

APPENDICES vii to xi

Contents

Appendix vii Savings Summary Table

Appendix viii Corporate Savings Principles

Appendix ix Making Fair Financial Decisions Guidance

Appendix x Efficiency Plan in support of Four Year Settlement Offer

Appendix xi Summary of equality implications

APPENDIX vii

2017/18 to 2019/20 SAVINGS - SUMMARY TABLE OF NEW PROPOSALS WITH PROFORMA AT SEPT. 2016

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
A	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health							
A18 a)	Widening the scope for charging by removing subsidy and increasing charges	200			200	N	Y	N
A18 b)	Widening the scope for charging by improving income collection performance	300			300	N	N	N
A19	Workforce productivity from better use of technology	200	300		500	Y	N	Y
A20	Reduction in day care offer	300	300	300	900	N	N	N
A21 a)	Review levels of Mental Health expenditure, manage demand for accommodation services	300	300	400	1,000	N	N	N
A21 b)	Review levels of Mental Health expenditure, review implementation of s117 requirements	200			200	N	N	N

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
B	Supporting People							
B3	*B3 - Re-procure floating support services	500			500			
E	Asset Rationalisation							
E6	E6 - Property investment acquisition	150			150	N	N	N
E7	E7 - Development of Private Rental Schemes	150	700	175	1,025	N	N	N
I	Management and Corporate Overheads							
I11 a)	I11 a) - Review insurance risks & reserves	225	50		275	N	N	N
I11 b)	I11 b) - Review insurance risks and reorganise	25			25	N	N	N
L	Culture and Community Services							
L8	L8 - Facilities management	70	130		200	N	N	Y
L9	L9 - Assemblies Fund	270			270	Y	Y	N
L10	L10 - Adult Learning Lewisham subsidy	40			40	N	N	N

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
M	Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services							
M3	*M3 - Housing needs restructure	61			61			
M4	M4 – PLACE / Ladywell	85			85	N	N	N
M5	M5 - Hamilton Lodge hostel income	150			150	N	N	N
M6	M6 - Reorganise provision of the Handy Persons service	150			150	Y	Y	Y
M7 a)	M7 a) - Reduce No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) re-provisioning housing	64			64	N	N	N
M7 b)	M7 b) – NRPF prompt claiming of Housing Benefit project	36			36	N	N	N
Q	Safeguarding and Early Intervention							
Q6 a)	Q6 a) - Developing alternative pathways for care – shared housing	170			170	N	N	N
Q6 b)	Q6 b) - Developing alternative pathways for care – housing support	420			420	N	N	N
Q6 c)	Q6 c) - Developing alternative pathways for care – access to public housing	50			500	N	N	N
Q6 d)	Q6 d) - Developing alternative pathways	270			270	N	N	N

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	for care – claiming of housing benefit							
Q6 e)	Q6 e) - Developing alternative pathways for care – contract monitoring	190			190	N	N	N
Q6 f)	Q6 f) - Developing alternative pathways for care – improved planning		100		100	N	N	N
Q7 a0	Q7 a) - Redesign Of Lewisham CAMHS – improve access pathways	44	50	100	194	Y	N	N
Q7 b)	Q7 b) - Redesign Of Lewisham CAMHS – further integration work	50			50	Y	N	N
Q8	Q8 - Develop in-house fostering and specialist carers	220			220	N	N	N
Q9	Q9 - Enhance support for children on edge of care	495			495	N	N	N
Q10	Q10 - Enhance family finding capacity for step down	150			150	Y	Y	N
Q11 a)	Q11 a) - Redesign of Meliot Centre - review of services at the centre	500			500	Y	N	Y
Q11 b)	Q11 b) - Redesign of Meliot Centre - develop contact centre	234			234	N	N	N

Appendix viii

Corporate Savings Principles

Prior to the General Election in 2010, the Labour Government instituted a programme of austerity planned over a five year period. In 2010 the Coalition Government increased the level of and pace of “fiscal consolidation” (i.e. tax increases and spending cuts) that applied to the nation’s public finances. In 2013 these were increased again such that the original plans of the (then) Labour Government to reduce public spending have been increased dramatically. To ensure that this scale of service cuts did not impact adversely on front-line services the Mayor and Cabinet agreed a set of principles to underpin the Council’s decision making. These principles ensure that we:

