

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 11 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION N

Contents page

Section N: Environmental Services

N3: Waste: Variety of changes	191
N4: Cease Routine Residential Road Sweeping	199
N5: Review of Lewisham’s Fleet and Passenger Transport Service	205
N6: Other Environment Savings & Income	211

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Waste Review (Collection / Disposal)
Reference:	N3
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
1 Review of Lewisham's Waste Services (Doorstep collection & disposal)	Yes	Yes	Yes
2 Transfer of estates Bulky Waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes	No	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Council are responsible for the collection & disposal of all household waste in the borough. An efficiency review of waste and recycling services is underway, primarily focusing on doorstep properties with wheeled bins. An analysis of service options has been produced. These options consider ease of use for residents, operational deliverability, environmental and financial impacts, particularly in relation to waste disposal market conditions. Service options are also evaluated to ensure compliance with the Waste Regulations.</p> <p>The efficiency review noted the high levels of bulky-lumber waste being produced from Lewisham Homes managed estates. Although the majority of collection costs are re-charged to Lewisham Homes, disposal costs are currently paid for by the Council. This arrangement does not incentivise housing managers to reduce the amount of waste being generated.</p>
Saving proposal
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Combinations of: Alternate weekly collections (residual waste/recycling). Charged garden waste service. Separate Paper/Card Collection. Separate Kitchen Waste Collection. 2 Re-charge bulky waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes. <p>1) Public Consultation is due to begin to gauge attitudes towards service changes based around the following areas: food collections, subscription based garden waste collections, frequency of collections, special arrangements and collecting certain materials separately. The results of the consultation combined with an analysis of the operational deliverability and environmental and financial impact, may result in a service represented by the options outlined below.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

- a. Option 1 (current service plus garden waste): Refuse collected weekly, recycling collected co-mingled weekly and garden waste fortnightly;
- b. Option 2: Refuse collected fortnightly, recycling collected twin stream (i.e. paper separately from the rest of the recycling) fortnightly and garden & food waste collected weekly;
- c. Option 3: Refuse collected weekly, recycling collected twin-stream fortnightly and garden waste fortnightly;
- d. Option 4: Refuse collected fortnightly, recycling collected twin stream fortnightly, garden waste collected fortnightly and food waste collected weekly.
- e. Option 5: Refuse collected fortnightly, recycling collected co-mingled fortnightly, garden waste collected fortnightly and food waste collected weekly.

2) The transfer of responsibility for bulky-waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes aims to encourage more active engagement with residents to manage unreasonable expenditure and environmental impact.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Potentially large change in waste and recycling services for service users and for staff delivering the new services.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Public resistance to change. Market volatility for recyclables. High dependence on private waste disposal/transfer facilities. Very difficult to predict accurate disposal costs or income levels from recyclable materials.

Risk	Detail	Mitigation
Number of people subscribing to the garden waste service might not be as high as expected	Benchmarked with other boroughs. Modelling has been undertaken to show high and low subscription levels to account for this and financial modelling adjusted accordingly. Already have 4000 unique users of garden waste bag service and the aim is to have 13,000 subscribers (25%)	Effective communications. Target households with gardens. Target existing users. Enforce no garden waste in black bin.
Participation Rates	Residents need to participate in the services to divert waste away from the black	Effective and ongoing communications. Fortnightly collections

4. Impact and risks of proposal

	bin therefore reducing the disposal budget. Language, levels of deprivation, transient populations will also impact on participation.	should ensure that participation in the food waste service is high.
Yields	Need to capture the right materials in the right bin. Modelling has been undertaken to show high and low yields as this will impact on any future waste reduction in the black bin and future waste contracts. If yields aren't as high then performance may be affected.	Effective and ongoing Communications.
Contamination Rates	Residents need to use the services correctly otherwise contamination levels will increase. This in turn may mean that loads are rejected and performance in recycling drops. There is also the potential impact of the Environmental Permitting Regulations that may also impact on reported contamination levels.	Effective contaminated bin procedure. Effective ongoing communications. Ensure contract documentation covers contamination processes and procedures.
Commodity Prices	Materials are traded on a commodities market and prices fluctuate. At the moment the prices are reducing and this would impact on a gate fee or rebate. MRF's have different ways of approaching twin stream material pricing so difficult to judge what the impact would be on any rebate. One local newsprint company has just gone into administration.	Following the commodities market to anticipate impact.
Disposal options	SELCHP Contract ends in 2024. This is likely to mean that the cost of incineration is likely to increase. Other disposal options for garden waste, food waste, recycling may have to consider additional bulking and haulage costs if direct	Looking at reducing the tonnage that goes into SELCHP (capture more recycling, food waste). Discussions with other boroughs about joint disposal arrangements.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

