

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

CONTENTS

Appendices

- i.** B4 – Supporting People
- ii.** D2 – Efficiency review proposal
- iii.** E8 - Asset rationalisation proposal
- iv.** I12 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Policy & Governance
- v.** I13 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Finance
- vi.** I14 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Counter Fraud
- vii.** I15 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Accounting review
- viii.** J3 - School effectiveness proposal
- ix.** K5 – Crime problem solving
- x.** M8 - Strategic housing proposal
- xi.** O5 – Public services proposal
- xii.** P3 – Planning income

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix i

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Service economy rental income
Reference:	B4
LFP work strand:	Supporting People
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Protection and Safety
Service/Team area:	Supporting People
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing, and Older People
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Healthier / Safer Stronger Select Committees

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Service Economy	No	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. To date savings proposals have been put forward totalling £5.5m since 2013.
Saving proposal
The service receives income from rental and the savings proposal is 50% if this income. The full amount is not proposed as this is required to support the services.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The use of the income would support provision if not used for savings.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
These are minimal and any resources allocated to this area are used directly for commissioning services .

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	6,549	(1,171)	5,378	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Service Economy	70	0	0	70
Total	70	0	0	70

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
% of Net Budget	1%	%	%	1%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
A	D	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 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
8	9	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
negative	negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

8. 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?

9. 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:	low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	low	Gender reassignment:	Low

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

9. Service equalities impact			
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
No specific legal implications

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix ii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Corporate efficiency from unallocated inflation
Reference:	D2
LFP work strand:	Efficiency Review
Directorate:	Corporate
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Strategic Finance
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Corporate efficiency measure	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
This saving corporate and not related to any specific service area. It will be implemented through the annual budget process when agreed at Council in February 2018.
Saving proposal
The proposal is to not allocate £1m of the estimated £3.7m of inflation (£1.1m for pay and £2.6m for non-pay) to service budgets when setting the 2018/19 cash limits.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The impact cannot be identified specifically as this is a general corporate saving. The impact will however be very limited as it represents a reduction of less than a half of one percent from all service budgets. Services will have to manage how best to absorb the reduction to their budget. For example; negotiate contract or agency rates, hold vacancies, limit discretionary spend during the year, etc..
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The risk is that services will not contain their expenditure within their budget. This would be identified quickly through the financial monitoring and highlighted for action.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	232,700		232,700	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Corporate efficiency from unallocated inflation	1,000			1,000
Total	1,000			
% of Net Budget	0.5%	%	%	0.5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E		A. Strengthening community input
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	B. Sharing services
Low		C. Digitisation
		D. Income generating
		E. Demand management

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
Negative		3. Clean, green and liveable
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	4. Safety, security and a visible presence
Low		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

8. 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?
	N/A

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

9. 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:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
N/A			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None – this saving, if agreed, will be taken as part of the Budget report to Council February 2018.

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix iii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Income from Private Rented Scheme (PRS) Joint Venture
Reference:	E8
LFP work strand:	Asset Rationalisation
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Regeneration
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Generate rental income from PRS	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>R&P and Strategic Housing are currently procuring a Joint Venture (JV) partner from the private sector. The Council will dispose of the Besson Street site into the JV, who will build, own and operate circa 230 Private Rental Sector (PRS) units. These units will comprise of at least 35% discounted London Living Rent units and provide a GP surgery at nil cost.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Accounting for the procurement costs, financing costs, and management costs, the net annual rental revenues paid by the JV to the Council (in the form of an investment return) will generate circa £500k of new income for the Council over a period of not less than 30 years.</p> <p>The procurement is due to conclude and a report be presented to M&C on the 6 December 2017. It is anticipated that the JV will form in March 2018, with the land transfer (and receipt) in 2018/19 after successful planning approval.</p> <p>Annual rental income will be generated from approximately 2021/22 onwards.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
<p>Positive impact on housing provision within the Borough, improved access to private rented accommodation. Increased Council Tax receipts. New, improved GP practice.</p> <p>Council staffing/management of JV needs to be considered and provided.</p>
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Planning risk – JV appoints suitable architects and enters into a Pre-Planning Application to mitigate this

Financial risk – costs of build increase or rental levels decrease – JV competitively tenders build package and ensures that product produced can attract appropriate rental income

