: Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration & Asset Management division
- H1: Restructuring of enforcement & regulatory services
- N1: Reorganise environmental services, close and cease to maintain a number of small parks
- N2: Street sweeping

- 3.2 The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:

**N1: Reorganise environmental services, close and cease to maintain a number of small parks**

- a) If the borough's parks are not properly maintained there might be a reduction in play-space.
- b) The risks associated with alternative management options should be considered as part of the consultation.
- c) The results of the consultation should be presented to the Select Committee for further scrutiny.

- d) The consultation should be communicated more widely across the borough. Furthermore, there needs to be broader public engagement, beyond the proposed user groups.

Therefore, the Select Committee recommends that:

- a) The consultation on N1 should be considered by all Local Assemblies, to increase public engagement.
- b) The results of the consultation on N1, plus any proposals derived from the consultation, must be presented to the Select Committee for consideration and scrutiny.
- c) There should be no closure of any of the borough's parks.

#### N2: Street sweeping

- a) An improvement in enforcement in areas such as trade waste could increase revenue for the Council, and lessen the need for budget savings in future years.

### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 Should the Committee's referral result in the budget being changed, this may affect the amount of savings achieved, potentially resulting in a savings shortfall that would mean that alternative proposals would have to be identified and built into the budget planning process. However, as these decisions are ultimately for the Mayor (in recommending his budget), and then the Council, there are no direct or immediate financial implications arising from this report.

### **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

### **Background papers**

Lewisham Future Programme – 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings – Officer Report to the Select Committees (October and November 2014)

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s31821/03LFP201516RevenueBudgetSavings30102014.pdf>

Sustainable Development Select Committee – Agenda of 20 January 2015

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=136&MId=3447&Ver=4>

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Roger Raymond, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49976).

<b>Public Accounts Select Committee</b>		
<b>Title</b>	Comments of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee on the Lewisham Future Programme budget savings report (2015/16)	
<b>Contributor</b>	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee	Item 3
<b>Class</b>	Part 1 (open)	5 February 2015

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the budget savings report, considered at its meeting on 3 February 2015.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Select Committee as set out in this report.

## **3. Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee views**

- 3.2 On 2 February 2015, the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme – budget savings report (2015/16) The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:
- 3.3 The Committee recommends that the Public Accounts Committee reconsider savings proposal G1c: Blue Badge Administration Fee, with a view to finding an outcome that is cost neutral. The Committee notes the cost of each Blue Badge (£4.60, excluding the cost of administering the scheme) and the proposed charge being put forward (£10). The Committee does not believe that the Council should generate income from the implementation of this proposal.
- 3.4 The Committee endorses the recommendation of the Overview & Scrutiny Business Panel for the Public Accounts Committee to consider the two new savings proposals - L3: Community Development budgets and L4: Broadway theatre.
- 3.5 The Committee also recommends that the Public Accounts Committee consider the overall equalities implications of the savings proposals.

## **5. Financial implications**

- 4.1 Should the Committee's referral result in the budget being changed, this may affect the amount of savings achieved, potentially resulting in a saving shortfall that would mean that alternative proposals would have to be identified and built into the budget planning process. However, as these decisions are ultimately for the Mayor (in recommending his budget), and then the Council, there are no direct or immediate

financial implications arising from the implementation of the recommendations in this report.

## **5. Legal implications**

- 5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

## **6. Further implications**

- 6.1 At this stage there are no specific environmental, equalities or crime and disorder implications to consider. However, there may be implications arising from the implementation of the Committee's recommendations.

## **Background papers**

Lewisham Future Programme report (<http://tinyurl.com/lbaqbkj>) considered at Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee on 3 February 2015

If you have any queries about this report, please contact Timothy Andrew, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 47916)