	delivery isn't an option.	
Property Numbers	The assumptions used in the modelling are high level and have taken the number of kerbside properties from general data. The number of properties actually delivered to may be less when you consider space for additional containers and whether fortnightly collections can take place in particular locations / housing types.	Analysis of properties currently being undertaken.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	14,600	(2,600)	12,000
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Waste Review	600	500	1,100
Total	600	500	1,100
% of Net Budget	5%	4%	9%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes		
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3	10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more	
	No specific impact	
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?	

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Possibly
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
3	Waste Regulations
3.1	Regulation 13 of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as

10. Legal implications

amended), transposes into English law Article 11 of the EU Revised Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC). Regulation 13 states that from 1 January 2015, waste collection authorities must collect waste paper, metal, plastic and glass separately. This duty is to ensure that recyclate is of a high quality and that the quantity of recyclate collected is improved. The duty is subject to two tests:

- 3.1.1 The Necessity Test: This is to ensure that waste undergoes recovery operations to facilitate or improve recovery, which tests if the material is of a sufficiently high quality? If yes, then it is not necessary to collect the materials separately from each other.
- 3.1.2 The Practicability or TEEP Test: Is it Technically, Environmentally or Economically Practicable (TEEP) to collect the materials separately from each other? If one of these is not the case, then it is not necessary to collect the materials separately from each other.
- 3.2 There is no statutory guidance on the requirements of Regulation 13, but a 'Route Map' was produced in England by local government stakeholders which sets out a process by which local authorities may assess their position in terms of compliance with the regulation.
- 3.3 Officers are currently conducting these tests using the 'Route Map' process, at the same time as developing and analysing the future waste and recycling service options.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation) Public Consultation 21 st August – 18 th October
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review Report to Sustainable Development Select Committee
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing Report to Mayor & Cabinet
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented Savings implemented should approval be granted
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	

11. Summary timetable	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	Savings implemented in a phased approach should approval be granted
October 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Replacing static street sweeping with mobile response facility – all residential roads
Reference:	N4
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Stop the routine sweeping of residential roads by traditional 'beat based' sweeper. Provide a mobile, 'as required', response service for these areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The street cleansing service comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. cleaning all paved areas of the highway (footways, carriageways and pedestrianised areas); b. cleansing the council controlled car parks and the grounds of Lewisham Homes based on Service Level Agreements (SLAs); c. providing, managing and emptying 2,000 litter bins, mostly placed on streets, and collecting and disposing of litter sacks using a small fleet of 7.5 tonne refuse collection and compaction vehicles (RCVs); d. operating the booked bulky household waste (lumber) collection service; e. clearing fly-tipping – including all residual waste under the Council's Clean Streets Policy; f. cleansing at least some of the sundry green spaces that are contiguous with highways; h. over-sight of the largely outsourced public toilets contract. <p>Management Structure</p> <p>1 The service is divided into 4 operational areas, each of which is overseen by a Cleansing Team Manager, who report to the Cleansing Operational Manager. Cleansing managers have responsibility for all staff dedicated to their areas and the effectiveness of operations, including by mobile crews and resources.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

Mechanical Resources

2 With the exception of the litter bin RCVs, the caged vehicle crews involved in household waste collections, cleansing SLA areas and priority locations such as retail areas and the vicinity of railway and bus stations, the only other significant piece of mechanical equipment involved in street cleansing is a Johnston 600 mechanical street sweeper. This latter vehicle mainly cleans Red Routes and other major roads that are largely protected by no parking restrictions. Off-side areas, refuges and splitter islands are also cleansed periodically on Sundays when traffic is lighter, with the aid of a manual crew. Prior to the budget cuts in April 2011 there were 2 Johnston 600s and a Scarab mechanical sweeping machine.

Manual Resources

3 Lewisham's street cleansing service is wholly manual, comprising street orderly carts that are generally equipped with a swish (dolly) broom, a medium yard broom, and a litter picker.