Partnership Risk – JV collapses – an extended public procurement exercise has been used with detailed HoTs agreed to ensure that the JV structure is robust and the most suitable partner appointed.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	16,870	(9,479)	7,391	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a)	500			500
Total	500			500
% of Net Budget	7%	%	%	7%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	Yes	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:			Transfer of site to GF will increase HRA headroom	

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
D	E	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
6	10	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence
Impact on main	Impact on second	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	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
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Yes - New homes, community space and commercial space
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	New Cross

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

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>A M&C report is scheduled for the 6 December with full legal implications, including the formation of a JV and the approval to enter into this for the purpose of funding and developing the Besson Street site.</p> <p>The last M&C report was the 13 July 2016 and obtained approval to start the procurement of the JV partner.</p>

12. 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:
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

12. Summary timetable	
Month	Activity
September 2017	Dialogue with bidders
October 2017	Final bids submitted
December 2017	M&C approval of JV partner
March 2018	Obtain SoS approval for disposal
March 2018	Enter JV, form new LLP
December 2018	Planning application made
March 2019	Land transfer to JV, land receipt received

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix iv

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Administrative budgets
Reference:	I12
LFP work strand:	Management & Corporate Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Policy and Governance
Service/Team area:	Executive Support
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Reduction of administrative budget	N	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p><u>Support to senior management and directorates</u></p> <p>This area of business provides support to senior management (Chief Executive, Executive Directors, Director and Heads of Service) and includes staffing and administrative costs. The function provides a wide range of administrative and clerical activities that support senior management in the planning and co-ordination of business within and across directorates. The function supports both internal (Mayor and Councillors) and external relations (with Government departments, partner agencies and the public). Significant reductions in staffing support have been delivered in recent years, culminating in the consolidation of most of these functions into a central location.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>A saving of £20k will be made from top slicing administrative budgets across the support activities to senior management.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
<p>Significant savings have already been made on the staffing support over recent years through rounds of staff cuts in this area of business. The consolidation of the remaining staffing support, largely to one floor, has exploited the scope for some efficiencies of co-location to mitigate the impact of such staff reductions and management of administrative costs.</p> <p>The focus now is on top slicing operational or administrative budgets but it does increase risks to meeting basic administrative needs. These risks are mitigated in part by excluding the key subscriptions budgets (the LGA and London Councils) from this saving and the beneficial impact of going increasingly “paperless” (reducing demand</p>

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

4. Impact and risks of proposal
for paper).
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
None noted

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	65	0	65	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
Reduce administrative budget	20			20
Total				
% of Net Budget	31%	%	%	31%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E		A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
M		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		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
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral		
Level of impact on main priority –	Level of impact on second priority –	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Low		

8. 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?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	n/a	Pregnancy / Maternity:	n/a
Gender:	n/a	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	n/a
Age:	n/a	Sexual orientation:	n/a
Disability:	n/a	Gender reassignment:	n/a
Religion / Belief:	n/a	Overall:	n/a
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented as part of 2018/19 budget

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix v

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Finance function efficiencies through the implementation of Oracle Cloud
Reference:	I13
LFP work strand:	I - Management and Corporate Overheads
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Financial Services
Service/Team area:	Financial Services Division
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Finance function service changes - £200k for 2018/19	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Financial Services division forms part of the Resources and Regeneration Directorate. It provides a range of different services which include; a statutory accounting function including core reconciliations, financial business and management accounting advice to managers, as well as a payroll and pensions administration function. Similar to the approach taken in recent years, it should also be noted that discussions about 'finance' also includes the strategic finance team, which is part of the Corporate Resources division. This team provides a budget strategy, treasury management and pensions' investment function.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The Financial Services Division is expected a saving at £300k over the course of the next two years, £200k for 2018/19 and £100k for 2019/20. This target could only be achieved in the context of ensuring that the Council continues to meet its financial statutory obligations. This proposal provides focus on the identification and delivery of the £200k saving for 2018/19.</p> <p>In May 2017, Mayor & Cabinet took a decision to integrate the IT functionality of the finance, procurement, human resources and payroll services through the development and implementation of an integrated Enterprise Resources Planning (ERP) solution. This programme, known as Oracle Cloud, is being designed to deliver a solution which will enable joined up information, processes and decision making. Amongst the most important element of business change, which financial services want to assist with, is encouraging business managers to take an enterprise view, by providing them with properly joined up information and a single entry point to initiate actions, rather than the separate ones for finance and human resources etc.,</p>

