APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Managing demand at the point of access to Adult Social Care (ASC) services
Reference:	COM1
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Adult Social Care
Service/Team area:	Adult social care
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Improved demand management for ASC £122k	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Social Care Advice and Information Team (SCAIT) is the first point of contact for enquiries for social care. The service has been piloting a more focused early intervention approach (3 conversations model). The assessment and eligibility process is a core component of the Care Act 2014. The 3 conversations process is used to identify the level of need for care and support so that a proportionate response is provided at the right time, based on the individual's needs. Prevention and early intervention are placed at the heart of the care and support system, and even if a person has needs that are not eligible at that time, the local authority must consider providing information and advice or other preventative services. This proposal will be part of the SCAIT intervention.
Cuts proposal
We have benchmarked good practice with other local authorities regarding the effective management of demand for services and have piloted new ways of working in order to support service users to make their own arrangements where possible. The new way of working is based on the "3 conversations model", a tool which assists in helping residents to help themselves and make full use of all the resources available to them – leaving the social care investment to be used when no other resources can be used. There are approx. 2,000 contacts made to adult social care, social care advice and information service per month. Of these 450 are dealt with by a home visit or a solution focused conversation and approximately 700-650 contacts convert and require an assessment. Our intention is to increase this approach by producing the right support at the point of contact. The approach will :

3. Description of service area and proposal

- Connect people at an early stage to support that help them to get on with their lives independently.
- Identify when people are at risk and apply solutions to make them safe
- To provide a fair and proportionate personal budget that considers where sources of funding come from which includes the persons own resources.
- Identifying people who are self-funders at an earlier stage and providing them with information and advice so that they can make their own arrangements.
- We will provide short term intervention such as rehabilitation, recovery, recuperation and reablement, including therapeutic help, for people who contact the service from within the community via self-referral, or from the GP as well as when discharged from hospital.

National good practice estimates that a local authority shouldn't spend more than 15% of the domiciliary care budget on a person for 10 hours or less per week, as this level of care can often be accessed by other means particularly ensuring that correct levels of benefits are in place. Support is provided to people to connect them to these resources and solutions from the staff within the SCAIT team. The proposal would reduce ASC spend from 15.5% of the budget to the 15% recommended above.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

This is a cultural shift to practice for staff who deal with contacts that come to ASC. It is supported by a learning and development programme led by the Principle Social worker (PSW).

The approach may reduce or delay the need for care and support provided or commissioned by ASC. It promotes self-management which can have a positive impact on an individual's psychological wellbeing and promotes independence where possible.

The approach may not always meet the initial expectations that residents have from adult social care and as a consequence, there may be an increase in complaints.

The approach is dependent on there being a range of services available that people can access from the voluntary and community sector, particularly for those who focus on support for vulnerable adults.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The risks associated are that people will choose not to purchase the care and support they need. These risks can be reduced by maximising take up of welfare benefits.

There will be comprehensive risk assessments undertaken as part of the assessment process.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	21,516	(1,937)	19,579	
HRA				

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Improved demand management for ASC £122k	122			122
Total	122	0		122
% of Net Budget	0.6%	0	%	0.6%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
E	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	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 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	
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
	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:	L	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L

9. Service equalities impact			
Gender:	H	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	L
Age:	H	**Sexual orientation:**	L
Disability:	H	**Gender reassignment:**	L
Religion / Belief:	L	**Overall:**	L
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Most people who contact ASC are vulnerable due to age, frailty or disability. Individuals are risk assessed to make sure they remain safe, supported and as independent as possible. Often the care can be provided by partners or family members if deemed appropriate which can fall disproportionately on women.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
No Specific legal implications as approach complies with statutory requirements of the Care Act 2014.

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Ensuring support plans are optimised for Value for Money (VFM)
Reference:	COM2
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Adult Social Care
Service/Team area:	Adult social care
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Ensuring support plans are optimised for VFM - £500k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The four neighborhood assessment teams established across the borough and a team that work specifically with adults with a learning disability provide the main assessment and support planning for those with care needs.

The assessment and eligibility process are a core component of the Care Act 2014. The process is used to identify any level of need for care and support so that a proportionate response is provided at the right time, based on the individual's needs. The assessment and eligibility framework provides ongoing engagement with the person so where they have eligible needs they are involved in the arrangements put in place to deliver the outcomes they want to achieve.