4 In April 2011 the number of management areas was reduced from 6 to 4, and the number of beat sweepers was also reduced by 20 in total. A further 14 sweeping posts were deleted from April 2015. This has resulted in a large increase in the size of the average sweeper beat, and yet the service is still aiming to guarantee to sweep every street once a week (Monday – Friday), with selected main shopping areas having dedicated sweepers on 7 days a week and secondary shopping areas also being swept on Saturdays.

Saving proposal

A saving of this size would require the loss of between 40-50 Sweeper posts. [The precise number to be determined upon reorganisation of the beat based service to mobile response units]

In order to make the saving, the traditional programmed sweeping of all residential roads will cease. This will be replaced by the creation of mobile response teams working on an intelligence based approach, e.g. problem areas / requests / complaints. To achieve an adequately resourced mobile facility it will be necessary to reduce the frequency of Town Centre and 'Main Drag' sweeping. A complete re-organisation and re-assessment of the service would be required to deliver the saving.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

There will be obvious impacts to the visual environment, e.g. increased detritus and weed growth in likely to increase pavement / highway maintenance costs. A poor visual environment and cleansing standards may generate complaints and casework in certain areas of the Borough.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Residential roads are currently swept approximately once a week, but the service allows for the more frequent sweeping of deprived and higher density areas. The aim

4. Impact and risks of proposal

would be to replace this static programmed sweeping with a responsive mobile service. Priority areas and problems would be identified, in part, by refuse collection staff who can supply frequent service standard updates. Previous savings from ceasing herbicide application on pavement areas would need to be re-instated to mitigate some of the visual deterioration to the street scene. A comprehensive restructuring of the service will need to take place to deliver these savings, shifting the emphasis from static street sweeping operatives towards an increase in vehicles, mobile teams, machinery and mobile technology. An in-house, Peer2Peer version of the LoveLewisham app is being developed to facilitate this.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	7,300	(1,600)	5,700
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Stop the routine sweeping of residential roads by traditional 'beat based' sweeper. Provide a mobile, 'as required', response service for these areas.	1,000		1,000
Total	1,000	0	1,000
% of Net Budget	18%	0%	18%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High	Medium	10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Specific impact in one or more wards
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Northern wards due to higher density housing & deprivation

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					TBC
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

--

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service
Reference:	N5
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Service/Team area:	Fleet and Passenger Services
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Review of Lewisham's Passenger Transport Service	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The council's Fleet management service and the Door to Door service sit within the Environment division. The fleet management service procure, run and maintain the council's owned fleet and procure specialist hired in vehicles when needed. The direct revenue cost of this service is in the region of £4.1m. The costs of the service are fully recharged to end service users such as Door to Door and Refuse collection.

The Door to Door services provides home to school transport to children with special educational needs and also transports adult social care clients to and from day care provision. The council spends approx. £5.3m p/a operating passenger transport made up of direct staff and management costs and vehicle costs recharged from Fleet (fuel, staff costs, vehicle on the road costs and maintenance etc). In addition to this, the council (primarily CYP SEN and ASC) spends a further £2m p/a on taxi provision for clients that can't be accommodated on Door to Door vehicles (due to capacity of vehicles, the logistics of the routes etc.) The total spent on providing transport for this client group therefore equates to £7.3m p/a.

Saving proposal

A. Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service: The relationship with the transport provider (Environment) and the client services (primarily CYP and ASC) and the funding model for these services are interwoven and complex. As such a corporate approach is being taken in order to identify opportunities to reduce spend and demand whilst continuing to meet statutory duties and support the residents that rely on passenger transport. It is expected that the savings identified for this review will be achieved via the following approaches:

1. Operational efficiency

3. Description of service area and proposal

Identify opportunities within the current Door to Door operational model to reduce costs through more efficient use of resource and increasing operational efficiency.