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

3. Description of service area and proposal

To deliver these savings it will be necessary to undertake an in-depth review of the Council's finance function in terms of how the staff teams are arranged and specific duties they are required to undertake. The aspiration is to move the function more towards an advisory type position, but it will take time to get there. This work is underway and it will be possible to deliver revenue budget savings of £200k for 2018/19.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The new solution is expected to engender greater self service for manages and budget holders throughout the organisation. Full adoption of the solution will be essential if the organisation is to fully realise the benefits and achieve the efficiencies needed.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Delivering savings of this order could have a significant impact on the council's ability to achieve its statutory obligations, the most fundamental one of which is to close the annual accounts and achieve a clean audit opinion at the end of that process. This will come about if officers are unable to fully realise the benefits of the new Oracle Cloud solution and ensure that it is used in the appropriate way.

Some of the function's routine responsibilities such as making statutory government returns (NNDR, Section 251, CTB, RA and RO forms etc.) would continue to be affected by reductions in the staffing compliment. Therefore, unless the finance function is deemed 'business ready' by April 2019 when the new Oracle Cloud solution is expected to have gone live, then there would be major risks of taking any more money out of the function. These risks are being mitigated through close monitoring of the Oracle Cloud design and delivery programme to ensure that any deviations from the plan can be appropriately rectified.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,682	(1,472)	3,210	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Finance function service changes	200			200
Total	200			200
% of Net Budget	6%	%	%	6%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Digitisation	Sharing Services	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 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
Inspiring Efficiency, effectiveness and equity	N/A	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	N/A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	N/A	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	None
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. 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:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

9. Service equalities impact	
None	
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	No

10. 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	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific legal implications which arise from agreeing this budget saving proposal. Any staffing changes, once identified, will be managed in compliance with the Council's managing change policy.

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

12. Summary timetable	
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix vi

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Loss of seconded Police Officer to Counter Fraud team
Reference:	I14
LFP work strand:	I – Management and Corporate Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Audit & Risk – Anti Fraud and Corruption Team (A-FACT)
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Loss of Police Officer secondment	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Anti-Fraud and Corruption Team (A-FACT) fulfils the statutory obligation on the Council to investigate Housing fraud. It also investigates, in accordance with legislation, allegations of misuses of public resources or internal fraud and promotes good practices to help protect public funds.
Saving proposal
Reduce the A-FACT budget by £70k to recognise the loss of the seconded police officer to Lewisham Council.
During 2017/18 the Metropolitan Police Service recalled all their Detective Constables, including the one seconded to Lewisham Council. They also confirmed that they would not be renewing this scheme that saw police officers seconded to London Boroughs and that in future this partnership working would return to being wholly between the authority and their local force.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The loss of the Police Officer will mean that any criminal cases will have to be taken up by the local force rather than directly. In addition the Police Officer was the Council's Financial Investigator, able to pursue Proceeds of Crime cases. This access and skills are being lost.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The risks are the inability to pursue criminal cases or seek the recovery of assets without the support of the local police or other qualified investigators. The mitigations are to continue working closely with the Borough police force and look to train another

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

4. Impact and risks of proposal

member of the team and a Financial Investigator or access these skills through the CIPFA Counter Fraud hub on an as needed basis.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	330	(30)	300	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Loss of Police Officer seondment	70			70
Total	70			70
% of Net Budget	23%	%	%	23%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	Yes	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:			Some investigations concern housing matters	

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
B		A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		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
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative		
Level of impact on main priority –	Level of impact on second priority –	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Low		

8. 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?

