

<b>Mayor &amp; Cabinet</b>			
<b>Title</b>	Comments of the Public Accounts Select Committee on the Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 Draft Revenue Budget Savings Proposals		
<b>Contributors</b>	Public Accounts Select Committee	<b>Item No.</b>	5 (Addendum)
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	30 September 2015

**Reasons for lateness: The report is late as Public Accounts Select Committee had not held its meeting before the agenda dispatch 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 Lewisham Future Programme.**

## **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 Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 Draft Revenue Budget Savings Proposals at the meeting on 29 September 2015.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Mayor & Cabinet is recommended to note the views of the Public Accounts Select Committee as set out in section 3 of this referral.

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

- 3.1 On 29 September 2015, the Public Accounts Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 Draft Revenue Budget Savings Proposals. The Committee resolved to advise the Mayor & Cabinet of the following:
- 3.2 The Public Accounts Select Committee endorsed the referrals made by Select Committees (attached at Appendix A) with the exceptions of referrals I9e from Children and Young People Select Committee, and G2 from Sustainable Development Select Committee on which it decided to reserve judgement in order to fully consider these matters at its own meeting. The Committee asked that the Mayor and Cabinet take these referrals into account alongside officer reports when taking a decision on the Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 Revenue Budget Savings Report.

- 3.3 In addition to these Select Committee referrals, the Public Accounts Select Committee agreed to add an additional recommendation to the Mayor and Cabinet as requested by the Chair of Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committee to endorse the importance of considering the equality impact of savings proposals on residents with protected characteristics, both for individual proposals and when considered overall, and that the equalities information provided by officers be updated as these proposals are developed and monitored once implemented, with additional analysis where possible.
- 3.4 The Public Accounts Select Committee agreed the following proposals with no changes: F2a and F2b;F3; I2a,I2b and I2c;I4a and I4b;I5:I6;I7;I8;I9a,I9b,I9c,I9d,I9e; I10a and I10b; and O4.
- 3.5 The Public Accounts Select Committee made additional comments on the following proposals:

**G2: Income generation**

- 3.6 The Committee agreed with the comments of the Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committee and strongly endorsed the appointment of a commercialism specialist at senior officer level. This had been brought out in evidence sessions as part of the Income Generation Review being conducted by the committee and would be one of the key recommendations of the final report which would be presented to Mayor and Cabinet at its meeting on 11 November 2015.

**I3: Reorganisation of how complaints are managed across the Council.**

- 3.7 The Committee agreed the proposal but requested that the Public Accounts Select Committee receive feedback on the results of the review after it had been completed.

**O5 Discretionary Freedom Pass**

- 3.8 The Committee endorsed the comments of the Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committee and rejected the proposal in its current form requesting that it be reconsidered in light of the implications on vulnerable residents.

**4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 Should the Committees' referrals result in the amount of savings achieved being reduced the resulting shortfall may mean that alternative proposals will 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 refer reports to the Mayor and Cabinet, who are obliged to consider the report and the proposed response from the relevant Executive Director; and report back to the Committee within two months (not including recess).

### **Background papers**

Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 Revenue Budget Savings  
Report - Meeting of the Public Accounts Select Committee, 29  
September 2015

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager (0208 3149446).

<b>Public Accounts Select Committee</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings – Select Committee views		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	3
<b>Contributors</b>	All Select Committees		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	29 September 2015

## **1 Summary**

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Select Committees (which met in September 2015) on the Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings report.

## **2 Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Select Committees as set out in this report.
- 2.2 The Select Committee Referrals from the following committees are summarised in sections 3 to 7 below.
- Children and Young People Select Committee
  - Healthier Communities Select Committee
  - Sustainable Development Select Committee
  - Housing Select Committee
  - Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee

## **3. Children and Young People Select Committee views**

- 3.1 On 8 September 2015, the Children and Young People Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme – 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings Report. The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:

### **A11: Managing and Improving Transition Plans.**

- 3.2 The Committee raised concerns about the ability for the Council to increase the number of localised options for young people with

complex needs and requested further clarification on the localised options being proposed, and further details of exactly how the savings would be achieved, and the timescale to be provided before a decision is taken on this proposal.

#### **A16: Public Health (Obesity and Physical Activity)**

- 3.3 The Committee highlighted that reductions in Council spending in this area could have a negative impact on the health of young people and increase the risk of childhood obesity. The Committee was concerned regarding the proposal to cease the free swimming programme for under 16s and adults over 60 and to cease the cycling in schools programme. The Committee requested further information on the current uptake of the schemes and the costings and savings predicted, before a decision be taken on this proposal.

#### **I9e: Realign Schools HR Recharge**

- 3.4 The Committee requested additional information on the exact nature of the proposal to charge schools for HR functions such as recruitment, occupational health, policy advice and DBS clearance. After hearing that the proposal around charging for HR functions would be considered by the Schools Forum in October, the Committee requested that the minutes from the Schools Forum meeting in which these matters would be discussed be circulated to members of the Children and Young People Select Committee at the earliest possible stage.