- 1) Take account of the impact on service outcomes and social results for customers and citizens
- 2) Be prudent and sustainable for the longer term, we will not just opt for short term fixes
- 3) Reflect a coherent “one organisation” approach that avoids silo-based solutions
- 4) Encourage self-reliance, mutualism and cooperative endeavour
- 5) Mitigate potential harm in accordance with an appropriate assessment of needs
- 6) Be mindful of the impact on the geography of fairness across Lewisham (and our boundaries)
- 7) Involve service users, staff and other stakeholders in the redesign of services for the future
- 8) Consider the current or potential actions of other public agencies and the voluntary sector locally, including sharing and reshaping services (Total Place)
- 9) Consider the impact on the Lewisham approach where we listen to all voices, take account of all views and then we move forward to implement.

Appendix ix



Making fair financial decisions

Guidance for decision-makers

3rd edition, January 2015

Introduction

With major reductions in public spending, public authorities in Britain are being required to make difficult financial decisions. This guide sets out what is expected of you as a decision-maker or leader of a public authority responsible for delivering key services at a national, regional and/or local level, in order to make such decisions as fair as possible.

The public sector equality duty (the equality duty) does not prevent you from making difficult decisions such as reorganisations and relocations, redundancies, and service reductions, nor does it stop you from making decisions which may affect one group more than another group. The equality duty enables you to demonstrate that you are making financial decisions in a fair, transparent and accountable way, considering the needs and the rights of different members of your community. This is achieved through assessing the impact that changes to policies, procedures and practices could have on people with different protected characteristics .

Assessing the impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is not just something that the law requires, it is a positive opportunity for you as a public authority leader to ensure you make better decisions based on robust evidence.

What the law requires

Under the equality duty (set out in the Equality Act 2010), public authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The protected characteristics covered by the equality duty are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The duty also covers marriage and civil partnerships, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination.

The law requires that public authorities demonstrate that they have had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in their decision-making. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which public authorities can demonstrate that they have had 'due regard'.

It is also important to note that public authorities subject to the equality duty are also likely to be subject to the Human Rights Act 1998. We would therefore recommend that public authorities consider the potential impact their decisions could have on human rights.

Aim of this guide

This guide aims to assist decision-makers in ensuring that:

- The process they follow to assess the impact on equality of financial proposals is robust, and
- The impact that financial proposals could have on people with protected characteristics is thoroughly considered before any decisions are arrived at.

We have also produced detailed guidance for those responsible for assessing the impact on equality of their policies, which is available on our website at www.equalityhumanrights.com

The benefits of assessing the impact on equality

By law, your assessments of impact on equality must:

- Contain enough information to enable a public authority to demonstrate it has had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in its decision-making
- Consider ways of mitigating or avoiding any adverse impacts.

Such assessments do not have to take the form of a document called an equality impact assessment. If you choose not to develop

a document of this type, then some alternative approach which systematically assesses any adverse impacts of a change in policy, procedure or practice will be required.

Assessing impact on equality is not an end in itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision that is being made.

Whether it is proportionate for an authority to conduct an assessment of the impact on equality of a financial decision or not depends on its relevance to the authority's particular function and its likely impact on people with protected characteristics.

We recommend that you document your assessment of the impact on equality when developing financial proposals. This will help you to:

- **Ensure you have a written record of the equality considerations** you have taken into account.
- **Ensure that your decision includes a consideration of the actions that would help to avoid or mitigate any impacts on particular protected characteristics.** Individual decisions should also be informed by the wider context of decisions in your own and other relevant public authorities, so that people with particular protected characteristics are not unduly affected by the cumulative effects of different decisions.
- **Make your decisions based on evidence:** a decision which is informed by relevant local and national information about equality is a better quality decision. Assessments of impact on equality provide a clear and systematic way to collect, assess and put forward relevant evidence.
- **Make the decision-making process more transparent:** a process which involves those likely to be affected by the policy, and which is based on evidence, is much more open and transparent. This should also help you secure better public understanding of the difficult decisions you will be making in the coming months.
- **Comply with the law:** a written record can be used to demonstrate that due regard has been had. Failure to meet the

equality duty may result in authorities being exposed to costly, time-consuming and reputation-damaging legal challenges.