9. 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:	N/A
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix vii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Balance sheet review of accounting policies
Reference:	I15
LFP work strand:	Management and corporate overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Strategic Finance and Core Accounting
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Public Accounts Select Cttee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Review of MRP accounting policy	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The service area facilitates the Council's Strategic Finance activities (managing the savings and budget setting process, providing corporate finance advice (including procurement), performing treasury management functions, and managing the pension fund) to support delivery of Council objectives.
Saving proposal
As part of the Treasury Management Strategy, review the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy and re-evaluate the appropriate levels required in line with current asset valuations to remain prudent and comply with international finance and CIPFA accounting guidance.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
This is a technical finance accounting adjustment that will not directly impact service users.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The risk is that if there is a sudden swing in the value of the Council's assets an in year charge would need to be taken to the Council's revenue budget. This will be mitigated by ensuring the asset position is considered with reference to the underlying value of the assets and any related borrowing costs to ensure a prudent approach.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	N/A		N/A – this concerns the balance sheet not revenue account	
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Review of MRP accounting policy	1,000			1,000
Total	1,000			1,000
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
N/A		A. Strengthening community input F. Sharing services G. Digitisation H. Income generating I. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		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		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Med		

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific impact

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

8. Ward impact	
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

9. 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:	N/A
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC – this will be part of setting the Council's Treasury Strategy as part of the budget in February 2018

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix viii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Statutory functions of School Effectiveness
Reference:	J3
LFP work strand:	School Effectiveness
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Head of Standards and Inclusion
Service/Team area:	Access, Inclusion and Participation
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Statutory functions to be funded from DSG	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Attendance and Welfare service delivers services to ensure children and young people attend school and have appropriate access to education. This includes attendance and welfare, child employment and support for parents and schools on exclusions and the education of Looked After Children. Part of the service is traded with schools, the statutory functions have up to now been funded from the General Fund.
Saving proposal
The Department for Education removed the Education Services Grant (ESG) from Local Authorities in 2017/18. The grant was then treated as part of the General Fund. The Department for Education however moved the part of the grant that supported statutory education services to the Dedicated Schools Budget. It is now proposed that those former statutory services be funded out of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
None
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The former education services grant has been incorporated into the new central block of the Dedicated Services Grant, potentially this could be reduced by central government or a fall in pupil numbers which would put pressure on these services. Over the past few years the level of the Dedicated Services Grant has been cash frozen and this is likely to continue in the future, making the need for efficiencies to be made in the service.

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	366	0	366	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
Statutory functions to be funded from DSG	366			366
Total	366			366
% of Net Budget	100%	%	%	100%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	Yes		
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:		Costs transferred to the DSG		

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
A	B	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 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
2	10	
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	
Low	Low	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

8. 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?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific legal implications

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented when setting GF and DSG budgets for 2018/19

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix ix

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Problem solving crime reduction
Reference:	K5
LFP work strand:	Crime reduction
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Protection and Safety
Service/Team area:	Crime, Enforcement and Regulation
Cabinet portfolio:	Community and Equalities
Scrutiny Committee(s):	Safer Stronger Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Problem solving crime reduction	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<p>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</p> <p>The Crime, Enforcement and Regulation Service covers the following statutory areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime reduction service inc ASB, PREVENT • Statutory Nuisance • Licensing • Trading standards <p>And the following non-statutory areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious Youth Violence • VAWG • Hate Crime • CCTV • Counter extremism <p>The CER service was created in Aug 15. There has been significant investment in staff development and training to enable staff to deliver in this multi-faceted service. Areas such as PREVENT, Serious Youth Violence, aspects of the VAWG service etc are all externally funded.</p>
<p>Saving proposal</p> <p>The service has allocated funds to support problem solving processes which could require small amounts of resources to deliver and tackle problems identified throughout the year. The proposal is to reduce this budget and resource by 50%. The full amount is not proposed as this will significantly limit services being delivered directly to communities as problems are identified.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<p>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</p> <p>The impact based on previous years will be a limited flexibility to deliver and support</p>

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

4. Impact and risks of proposal

problems that arise. This will impact on residents and partners.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Reduced service offer designed to tackle problems identified. The risks can not be mitigated as resources across the partnership are also reduced.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	3,092	(1,233)	1,859	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Problem solving crime reduction	30	0	0	30
Total	30	0	0	30
% of Net Budget	1%	%	%	1%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
A		A. Strengthening community input
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Medium		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
4	1	1. Community leadership and empowerment
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
negative	negative	3. Clean, green and liveable
Level of impact on main priority –	Level of impact on second priority –	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

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens
Medium	Medium	10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

8. 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?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Medium	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Medium	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Medium	Overall:	Medium
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix x