2. Promoting Independence

Recent legislative changes (e.g. the Care Act and the Children and Families Bill) make the need to promote choice, independence and 'ordinary lives' essential in the delivery of services to both children and young people with SEN and clients accessing adult social care support. This extends to how we meet a client's transport needs. However the legislative changes also increase the age range applicable for travel assistance from 5-18 years to 0-25 years. Within CYP we will be exploring the potential to further embed and offer a wider range of alternative travel assistance options (such as direct payments and independent travel training) in order to better support independence and reduce reliance on local authority provided transport. Whilst direct transport provision will continue to be the most suitable option for some clients, we expect to be able to at least maintain, and possibly reduce, demand through growing and improving the range of travel assistance options we offer. It should be noted however, that there is currently an overspend on the CYP SEN budget (of approx. £700k) and as such any reduction to spend achieved as a result of this approach will be required to reduce the overspend in the first instance.

Adult Social Care will also continue to promote Direct Payments in line with the previously agreed saving for remodelling day services (A4).

The council's waste services account for a significant proportion of the costs attracted by the Fleet service. The influence of demand on those costs are being considered by the waste strategy review as a part of a separate savings strand.

3. Alternative delivery models

Explore opportunities to pursue alternative delivery models for local authority provided transport provision (e.g. via an outsourced contract).

4. Policy review

The council is required to provide transport for eligible young people of statutory school age. Other local authorities (e.g. Coventry) are now exploring removing or charging for discretionary travel for under 5s and over 16s. As part of this review we would like to explore the legal position of this approach to determine the extent to which this could be applied in Lewisham. This is a work in progress and any proposed changes to Policy would be returned to Mayor and Cabinet.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The impact of the approaches detailed in this proposal are as follows:

- Possible re-organisation within the Door to Door Service (to respond to a reduced demand from client services as a result of higher take up of direct

4. Impact and risks of proposal

payments/independent travel training, or as a result of operational efficiencies identified).

- Changes to process within the client service areas – to promote and embed a wider range of alternative travel assistance options.
- Market development – to ensure we have a suitable range of travel assistance options to offer to suitable clients (e.g. commission an independent travel training programme for SEN clients).
- Service users – Eligible clients within ASC will be offered Direct Payments as a matter of course. Within CYP, new and existing clients will be encouraged to take up travel assistance options with direct transport provision being seen as a last resort.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

For any changes the current Door to Door operating model or a reduction in service requirements as a result of reduced demand from client services (due to an increased take up of direct payments/independent travel training) staff consultation would be required.

For CYP- Consultation with service users would be required prior to the introduction of new travel assistance options, or if changes to the processes for application or the transport policies were to be pursued.

For ASC Clients – Discussions about transport requirements will form part of an individual's care plan. For those who the service is changing – consultation has already taken place as part of the previously agreed saving.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	7,884	(660)	7,224
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service	500	500	1,000
Total	500	500	1,000
% of Net Budget	7%	7%	14%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
		1. Community leadership and empowerment

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
9	10	2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact on a single ward.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	0	0	0	0	0
Scale 3 – 5	61	61	61	0	0
Sc 6 – SO2	48	48	51	0	3
PO1 – PO5	7	7	9	0	2
PO6 – PO8	2	2	2	0	0
SMG 1 – 3	1	1	1	0	0
JNC					

9. Human Resources impact					
Total	119	119	124	0	5
Gender	Female	Male			
	53	66			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	52	64	3	0	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

TBC

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Other Environment Savings & Income
Reference:	N6
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Increase income from Trade Waste Services & Parks Events	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
We currently provide a Trade Waste collection services to around 2500 Lewisham businesses. Our parks and open spaces are subject to increasing demand for income-generating events.
Saving proposal
To develop our Trade Waste customer base, improve efficiency and increase income. To negotiate an increased share of income from Parks Events.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Improved Trade Waste services will have a positive impact on our street scene, cleansing and domestic refuse services.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
A post within the Environment Division will be developed to focus on business development opportunities. IT, Accountancy/Debt Recovery systems are being improved to facilitate an improved business focus. Each Park event is subject to consultation within the Council's Events Strategy. Increased income will, of course, be subject to this approval.

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	4,700	(2,200)	2,500
HRA			
DSG			
Health			

5. Financial information			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
To develop our Trade Waste customer base, improve efficiency and increase income. To negotiate an increased share of income from Parks Events.	250	250	500
* budget figures are commercial waste and parks budget combined			
Total	250	250	500
% of Net Budget	10%	10%	20%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3	5	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil	

8. Service equalities impact			
		Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					TBC
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC from legal re competing with Private Sector Commercial Waste companies.

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)

11. Summary timetable	
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	