When should your assessments be carried out?

Assessments of the impact on equality must be carried out at a **formative stage** so that the assessment is an integral part of the development of a proposed policy, not a later justification of a policy that has already been adopted. Financial proposals which are relevant to equality, such as those likely to impact on equality in your workforce and/or for your community, should always be subject to a thorough assessment. This includes proposals to outsource or procure any of the functions of your organisation. The assessment should form part of the proposal, and you should consider it carefully **before** making your decision.

If you are presented with a proposal that has not been assessed for its impact on equality, you should question whether this enables you to consider fully the proposed changes and its likely impact. Decisions not to assess the impact on equality should be fully documented, along with the reasons and the evidence used to come to this conclusion. This is important as authorities may need to rely on this documentation if the decision is challenged.

It is also important to remember that the potential impact is not just about numbers. Evidence of a serious impact on a small number of individuals is just as important as something that will impact on many people.

What should I be looking for in my assessments?

Assessments of impact on equality need to be based on relevant information and enable the decision-maker to understand the equality implications of a decision and any alternative options or proposals.

As with everything, proportionality is a key principle. Assessing the impact on equality of a major financial proposal is likely to need significantly more effort and resources dedicated to ensuring effective engagement, than a simple assessment of a proposal to save money by changing staff travel arrangements.

There is no prescribed format for assessing the impact on equality, but the following questions and answers provide guidance to assist

you in determining whether you consider that an assessment is robust enough to rely on:

- **Is the purpose of the financial proposal clearly set out?**

A robust assessment will set out the reasons for the change; how this change can impact on protected groups, as well as whom it is intended to benefit; and the intended outcome. You should also think about how individual financial proposals might relate to one another. This is because a series of changes to different policies or services could have a severe impact on particular protected characteristics.

Joint working with your public authority partners will also help you to consider thoroughly the impact of your joint decisions on the people you collectively serve.

Example: A local authority takes separate decisions to limit the eligibility criteria for community care services; increase charges for respite services; scale back its accessible housing programme; and cut concessionary travel. Each separate decision may have a significant effect on the lives of disabled residents, and the cumulative impact of these decisions may be considerable. This combined impact would not be apparent if the decisions were considered in isolation.

- **Has the assessment considered available evidence?**

Public authorities should consider the information and research already available locally and nationally. The assessment of impact on equality should be underpinned by up-to-date and reliable information about the different protected groups that the proposal is likely to have an impact on. A lack of information is not a sufficient reason to conclude that there is no impact.

- **Have those likely to be affected by the proposal been engaged?**

Engagement is crucial to assessing the impact on equality. There is no explicit requirement to engage people under the equality duty, but it will help you to improve the equality information that you use to understand the possible impact on your policy on different protected characteristics. No-one can give you a better insight into how proposed changes will have an impact on, for example, disabled people, than disabled people themselves.

- **Have potential positive and negative impacts been identified?**

It is not enough to state simply that a policy will impact on everyone equally; there should be a more in-depth consideration of available evidence to see if particular protected characteristics are more likely to be affected than others. Equal treatment does not always produce equal outcomes; sometimes authorities will have to take particular steps for certain groups to address an existing disadvantage or to meet differing needs.

- **What course of action does the assessment suggest that I take? Is it justifiable?**

The assessment should clearly identify the option(s) chosen, and their potential impacts, and document the reasons for this decision. There are four possible outcomes of an assessment of the impact on equality, and more than one may apply to a single proposal:

Outcome 1: No major change required when the assessment has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to advance equality have been taken.

Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers identified by the assessment or to better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified?

Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified some potential for adverse impacts or missed opportunities to advance equality. In this case, the justification should be included in the assessment and should be in line with the duty to have 'due regard'. For the most important relevant policies, compelling reasons will be needed. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact, as discussed below.