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation
Reference:	M8
LFP work strand:	Housing non-HRA
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Strategic Housing
Service/Team area:	Housing Needs and Refugee Services
Cabinet portfolio:	Housing
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Housing Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Housing Needs and Refugee Service manages the housing and homelessness assessment process, the statutory provision of emergency housing for homeless households, and the work that the Council is doing to support refugees.</p> <p>The London wide housing crisis has driven huge operational and financial pressures for all London local authorities in this area. In Lewisham there are now more than 1,800 households who are homeless and living in temporary accommodation, of whom more than 500 are living in “nightly paid” accommodation.</p> <p>Over the past five years the Council has pursued a wide ranging strategy to address these pressures. This has included: ambitious targets for Council house building; a range of projects to create better and cheaper forms of temporary accommodation of which PLACE/Ladywell has been the most high profile example; providing £40m of loan finance to Lewisham Homes to enable it to acquire properties for use for homeless households; and a focus on intervening with families earlier in the homelessness process in order to prevent rather than respond to potential problems.</p> <p>Through all of these measures, the number of households in nightly paid temporary accommodation has broadly stabilised at around 520, and there are on-going strategies in place to continue to reduce this number.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The proposed saving is to reduce, by £250k, the budget of £3.05m which is held to fund “nightly paid” accommodation for homeless households.</p> <p>It is projected that this saving can be enabled in three ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By reducing the number of households placed in nightly paid accommodation 2. By reducing the average cost per placement for households placed in nightly

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

3. Description of service area and proposal

accommodation

3. By generating income from alternative forms of temporary accommodation that are being bought or built by the Council

The reduction in the overall number of households is projected to be achieved by continuing the range of interventions set out above. Further property acquisitions, conversions, leases and developments are expected to come forward in the coming year which will help to provide alternatives to nightly paid options. In addition the continuing focus on homelessness prevention should continue to tackle the overall level of demand.

The reduction in average cost per placement can be achieved through the effective targeting of the most expensive placements, supported by high quality management information and reporting on cases and costs that has been developed over the past two years. This approach has already helped to reduce average placement costs even as the number of placements has stayed the same.

Finally, some alternative forms of temporary accommodation generate an income to the Council, and in some cases also generate an operating surplus over and above the costs of operation and of financing the original investment. The PLACE/Ladywell and Hamilton Lodge developments are examples of where this has been possible, and have already facilitated revenue savings in previous iterations of the budget setting process. Officers are bringing forward further similar projects which will, in due course, also generate an operating surplus to the Council. While most of these are projected to come on-stream from 2018/19 onwards, it is still expected that a small additional operational surplus can be made in the coming year and can contribute to the overall £250k saving.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The Council and its service users are negatively impacted by the on-going housing crisis and the efforts set out above to address this by sourcing better and more sustainable accommodation benefit both homeless households and the Council's financial position.

In that sense, this proposal mainly provides benefits rather than risks. That said, there are risks to delivery. The London housing crisis could worsen, and increase demand more than currently expected. Equally the savings are predicated on the continuing tight management of placement costs, and continuing delivery of acquisition and new build projects, without which the saving will not be deliverable.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Tight operational management of costs can be facilitated through a structured approach to decision making and the provision of regular and robust management information to support decisions.

The delivery of acquisition and development projects can be supported by ensuring sufficient operational resources, processes and access to technical support is in place.

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	28,263	(22,675)	5,588	
HRA	n/a	n/a		
DSG	n/a	n/a		
Health	n/a	n/a		
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation	250			250
Total	250			250
% of Net Budget	5%	%	%	5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
E	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 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
Decent Homes for all	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	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

8. 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?

9. 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:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Nightly paid accommodation is least stable form of emergency accommodation. By providing alternatives to this form, residents will benefit from a positive impact			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific legal implications from reducing this budget. The specific proposals that have enabled it to be made, and future iterations of those, are all considered separately at Mayor and Cabinet and legal implications are considered at that time.