#### **J2a: Schools Service Level Agreement**

- 3.5 The Committee requested that copies of the minutes of the meeting of the Schools Forum where the proposed 2.5% increase in the cost to schools would be considered, be circulated to the Children and Young People Select Committee as soon as they were available.

#### **J2b: Schools Attendance and Welfare**

- 3.6 The committee had concerns regarding the impact this proposal would have on schools and felt additional information on this was needed, particularly with respect to Primary Schools which they felt may have less capacity to manage these changes. The Committee raised concerns that the impact could be greater than predicted and requested assurances that the impact predictions had been fully researched, to be received before a decision on this proposal be taken.

#### **N5: Review of Lewisham's Passenger Transport Service**

- 3.7 The Committee was reassured that there would be no changes to the eligibility criteria as a result of the proposed savings but requested further information to ensure that the proposals were realistic given the

current deficit of £700,000 in that service area, to be received before a decision on this proposal be taken.

**Q3a&b: Sensory Teachers**

- 3.8 The Committee requested additional information on how these savings would be achieved and any potential negative effects on students as a result of passing on costs to the Dedicated Schools Grant, to be received before a decision on this proposal be taken.

**Q3c: Educational Psychologists**

- 3.9 The Committee had concerns regarding the reduction in staffing and requested additional information on the proposal and impact, to be received before a decision on this proposal be taken.

**Q3e: Reducing Carers Funding**

- 3.10 The Committee requested further clarification on the savings proposal and highlighted the importance of the Contact a Family scheme. The Committee requested assurance be given, that this proposal was not replicating a previously trialled programme, before a decision on this proposal be taken.

**Q5: Youth Service**

- 3.11 The committee requested more detail on the proposed changes to services and the potential impact on young people as well as additional detail on other alternative options considered, to be received before a decision on this proposal be taken.

**4. Healthier Communities Select Committee views**

- 4.1 On 9 September 2015, the Healthier Communities Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme: 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings Proposals for Scrutiny. The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:

**A14: Managing the demand for formal social care and achieving best value in the provision of care packages**

- 4.2 The Committee submits that there was insufficient information on how this proposal would impact on service users; especially on which services may no longer be available. The Committee requested monitoring reports at key stages of the implementation of this strand of work which should include risk analysis of the impacts on service users. The Committee welcomed the suggestion by officers to provide anonymised case studies of service users affected by changes to support plans as part of the information provided for this savings

proposal. The Committee requested reassurance that service users would be supported in avoiding future crisis situations, as well as being supported during a crisis. In addition, the Committee commented on the difficulties of managing expectations as to what the Council will be able to provide and therefore highlighted the need to engage with both service users and practitioners to affect this change in culture.

## **B2: Supporting People – Reduction in budget across all client groups**

- 4.3 The Committee notes with great concern the potential impact of removing services for some of the most vulnerable residents in the borough, as these services often function as a last resort. The Committee is also concerned about the risk of this proposal leading to cost shunts to other services. The Committee is supportive of work undertaken to identify alternative sources of funding for these services and to identify other support networks. The Committee rejects the proposal to reduce the provision of the accommodation and floating support services for these vulnerable residents.

## **5. Sustainable Development Select Committee views**

- 5.1 On 15 September 2015, the Sustainable Development Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme: 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings Proposals for Scrutiny. The Committee resolved to advise Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:
- 5.2 The budget savings should be made with proper investment in relevant personnel and technology wherever necessary rather than taken without the tools that officers need to facilitate their introduction.
- 5.3 **N4: Provide a mobile, 'as required', response service for residential roads instead of traditional 'beat cased' sweeper.**
- The Committee was unanimous in their view that accepting this saving proposal would seriously damage the corporate reputation of the Council and the image of the borough in the eyes of its residents and stakeholders.
  - The Committee was concerned that the public could lose faith in the Council's ability to run services if the Council was to accept this proposal.
  - Residents may come to the view that the Council was not able to carry out other basic functions if it was not able to keep the streets clean as well as in the past.
  - It is important to retain the lessons of the "broken window" philosophy – a situation where minor environmental degradation can escalate if left unaddressed and this would apply on a borough-wide scale should the council stop regular weekly street-sweeping.

## Appendix A

- The introduction of a responsive 'as and when' service would further damage the perception of the council because residents would always end up phoning to report litter in their street as soon as it appeared.
- Littering and fly-tipping is bad enough at present and any untidiness would give offenders greater license for their bad habits.
- Residents may start to take less pride in keeping the borough clean themselves.

### 5.4 **N6: To develop our trade waste customer base, improve efficiency and increase income. To negotiate an increased share of income from Parks Events.**

- The Council should be looking at contracts where it is the commercial landlord to increase opportunities to increase income on trade waste.
- The Council should investigate whether it can enforce a requirement to undertake cleansing in an agreed zone of dispersal for park events.
- A 'catch-them-young' comprehensive borough-wide anti-litter campaign needs to be introduced to all schools in order to help residents adopt life-long anti-litter habits.

### 5.5 **P2d: Review of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on the way in which the service consults on planning applications. Efficiency savings based on paper, printing and postage costs.**

- If the Council is going to cease delivering planning notices to properties that neighbour planning application sites, improved alternatives should be in place before the change. These should be:
  - Large, bright notices in the place of the current, small, old-fashioned 'municipal' style A4 notices that are currently used.
  - The Council should develop its use of technology to be able to contact residents with a singular 'resident profile' that could be used by services across the Council.

### 5.6 **G2: Income Generation**

- The Committee supported the appointment of a designated commercially experienced officer or officers to develop the Council's income generation strands.

### 5.7 Therefore, the Select Committee recommends that Public Accounts advise the Mayor of its view that:

- He should note the comments on N6, P2d and G2
- He should accept saving proposals: N3, N5, and N6
- He should reject the savings proposal N4
- He should accept saving proposals: P2a, P2b, P2c, and P2d.

- He should accept the savings proposal G2

## **6. Housing Select Committee views**

- 6.1 On 16 September 2015, the Housing Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme: 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings Proposals for Scrutiny. The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:

### **B2: Supporting People – Reduction in budget across all client groups**

- 6.2 The Committee notes with great concern the potential impact of removing services for some of the most vulnerable residents in the borough, as these services often function as a last resort. The Committee is also concerned about the risk of this proposal leading to cost shunts to other services. The Committee also noted its concern that a reduction in individual available places may result in lack of places for clients, and it also could lead to more work for partners such as the police, probation, South London and Maudsley NHS Trust and Lewisham Hospital if incidents escalate. It could also lead to people becoming homeless, have an impact on statutory services/temporary accommodation/residential care, increased use of existing hostels by high needs out of borough clients and a rise in rough sleeping. The Committee rejects the proposal to reduce the provision of the accommodation and floating support services for these vulnerable residents, in line with the Healthier Communities Select Committee's comments.

### **M2a and M2b: Review of funding streams across housing strategy, development and partnership functions; and reduction in premises costs**

- 6.3 The Committee referred no comment on these saving proposals.
- 6.4 Therefore, the Select Committee recommends that Public Accounts advise the Mayor of its view that:
- He should accept saving proposals: M2a and M2b
  - He should reject the savings proposal B2

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

- 7.1 On 16 September 2015, the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee considered a report entitled Lewisham Future Programme:

2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings Proposals for Scrutiny. The Committee resolved to advise the Public Accounts Select Committee of the following:

**B2: Supporting People – Reduction in budget across all client groups**

- 7.2 The Committee is concerned about the impact of this proposal on vulnerable residents and feels without further information on the consequences for vulnerable residents, the Committee rejects this savings proposal. The Committee supports the concerns raised at Healthier Communities Select Committee meeting about this savings proposal.

**L6: Library and Information Service**

- 7.3 The Committee supports the proposal to consult on changes to the library services in Forest Hill, Torrington Road and Manor House. The Committee submits that there is insufficient information about the proposal to integrate the library provision in Catford into the repurposed ground floor space within Laurence House. It is currently unclear what kind of services would be on offer from the library, how the space in Laurence House would be used, and what the interplay between the library service and other Council services would be. The Committee submits that the library and information service could play a valuable role in supporting residents in accessing digital services, and that a more comprehensive look should be taken at how all the services on offer on the ground floor of Laurence House work together to support residents.

**L7: Leisure Services**

- 7.4 The Committee requests that when examining re-drafting of Leisure Centre Contracts in the search for £1m per annum savings, officers should: (i) estimate the effect on pricing and on the content of provision bearing in mind many residents are on low incomes linked to poor health outcomes and some services are not commercially viable without subsidy; (ii) estimate the potential for savings made by closing entire facilities; (iii) give special consideration to those facilities that have potential dual exercise and social/community use such as halls and outdoor spaces.

**O5: Discretionary Freedom Pass**

- 7.5 The Committee rejects this proposal in its current form, as the Committee feels vulnerable residents should be protected. The Committee submits that officers should instead encourage residents to use alternative travel concessions. Officers should review which residents are eligible for the 60+ London Oyster Card and the Job Centre Plus travel discount card, while the travel needs of residents

currently using the Discretionary Freedom Pass due to a mental health condition should be reviewed as part of the standard assessments for eligibility of adult social care.

## **8 Financial Implications**

- 8.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se; but there may financial implications arising from carrying out the action proposed by the Committee.

## **9 Legal Implications**

- 9.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to refer reports to the Mayor and Cabinet, who are obliged to consider the report and the proposed response from the relevant Executive Director; and report back to the Committee within two months (not including recess).

## **Background papers**

Lewisham Future Programme: 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings Proposals for Scrutiny at the Select Committee meetings in September 2015.