Outcome 4: Stop and rethink when an assessment shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination.

- **Are there plans to alleviate any negative impacts?**

Where the assessment indicates a potential negative impact, consideration should be given to means of reducing or mitigating this impact. This will in practice be supported by the development of an action plan to reduce impacts. This should identify the responsibility for delivering each action and the associated timescales for implementation. Considering what action you could

take to avoid any negative impact is crucial, to reduce the likelihood that the difficult decisions you will have to take in the near future do not create or perpetuate inequality.

Example: A University decides to close down its childcare facility to save money, particularly given that it is currently being under-used. It identifies that doing so will have a negative impact on women and individuals from different racial groups, both staff and students.

In order to mitigate such impacts, the University designs an action plan to ensure relevant information on childcare facilities in the area is disseminated to staff and students in a timely manner. This will help to improve partnership working with the local authority and to ensure that sufficient and affordable childcare remains accessible to its students and staff.

• **Are there plans to monitor the actual impact of the proposal?**

Although assessments of impact on equality will help to anticipate a proposal's likely effect on different communities and groups, in reality the full impact of a decision will only be known once it is introduced. It is therefore important to set out arrangements for reviewing the actual impact of the proposals once they have been implemented.

What happens if you don't properly assess the impact on equality of relevant decisions?

If you have not carried out an assessment of impact on equality of the proposal, or have not done so thoroughly, you risk leaving yourself open to legal challenges, which are both costly and time-consuming. Legal cases have shown what can happen when authorities do not consider their equality duties when making decisions.

Example: A court overturned a decision by Haringey Council to consent to a large-scale building redevelopment in Wards Corner in Tottenham, on the basis that the council had not considered the impact of the proposal on different racial groups before granting planning permission.

However, the result can often be far more fundamental than a legal challenge. If people feel that an authority is acting high-handedly or without properly involving its service users or employees, or listening to their concerns, they are likely to become disillusioned with you.

Above all, authorities which fail to carry out robust assessments of the impact on equality risk making poor and unfair decisions that could discriminate against people with particular protected characteristics and perpetuate or worsen inequality.

As part of its regulatory role to ensure compliance with the equality duty, the Commission monitors financial decisions with a view to ensuring that these are taken in compliance with the equality duty and have taken into account the need to mitigate negative impacts, where possible.

Appendix x

Efficiency Plan in support of Four Year Settlement Offer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 As part of the 2016/17 Local Government Finance Settlement the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to all authorities to offer them a four year financial settlement. This settlement is still subject to an annual consultation and confirmation by parliament.
- 1.2 For Lewisham this relates to the offered level of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) each year to 2019/20. To take up this offer the Council must write to the Secretary of State by the 14 October 2016 and include a link to their published efficiency plan. This paper is Lewisham's efficiency plan to 2019/20 to enable it to take the four year settlement of RSG worth £170.3m.

2. Corporate objectives

- 2.1 The Council's vision is for Lewisham to be the best place in London to live, work and learn. This vision was developed following extensive consultation with Lewisham residents, public sector agencies, local business, voluntary and community sector organisations. This vision has been adopted by all our partners.
- 2.2 In working to achieve this vision the Council is guided by two principles – 1) reducing inequality, and 2) delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably. Delivery against these ambitions is then guided by six strategic priorities and ten corporate objectives. All the above are set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy.

3. Savings targets

- 3.1 In the seven financial years 2010/11 to 2016/17 the Council has delivered £138m of savings and used reserves in the last three years to enable it to set an annual balanced budget. For the next three years the base case from the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy identifies a further £62m of savings are likely to have to be made. This will bring the total to £200m in ten years.
- 3.2 In respect of the required £62m of savings for the years 2017/18 to 2019/20 the Council has already made good progress and continues to work hard to close the gap to put its finances on a sustainable footing. The Council's approach to this work is described below. To date £16m (26%) of the savings required have been agreed. At this time, a further £21m (34%) are the subject of proposals to be put before members in September - £7m in detail for 2017/18 and £14m in outline for the following two years. Leaving £25m (40%) still to be identified.

- 3.3 The budget numbers – resources, expenditure, and gap - are summarised in the table below:

London Borough of Lewisham	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
MTFS	£m	£m	£m	£m
Revenue Support Grant	59.6	46.2	36.9	27.6
Business Rates (retained & top up)	87.1	88.8	91.4	94.3
Council Tax*and Collection Fund	89.5	91.9	96.5	101.8
General Fund resource	236.2	226.9	224.8	223.7
Expected spend after savings	247.1	259.3	239.4	238.7
Use of reserves	-10.9	-	-	-
Gap – annual	0	32.4	14.6	15.0
Gap – cumulative	-	32.4	47.5	62.0
Savings agreed	-	16.2	0.0	0.0
Savings proposed	-	6.8	5.0	8.6
Savings to be identified	-	9.4	9.6	6.4

*these Council Tax increases reflect assumptions about growth in the tax base and that the 2% social care precept and a 1.99% general rise are applied annually.

4. Approach to savings

- 4.1 In 2013 the Council established the Lewisham Future Programme as an organisation and system wide approach based on corporate control and accountability to deliver ongoing savings. The programme focuses on areas of greatest spend and common services, recognising that further years of significant spending reductions require even greater innovation, focus on the customer, and collaborative thinking to deliver savings while, if at all possible, minimising the impact on residents
- 4.2 In respect of the £62m of savings for the three years to 2019/20, a summary of the current savings position and where the Council is targeting its efforts, relative to net general fund budgets for these services, is set out in the table below:

Lewisham Future Programme	16/17 GF budget £m	Saving Target £m	Proposals			Gap £m
			17/18 £m	18/19 £m	19/20 £m	
Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	70.5	14.7	5.7	1.6	2.6	4.8
Supporting people (SP)	9.8	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Asset rationalisation	7.6	9.4	1.3	1.1	0.5	6.5
Enforcement & regulation	in SP above	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Management & corporate overheads	25.0	9.2	2.5	0.9	1.8	4.0

Lewisham Future Programme	16/17 GF budget £m	Saving Target £m	Proposals			Gap £m
			17/18 £m	18/19 £m	19/20 £m	
School effectiveness	1.3	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.0
Crime reduction (incl. drugs & alcohol)	in SP above	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.5
Culture & community services	11.4	4.6	3.0	0.4	0.0	1.2
Strategic housing	5.5	1.6	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.6
Environment services	18.9	5.3	1.3	0.3	1.8	1.9
Public Services – customer contact	13.5	3.9	1.4	0.0	1.9	0.6
Planning & economic development	1.4	1.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.7
Early intervention & safeguarding	47.6	6.8	3.5	0.2	0.1	3.0
Corporate cost (e.g. capital charges)	20.7	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	236.2	61.7	23.0*	5.2	8.7	24.8

*£16.2m of this total was agreed when 2016/17 annual budget was set.

5. Approach to transformation

5.1 To support the work of the Lewisham Future Programme and following a large scale consultation with the community (the Big Budget Challenge), in 2015 the Council adopted its Lewisham 2020 strategy. This focuses on four themes for transformation and enabling approaches to support the implementation of service reductions. They are:

- Creating the conditions where communities will be able to support themselves;
- Actively exploring all opportunities to share services;
- Digitising our services and our interactions with residents (to help simplify and manage demand); and
- Developing entrepreneurial approaches to income generation, particularly in relation to assets.

5.2 The table below summarises examples of the many savings and efficiencies made to date and planned, mapped against the transformation themes adopted by the Council. Those areas of activity to date are still relevant as work continues to extend these practices, as well as identify new efficiencies.

Transformation theme	Examples – to date	Examples - proposed
Communities supporting	• Expansion of successful	• Support Local Assemblies

Transformation theme	Examples – to date	Examples - proposed
themselves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community libraries • Volunteer engagement to maintain parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to self-manage • Engage tenants to support handy person service
Sharing Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared operation support with other London Boroughs – IT & Comms • Employment and Skills training cross Borough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment fleet and depot services in South East London • Co-location of offices with partners – e.g. CCG
Digitising services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Citrix infrastructure and paperless office plans • Channel shift to bring more services on-line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing workforce practices to more flexible working – e.g. social work • Embed channel shift and increase automation
Managing demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core home support to lower health & care costs • Recruitment of more local foster parents • Work to support self-travel to limit transport demands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend personal budgets to lessen need for support • Focus through contracts on prevention support • Extend extra care and shared lives schemes
Income generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop own enforcement agency re debt collection • Offer extended services – e.g. trade waste, green recycling, pre-planning etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invest in developing housing supply – e.g. PRS, short-term & hostels • Extend use of open spaces for events • Improve timely and efficient debt collection

5.3 In addition to the approaches noted above the savings numbers to be delivered also continue to require rigorous work on cost control in all areas (e.g. use of agency staff, contract management etc..) and an acceptance of more service and financial risk through leaner corporate governance, risk and control arrangements.

6. Risk considerations

- 6.1 The risk landscape facing local authorities continues to change as a result of policy and practice. All of which bring further financial uncertainty and pressure to bear on plans and may require further and more radical efficiencies to be made.
- 6.2 A summary of the risks and opportunities being monitored and managed by the Council include:

National	London	Lewisham
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move to 100% self-financing via Council Tax and Business Rates (plus appeals and 2015 valuation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> London devolution proposals re business rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer discretionary services and more rationed statutory services impact sense of place and community cohesion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devolution of new responsibilities to local government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport priorities such as the Bakerloo line extension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population growth creating service demands – e.g. need for housing, schools, social care etc..
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to New Homes Bonus scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisation and governance of health & care services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate governance, risk and control tested e.g. workforce resilience, financial tolerance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of Improved Better Care Fund monies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of travel, e.g. concessionary scheme 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New apprenticeship levy – workforce & cost implications 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More schools to academy and funding changes 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further public sector spending cuts to unprotected areas 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic climate impacts investment decisions 		

7. Financial sustainability

- 7.1 As the Council continues to make significant budget cuts it is increasingly juggling the challenges from taking more risk while avoiding service or financial failure. To help manage the timing and

scale of this challenge the Council sets aside monies and uses reserves to balance the budget.

- 7.2 In respect of timing, the Council identifies £7.5m annually to be allocated to specific service risks and pressures as they emerge from setting the budget and regular financial and performance monitoring through the year. In addition, the Council has been putting the New Homes Bonus it receives into reserves, rather than directly into the base budget while the scheme's future remains uncertain, and drawing on this to meet demand.
- 7.3 In terms of scale, the Council has been using earmarked reserves to support investments, redundancies and change. For example; the Council continues to make capital investments in school places and different types of housing provision, and investments in services such as IT and fleet. And the Council has run three voluntary severance schemes in the last five years.

8. Related documents

- 8.1 Other published documents related to this plan include:

Sustainable Community Strategy

<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/strategies/Documents/Sustainable%20Community%20Strategy%202008-2020.pdf>

Budget for 2016/17

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s41570/2016%2017%20Budget.pdf>

Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2019/20

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=123&MId=4155>

Strategic Asset Management Plan

<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/strategies/Documents/150330%20SAMP%20Final.docx>

Corporate Budget Book 2016/17

<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/finances/Documents/Corporate%20Budget%20Book%202016%E2%80%9317.pdf>

Lewisham 2020 5 year forward view

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s39593/Lewisham%202020%205%20year%20Forward%20view.pdf>

END

Appendix xi

Summary of Equalities Implications

Context

The Lewisham Future Programme 2016/17 report sets out options in 20 proposals (excluding B3 and M3 and the separate Public Health proposals – see report) with a total value of £6.4m of savings for pre-decision scrutiny prior to Mayor and Cabinet on 28 September 2016. As part of the budget setting process, equality assessment analysis of selected budget savings is carried out to better understand the likely impact on protected groups and, where possible, to mitigate any negative effects.

An initial assessment of the likely impact of changes on protected groups is carried out during the development of each savings proposal. A determination is also made as to whether the proposal, should it be agreed, would require a full equalities analysis assessment. This information is presented in section eight of each proforma (appended to the budget savings report).