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
April 2018	Budget reduced and savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix xi

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Council Tax single person discount review
Reference:	O5
LFP work strand:	Public Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Services
Service/Team area:	Revenues / Council Tax
Cabinet portfolio:	Resouces
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Council Tax single person discount review	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Council Tax collection and administration.
Saving proposal
<p>There are 125,000 households in the borough and of these 47,000 (37%) are in receipt of a single person discount. This is the highest percentage of single person discount claims in London.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed its single person discounts on an annual basis for many years using an external provider that carries out a data match exercise. This has generated additional Council Tax of over £700,000 pa. However, in 2017/18 the Council carried out a proof of concept using a more detailed data match, which identified a possible 2,500 incorrect claims and lost Council Tax of potentially up to £800,000 pa.</p> <p>The saving is the billing and collection of the additional Council Tax the review identified as due. The service believes it will collect at least £500K of this additional Council Tax in 2018/19.</p> <p>The reason the £500K is below the estimate of £800K, is because it is expected that further challenges to the discount withdrawal will be received once the Council sends a bill. In addition, the Council is expecting it is going to have to take a higher than normal level of enforcement action to collect the debt.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The impact on service users will be that those Council Tax payers who are not entitled to a single person discount will have to pay more. There will be no impact on

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

4. Impact and risks of proposal

partners. There will be some additional administration for staff.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that the data used is unreliable. However, Council Tax payers have been given two opportunities to challenge it before we withdrew the discount and sent an amended bill.

There is a risk that Council Tax payers may not pay the increased bill. However, the service will take enforcement action against those that do not pay their bill.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	
HRA	-			
DSG	-			
Health	-			
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
Council Tax single person discount review	500			
Total	500			
% of Net Budget	N/A	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
D		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence
10		
Impact on main	Impact on second	

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	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
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

8. 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?

9. 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:	n/a
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None.

12. 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

Appendix xii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Planning savings
Reference:	P3
LFP work strand:	Planning and economic development
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Planning
Service/Team area:	Planning
Cabinet portfolio:	Regeneration
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) increase income	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Government has recently laid before Parliament draft legislation relating to changes to the Planning Statutory Fees. It is proposed that planning application fees will be increased by 20%, which should be in place by 1 April 2018.</p> <p>Planning Application Fees for 2016/17 were £910,778 and are forecasted as £1.2m during 2017/18, against an annual budget of £929,000 for both years. An increase of 20% would have uplifted this income to £1,092,934, an increase of £182k (2016/17) and £1,440,000 a forecast increase of £240k (2017/18).</p> <p>However, we are only able to take advantage of the 20% increase in fees if we do not reduce our base budget. This Government requirement has been introduced to ensure that the application fee increase will be “ring-fenced” to improve planning capacity and customer service. Therefore, the Development Management (E44613) base budget of £1,751,393 cannot be reduced in the budget savings exercise for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The Planning Service have therefore looked to identify opportunities to generate additional income as opposed to savings to the base budget.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>In total £270k made up of:</p> <p>£240k from the outline proposal for 2018/19 presented in the savings round for 2017/18. This was anticipated to come from £200k income and £40k restructure. Due to the ringfencing of the base budget, the £40k restructure figure is no longer achievable via a restructure but would be more than offset by the statutory fee increase.</p> <p>The additional £30k increase in income to the DM budget will come through a further</p>

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

3. Description of service area and proposal

review of and increase to chargeable services.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

There will be an impact on service users through the increase of fees. However, these have not been reviewed for some time and we would be seeking to ensure that we are fully recovering the cost. The Planning Service are continuing to improve the Planning web pages to ensure that a free offer is available to any householders looking to undertake works in the Borough. Discussions with developers has indicated a willingness to pay increased fees if it enables a good level of service to be provided.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that by increasing fees, less customers will choose to use the service. In order to minimise this, the Planning Service are already looking at customer satisfaction and ways of promoting and marketing services.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	2,637	(1,582)	1,055	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
income	270			270
Total	270			270
% of Net Budget	26%	5%	%	26%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
Income generating	Demand management	A. Strengthening community input
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	B. Sharing services
Low	Medium	C. Digitisation
		D. Income generating
		E. Demand management

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

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

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Decent Homes for all	Strengthening the local economy	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	
low	low	

8. 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?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	n/a	Pregnancy / Maternity:	n/a
Gender:	n/a	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	n/a
Age:	n/a	Sexual orientation:	n/a
Disability:	n/a	Gender reassignment:	n/a
Religion / Belief:	n/a	Overall:	n/a
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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
As increasing income to cover the full cost of undertaking service, no legal implications.

12. 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:

Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

12. Summary timetable

The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.

Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented