

**LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015**

**APPENDIX 2 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION B**

**Contents page**

**Section B: Supporting People**

B2: Reduction in budget across all client groups

67



<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Funding related to the programme known as Supporting people
<b>Reference:</b>	B2
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Supporting People
<b>Directorate:</b>	Community Services
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Crime Reduction and Supporting People
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Healthier Communities / Safer Stronger Communities

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) reduction in budget across all client groups	Yes	No	No

### **3. Description of service area and proposal**

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

The supporting people service funds housing related support via a number of providers to clients with varying needs. These range from high-support hostels to floating support in the community. The total spend on these services in 2014/15 was £8.4m. To date savings proposals have been put forward totalling £2.5m across 15/16 and 16/17.

In order to meet the reduced budget requirement for the service in 2017/18, the service will need to further remodel how it provides housing support. Officers have remodelled the initial proposals working on the following assumptions:

- Significant savings are required from this budget and it is not possible to deliver these without having impact on some current users.
- Direct cost shunts should be avoided (e.g. closing a service where a large proportion of users will directly require another Council funded service).
- Alternative sources of funding to support this client group should be explored.
- Other support networks should be considered in order to ensure that existing service users can continue to receive some level of support if funding is withdrawn.

#### **Saving proposal**

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 receive interventions but ultimately the threshold for access to services will have to rise.

Supporting People (SP) funded services are generally preventative services and this reduction of capacity may impact on higher level services such as residential care.

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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. This impact is expected to be greatest through the reduction in floating support.

The vast majority of the funding reductions will be passed to the providers of the frontline services (including those in the voluntary sector) in the form of:

- Reduced support for mental health, learning disability and single homeless clients
- Closure of provisions for vulnerable groups such as alcohol dependant.
- Closure of units for single homeless.
- Decommission floating support and replace with a crisis management targeted floating support service with reduced capacity and for all client groups

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Reductions may result in:

- cost shunts to other parts of the Council specifically in relation to Adult Social care and housing
- reduction in individual available places may result in lack of places for clients.
- More work for partners such as the police, probation, mental health SLAM and the hospital if incidents escalate.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

1. People becoming homeless

*Any losses to the floating support service will carry increased risk of more individuals becoming homeless*

2. Impact on statutory services/temporary accommodation/residential care

*Loss of hostel bed spaces may lead to pressure elsewhere for council resources.*

3. Increased risk of safeguarding cases and services failure

*Further reductions in funding may impact on staff quality and morale potentially putting service users at risk*

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.*

5. A rise in rough sleeping

*Numbers of people living on the streets in Lewisham may rise*

6. A rise in Anti Social Behaviour on the streets

*Anti social behaviour on the streets in Lewisham may rise*

7. Financial Viability

*Remaining services become financially unsustainable for providers and they withdraw from the market.*

Work will be undertaken to ensure there is ongoing and detailed communication with partners and agencies that deliver services such as outreach provision and where possible discussions with a range of voluntary and community groups will take place.

<b>5. Financial information</b>			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	6,867	(514)	6,353
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)		1,200	1,200
Total		1,200	1,200
% of Net Budget	%	19%	19%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	n/a		

<b>6. Impact on Corporate priorities</b>		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	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	
<b>Negative</b>	<b>Negative</b>	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	

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

<b>8. Service equalities impact</b>			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	H	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The nature of the services see funding reductions mean that the impact on certain groups is likely to be higher than others.			

## 8. Service equalities impact

Statutory Consultation will be required in relation to some of the reductions. 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 will be required and a full report to Mayor and Cabinet will detail assessments and set out actions reduce these impacts as far as possible .

Statutory Consultation will be required in relation to some of the reductions. 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 will be required and a full report to Mayor and Cabinet will detail assessments and set out actions reduce these impacts as far as possible.

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	Some yes and some no
---	----------------------

## 9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
---	----

## 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

All services are delivered via contracts which will require decommissioning/ recommissioning, Reductions, Negotiations

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) reports on the main principles 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
May 2016	Service redesign work complete and procurement begins
September 2016	Procurement processes completed
November 2016	Final service reductions and new contract values ( <b>full decision</b> ) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
March 2017	Savings implemented