The Public Sector Equality Duty requires the Council to have ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Characteristics¹ covered by the Equality Duty are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- The duty also covers marriage and civil partnerships, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination within employment and training.

The Council is required to demonstrate that it has had ‘due regard’ to the aims of the Equality Duty in decision-making. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which the Council can demonstrate that it has had ‘due regard’.

Lewisham’s has a comprehensive equalities scheme (2012-16) which is based on the principles set out in the borough’s sustainable communities’ strategy. The scheme brings together information and intelligence about the Council’s strategic approach to equality and states the Council’s commitment to achieving these five objectives:

- Tackling victimisation, harassment and discrimination
- Improving access to services
- Closing the gap in outcomes for citizens

- Increasing understanding and mutual respect between communities
- Increasing participation and engagement

Having due regard to the requirements of the public sector equality duty and having consideration of the objectives of the Comprehensive Equalities Scheme, it has been agreed that the assessment of the impact on equality should be focused on, and proportionate to, decisions being made.

Where proposals are anticipated to have an impact on staffing levels, they are subject to consultation as set out in the Council's employment policies, and services will be required to undertake an Equalities Analysis Assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process.

These proposals are identified as aligning to the Council's corporate priorities as follows:

Corporate Priority	Proposals - primary impact by number and value			
	Number	%	£'000	%
1. Community leadership and empowerment	2	10%	470	7%
2. Young people's achievement and involvement	0	0%	0	0%
3. Clean, green and liveable	1	5%	150	2%
4. Safety, security and a visible presence	0	0%	0	0%
5. Strengthening the local economy	0	0%	0	0%
6. Decent homes for all	3	15%	385	6%
7. Protection of children	7	35%	3,193	50%
8. Caring for adults and the older people	4	20%	1,800	28%
9. Active, healthy citizens	1	5%	40	1%
10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness	2	10%	400	6%
Total	20	100%	6,438	100%

Of these 20 proposals they were assessed by impact and severity as follows

Impact	No	%	Severity	No	%
Positive	10	50%	High/Medium	1	5%
Neutral	7	35%	Medium	14	70%
Negative	3	15%	Low	5	25%
Not known	0	0%	Not known	0	0%
Total	20	100%	Total	20	100%

Of the proposals three were identified as Negative and Medium and seven as Positive and Medium with the others in between.

Overall from an equalities perspective and the potential impact on service users, the 20 proposals were assessed as follows*

Overall equalities assessment on service users*		
Likely impact	Number	%
High	0	0%
Medium	4	20%
Medium/Low	2	10%
Low	8	40%
Not known or Not applicable	6	30%
Total	20	100%

*NB these assessment are before any consultation where required with service users to evaluate these initial assumptions.

In respect of the potential specific equalities implications from proposals directly impacting the public, the following was identified against twelve (or 60%) of the proposals (with a value of £4m or 62% of the total value of the proposals).

Protected characteristics	Proposals – possible High or Medium impact			
	High	Medium	Total	Comment
Ethnicity	1	4	5	
Gender	1	2	3	
Age	2	3	5	
Disability	3	7	10	
Religion / Belief	0	0	0	
Pregnancy / Maternity	0	1	1	
Marriage & Civil Partnerships	0	0	0	
Sexual orientation	0	0	0	
Gender reassignment	0	0	0	
Total	7	17	24	

As only six proposals were identified as having potential High or Medium equality implications, 70% of the proposals are identified as having a low level of impact or

the equalities implications are judged not to be applicable (or assessment unnecessary).

Officers were also asked to consider the potential geographical impacts of the budget savings proposals. In all cases, no specific ward impact has been identified.

Conclusion

Corporate Priorities

- The two main corporate priorities impacted by these proposals are the protection of children and caring for adults and older people, 55% by number of proposals and 78% by value. This consistent with the proportion of the Council's budget committed to these services. None of the proposals are judged to have a high impact on the corporate priorities and the balance between positive and negative impacts is roughly equal.

Equalities

- Six of the proposals were identified as having potential high or medium impacts on service users, all in the areas of age, disability, ethnicity and gender. None of the proposals were judged as having a high equalities impact overall.