This proposal links to the 3 conversation approach used at the point of contact, and builds on the "asset-based approach" that will assist to identify community and family resources which can help to support people as well as social care investment. It will also ensure that residents receive health investment in a timely fashion.

Cuts proposal

In accordance with social care best practice and care act requirements, there will be continued reassessments of support plans using the strength/ asset based approach. This will include the following actions:

- All Care packages will be based on medium term goals that assist a person where possible to move to greater independence.
- Continuing Health Care decisions to be completed within national timeframes
- Commissioners will continue to work with care market to ensure that the social care investment used is the most cost effective and of good quality.

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is a well-established expectation of residents, staff and health professionals that social care resources will be offered once a referral is made – an approach that considers other resources as part of the solution may raise questions until more fully established.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
There is a risk that community based solutions become less available as funding restrictions impact on voluntary sector partners.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	18,375	0	18,375	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a)	250	250		500
Total				
% of Net Budget	1.4%	1.4%	%	2.7%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E	A	
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**
8	9	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Positive	Positive	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	**7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
Medium	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:	L	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	L
Gender:	H	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	L
Age:	H	**Sexual orientation:**	L
Disability:	H	**Gender reassignment:**	L
Religion / Belief:	L	**Overall:**	L
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Most people that contact ASC are frail or vulnerable due to age or disability. Individual assessments will mitigate any risks and ensure that decisions that are made will ensure support and safety. Often the care can be provided by partners or family members if deemed appropriate, which can fall disproportionally on women.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
No Specific legal implications as approach conforms to Care Act 2014 requirements

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review

12. Summary timetable	
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Increase revenue from charging Adult Social Care clients
Reference:	COM3
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Adult Social Care
Service/Team area:	Adult social care
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Timely charging for services £159k	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The assessment and eligibility process are a core component of the Care Act 2014. The process is used to identify any level of need for care and support so that local authorities can consider how to provide a proportionate response at the right time, based on the individual's needs. As part of the assessment process people are financially assessed in accordance with the fairer charging policy to ascertain the level of contribution they are eligible to make towards the cost of their care.
Cuts proposal
This proposal relates to an increase in income generation rather than a budget cut and involves joint working between Adult Social Care, Customer Services and Resources & Regeneration. Since January 2018, corrective work has been carried out to bring everyone's charges up to date, resulting in provisional estimates of an additional income of £25k weekly. Further corrective work and an earlier financial assessment along with the introduction of auto-charging and the provider portal to the financial system, will provide more accurate billing and invoice processing to both the service users who are charged and the range of care providers who are commissioned.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Some service users may cancel their care due to the costs. They will be engaged with on an individual basis to explore solutions and to ensure they have access to any benefits that they are entitled to.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
See above.

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
		(10,516)	(10,516)	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Timely charging for services £159k	159	0	0	159
Total	159			159
% of Net Budget	1.5%	%	%	1.5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
D	C	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	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 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	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	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
	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:	L	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	L
Gender:	L	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	L
Age:	H	**Sexual orientation:**	L
Disability:	H	**Gender reassignment:**	L
Religion / Belief:	L	**Overall:**	L
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Most people who receive ASC services that are chargeable are frail or vulnerable due to age or disability. The national framework for charging is applied. However, this considers disability related expenditure as part of the financial assessment.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The fairer charging policy sets out an approach to charging that considers a person's assets and ability to contribute towards their care costs based on an individual financial assessment. The introduction of a more efficient charging mechanism in response to care service support changes, will bring the financial impact of those changes forward more quickly than the current arrangements. However, advice and support will be in place, as now, to explain the changes and ensure services are maintained as required to meet eligible need.

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduce costs for Learning Disability and Transitions
Reference:	COM4
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Adult Social Care
Service/Team area:	Adults with learning disabilities and transitions team
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) Increased care cost negotiations £1,300k	Yes	No	No
b) Voids reduction £200k	No	No	No
c) Improved transitions pathway £400k	Yes	No	No
d) PSR identities to be checked and amended	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The adults with learning disabilities (AWLD) team provide assessment and support planning to adults with a learning disability and young people with complex needs or disabilities who are preparing for adulthood “growing up” and receiving support from adult services. Following our recent independent report on the use of resources in adult social care based on 16/17 statutory returns, it has been identified that on average we are spending 10% more per head on Learning Disability service users (under 65) than our comparators. In looking at the same information for 17/18 we have reduced the level of spend per person by 5%, our intention is to reduce this further by another 5% in 19/20. Once the national 17/18 benchmarking data is available, we will be able to look at further reductions in total budget for 2020/21 to ensure we are in line with our comparators. We will continue to review using the strength based approach and will negotiate high cost areas with providers.
Cuts proposal
This savings proposal will focus on 3 areas to reduce costs :

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal
a) Negotiating care costs with providers to ensure they are value for money. b) Working with young people and their families who transfer to adult services at an earlier stage to prepare for their employment/training/ education, independent living and housing requirements, a healthy life and friendships and community connections. c) Ensuring there is good oversight of any voids within supported housing schemes and that they are utilised where ever possible.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Good transition planning will need to be complemented by the development of services that can meet the needs and aspirations of young people within the borough. This will require the commitment of a wide range of key stakeholders.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Voids-Ordinary resident is a risk-mitigation - to develop a placement agreement with any local authority/CCG whereby they confirm they will not seek to transfer the customer being moved into LBL under Ordinary residence rulings. Negotiations on costs may cause concern within the provider market. This risk will be mitigated by negotiations on a case by case basis.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	34,581	(1,984)	32,597	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) LD Unit costs	600	700		1,300
b) Voids management	100	100		200
c) Transitions costs	200	200		400
Total	900	1,000		1,900
% of Net Budget	3%	3%	%	6%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E	B	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	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
10	8	
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**	
High	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?
	N/A

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:	Medium	**Sexual orientation:**	Low
Disability:	High	**Gender reassignment:**	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	**Overall:**	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
All people affected have a disability, new entrants into the service are likely to be younger adults in transition.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Increased focus of personalisation
Reference:	COM5
Directorate:	Community services
Head of Service:	Head of Adult Social Care
Service/Team area:	Adult social care
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
More personalisation of care - £742k	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

This proposal is based on the market development to:

1) Increase the availability of Personal Assistants (PA) and
2) The Shared Lives service.

The support planning process follows the assessment and identifies the type and level of support that is required. There are a range of care services commissioned by the Council to support people to remain at home. These include domiciliary care, respite care, extra care housing, supported housing and day opportunities.

As well as commissioned services, people are offered the option of a Direct Payment so they can employ a Personal Assistant (PA) to support them with their daily living requirements. This option is often experienced as more personalised particularly by younger disabled people and is more cost effective to the local authority as opposed to commissioned services. The cost of a PA is £3 per hour less than the cost of commissioned domiciliary care (this includes payment for LLW, pension holiday entitlement). A component of this cut proposal is based on the increased use of PA's. The current availability is 20,and the intention is to increase to 75.(19/20 £60 /2021 £112)

Cuts proposal

The Shared Lives scheme currently has 20 placements for people with a learning disability and is managed by one member of staff. Our intention is to expand this offer building on capacity and the range of placements including respite care, so that this offer can be available to a wider range of individuals, for example, older people. The intention is to increase capacity by a further 10 placements. The component of savings relating to this are based on the comparison of costs associated with a Shared Lives placement and that of a bed based respite or long term residential placement. (19/20 £200K/ 20/21 £370).

The Shared Lives scheme is another offer that is used as an alternative to commissioned services such as supported living or residential care. It provides a home environment that supports people on a long term basis or for respite care.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The approach gives more control to service users regarding the way their care is provided. It has to be underpinned with an infrastructure that is already in place to monitor the use of the direct payments with support provided to set up these arrangements. The Shared Lives scheme is regulated by the Care Quality Commission. The service provides on-going support and training to the Shared Lives Carers. Both schemes provide employment opportunities to local residents.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
This recruitment campaign needs to be aligned with the foster carers' campaign.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	30,895	(3,922)	26,973	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
More personalisation of care - £742k	260	482		742
Total				
% of Net Budget	1%	1.8%	%	2.8%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
A	E	
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**
8	10	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	**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**
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	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:	L	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	L
Gender:	L	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	L
Age:	L	**Sexual orientation:**	L
Disability:	H	**Gender reassignment:**	L
Religion / Belief:	L	**Overall:**	L
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
These schemes have a positive impact on individuals who have a disability as they offer an opportunity to make individual choices and to live with support within a home environment.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Nothing specific as complies with the Care Act 2014.

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

12. Summary timetable	
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in Mental Health Residential care costs
Reference:	COM6
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Joint Commissioning
Service/Team area:	Mental Health
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) £500k reduction of residential care costs	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Lewisham Council holds statutory duties under the Mental Health Act 1983 (Section 117) to fund the cost of aftercare provision for Adults with mental health disorders following detention within a mental inpatient ward under section 3 of the Mental Health Act. In addition, individuals may also be eligible for funded care packages from the local authority under the Care Act 2014. Section 117 aftercare and Care Act eligible packages often include placements within residential care for individuals that require high levels of support in managing their mental illness that will enable daily functioning. Lewisham due to its geography and high levels of mental health need has an established mature mental health residential care market. An external review undertaken by Care Analytics in 2016 highlighted that Lewisham places individuals at an earlier stages in people lives than comparator boroughs. Access to mental health residential care is delegated by LBL to the South Maudsley Mental Health Trust under a section 75 agreement for the provision of an integrated (Health and social care) mental health services. The local authority chairs the integrated placement panel that authorises each placement. LBL managers and South London and Maudsley Mental Health Trust Managers agree that developing a more robust supported accommodation pathway will provide more choice of residential support and reduce social care expenditure on residential care.
Cuts proposal
Cost of care for those eligible for section 117 aftercare from LBL to be reduced by de-registering a number of residential care providers from the CQC residential care providers register to create more supported living accommodation that can be funded jointly through Housing benefit therefore reducing Adult Social Care costs.

3. Description of service area and proposal
The creation of additional supported living accommodation units will also contribute towards the reduction in care costs. There will continue to be a need to fund the care costs for these supported living accommodation units. A current example of the approach has been implemented with a local provider. Eight residents are now supported for an overall cost to ASC of £58k per annum. The previous ASC care costs for these patients would be £332k (Average £900 per week).

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Services users • The proposal will provide more choice in the first instance for individuals with mental health needs that require accommodation based support. • Some service users may be required to contribute towards the cost of their accommodation based support **Council** We expect an expansion of personalised care packages in conjunction with a reduction in residential care placements Adult social care's expenditure on mental health placement will reduce De-registration of care homes may reduce the number of Out of borough services users that achieve ordinary resident status within Lewisham therefore reducing duties to fund this individuals care **Providers** Some residential provider's income from LBL may reduce as a result of a reduction in residential placements.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Lewisham has a significant number of residential care providers therefore less residential care provision funded by LBL may result in some providers importing patients from other borough's that then become eligible for Ordinary Residence. To work with the local provider market that do not de-register with the CQC to ensure that they are integrated into the Lewisham rehabilitation and recovery pathway so that most of the remaining beds/placement in the borough are occupied by Lewisham residents. SLaM will be encouraged to charge placing authorities for non-Lewisham residents for care co-ordination.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	3,054	(206)	2,848	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**Spend**	**Income**	**Net Budget**	**Total £'000**

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
Reduction of residential care costs	300	200	500	
Total				
% of Net Budget	10.5%	7.0%	17.5%	
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
E		
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
8	10	
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	
Low	High	

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

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

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact			
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:			
The changes will not have any impact on the quality of care delivered to clients and will create more opportunities to negotiate more bespoke individualised care packages. All individuals that are eligible under section 117 (MHA) or the Care Act will be affected.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no legal implications as this will not impact on the Councils duty to provide support

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in Adult Social Care contribution to Mental Health Integrated Community Services
Reference:	COM7
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Joint Commissioning
Service/Team area:	Mental Health
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
£150k reduction of management costs	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Social Inclusion and Referral Service (SIRS) provides person-centred support services within mental health which aims to enable people to explore their goals and ambitions, to become more independent, to stay well, and to feel part of their community.

SIRS can support people to make choices about accessing the support they need now and in the future. SIRS offers a 12 week service working with people to assess their needs and develop individually-tailored Support plans. This may include:

- Support to manage day to day living
- Advice and support to access/retain employment, voluntary work, training and education
- Assessment of independent living skills
- Establishment of routines and social network
- Development of leisure and creative interests
- Signposting to a range of community resources
- Support on being discharged from hospital
- Help to develop a healthy lifestyle to improve/maintain mental health and wellbeing
- Advice regarding eligibility to access a ‘Personal Budget’
- Maximisation of Welfare Benefits for those receiving a service from SIRS

Cuts proposal

To reduce management and other non-direct care costs within the Section 75 Partnership Agreement between SLaM and LBL. SLaM are undertaking a review of their services in the community and as a component of this process, we will seek to review management and all other non-direct care costs. SLaM have indicated that this is possible.

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Services users • No direct impact on client care • Potential integration of functions **Council** • Reduced expenditure as a result of reduced contribution to management charges **Providers** Income for overall service reduced Potential re-distribution of staff across community mental health services
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The proposed savings are related to management costs so there are no associated risks related to this proposal.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	603.3	0	603.3	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) Residential Management costs	100	50		150
Total	100	50		150
% of Net Budget	16.6%	8.3%	%	24.9%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E	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**
10	8	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	**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**
Positive	Positive	
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?
	N/A

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:			
The changes will not have any impact on the quality of care delivered to clients as they relate to on cost applied by the provider that do not related to client care.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no legal implications as this will not impact on the Councils duty to provide support.

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

12. Summary timetable	
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	A change in the public engagement responsibilities for air quality and dedicated funding
Reference:	COM8
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Protection and Safety
Service/Team area:	Environmental health (air quality)
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for parks, neighbourhoods and transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Cut in the budget allocated to delivering on the Air Quality strategic plan £60k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Environmental Health service is responsible for a number of statutory requirements including :

- Food standards and safety Inspections of all premises serving/selling food (e.g. restaurants, retailers) for hygiene and food standards requirements. The frequency is specified by FSA. Food notices / closures
- Council's statutory function delivering Health and Safety Enforcement for both commercial premises and Sports grounds / Investigation of workplace accidents – the council is required to maintain a number of suitably train and experienced staff for these functions by statute.
- Infectious diseases control and investigation of outbreaks/ Support Public health response – again a statutory function.
- Environmental protection including air quality monitoring and compliance with the air quality Management areas/ land contamination and advice on planning as development schemes.

The restructuring and amalgamation of the crime, enforcement and regulatory services, along with food safety and environmental protection in August 2015 resulted in a cut of £800,000 to the Local Authority. This saving had an impact on the ability on the Services to deliver on statutory obligations.

Cuts proposal

To delete the budget allocated for delivering the Strategic Air Quality programme of work which is not part of the statutory requirements and identifying a lead for the strategic approach to air quality in another part of the Council. Public engagement will be taken up by Public Health. There will remain a clear focus on Schools engagement and this will be maintained via the schools travel plans.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Impact on service users: The strategic Air Quality agenda has delivered direct intervention and advice to a number of groups including children, parents, residents, pressure groups, community groups etc. by this service not doing this the ongoing awareness raising and behaviour change approach needed to improve air quality may impact on residents. **Impact on partners**: Poor air quality impacts everyone and impacts on health services in particular. Reducing the focus on the agenda will have a negative impact on the health services. **Impact on other council staff :** The Service has lead the work on the strategic air quality agenda. The cut will mean only focusing on the statutory aspects and this will require other departments in the council to take a lead role in delivering the wider strategic actions.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Risks: 1- The focus on the strategic delivery invested in over the past 18 months will be lost 2- Poor air quality has negative impacts on individuals **Mitigation:** 1- Ensure the agenda is sighted within another department within the council. This cut is proposed for 20-21 which will enable the current work to continue and embed whilst transitioning the arrangements and identifying other sources of resources that may assist in the activity costs and delivery.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	944		667	
HRA				
DSG	**-**			
Health	**-**			
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) reduction of staffing to only focus on the statutory element of Air quality		60		**60**
Total				60
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	9%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	yes	-	-	-
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. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
A	-	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
H	-	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **11. Community leadership and empowerment** **12. Young people's achievement and involvement** **13. Clean, green and liveable** **14. Safety, security and a visible presence** **15. Strengthening the local economy** **16. Decent homes for all** **17. Protection of children** **18. Caring for adults and the older people** **19. Active, healthy citizens** **20. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
3	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**	
High	High	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	All
	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:	High	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	High
Gender:	High	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	n/a
Age:	High	**Sexual orientation:**	n/a
Disability:	High	**Gender reassignment:**	n/a
Religion / Belief:	n/a	**Overall:**	High
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The reduction in focus on a strategic approach to air quality will have a high and negative impact on all aspects of the community. This can be mitigated if other departments within the Council take on a lead role in continuing the strategic work in train.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			no

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	no

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Section 6 Food Safety Act 1990, to carry out all necessary food enforcement inspections as a statutory 'food authority', (this is carried out and will continue to be carried out with the assistance of external qualified support,) the provisions of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, in particular, Ss. 18 & 19, so as to enforce the necessary health and safety provisions as a statutory 'enforcement authority' All relevant functions pursuant to the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984, including powers of necessary entry to premises (s. 61) as a 'relevant health protection authority' (and for the Council to be able to serve all relevant documents and notices, s. 60) also in particular, Part III of the said Act. All relevant functions pursuant to the Health Protection (Part 2A Orders) Regulations 2010 (in the context of the said 1984 Act) and this includes the obligation to provide a written report to the national 'Public Health [England]' Office, each time a Part 2A Order is made. All relevant functions pursuant to the Public Health Act 1961 including filthy or verminous premises. All relevant functions pursuant to the Control of Pollution Act 1974, which are not dealt with elsewhere within the Council's enforcement services; namely, including but not limited to, the service of statutory notices and related enforcement action concerning controlling 'noise' emanating from construction sites (Ss. 60 & 61), and exercising lawful rights of entry and inspection (s. 91). All relevant functions pursuant to the Environmental Protection Act 1990, including those within Part IIA of the Act, where necessary. For this Part of the 1990 Act, the Council is the 'enforcing authority'. This enables the authority to serve appropriate notices, so as to require and subsequently enforce remediation of contaminated land – and deal with alleged significant pollution of controlled waters. The Council must maintain a register containing prescribed particulars relating to 'remediation notices' served and action taken. All relevant functions pursuant to the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Part III, where necessary. Here the Council's authorized officers seek to counter alleged statutory nuisances when witnessed by them, pursuant in particular sections, 79 and 80. All relevant functions pursuant to the Clean Air Act 1993, to control in particular, smoke. Part III of the said Act is relevant to the discretionary power available to a local authority; namely the declaration of a smoke control area. Local Authorities within the provisions of this Act, have the power to obtain information about the emission of pollutants and other substances into the air, and the undertaking of relevant enforcement action if deemed necessary. This works in tandem with the Government published National Air Quality Strategy which contains policies with respect to the assessment or management of the quality of air, pursuant to s. 80 of Part IV Environment Act 1995. The functions here are linked closely with those pursuant to the Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999, s. 1 which seeks to prevent polluting activities.

11. Legal implications
All relevant functions pursuant to the said 1999 Act require Local Authorities to regulate certain types of industries so as to reduce pollution and in particular improve air quality. Certain industrial activities require Permits to be issued so as to set controls and emission standards to minimize pollution. All relevant functions pursuant to the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975, and 1987, including in particular the inspecting and issuing of safety certificates for stands at sports grounds.

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 cuts timetable for 2019/20 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.**	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Cut to intensive housing advice and support service (funded through Supporting People budget)
Reference:	COM9
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Protection and Safety
Service/Team area:	Prevention, Inclusion and Public Health Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Health, wellbeing and older people
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) Bringing element of service in-house and reducing refocusing core offer £300k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Supporting People is the overall name given to the funding of hostels, supported housing and homelessness prevention services.

The accommodation based services are organised into three pathways – young people, vulnerable adults with an emergency housing response service based with the SHIP service.

The spend on these services has been cut by £12.9million since 2010 a reduction that equates to 69.7%.

These are non-statutory services so technically any level of savings could be delivered but this comes with significant risks – it is recommended that no savings are taken from accommodation based services.

In addition to the accommodation based services the budget also funds the Intensive Housing Advice and Support Service (IHASS) which is designed to provide a rapid response to those presenting to the council at risk of homelessness in order to prevent them becoming so. The annual contract value for this service is £674,000.

The service currently works with up to 225 people at any one time and around 900 in any given year.

Cuts proposal

The proposal is that £300,000 could be delivered through reducing the capacity with IHASS and refocusing it to meet changing priorities.

This would be delivered through the insourcing of the existing young person's mediation service (currently 3 members of staff who primarily work with 16/17 year olds who are approaching the council as homeless) and integrating them with the

3. Description of service area and proposal
service offer currently located across Housing (SHIP) and the Children's Social Care First response service. This exact configuration of this offer will be determined as part of the ongoing review of the 'front door' for under 18s but would require the TUPE transfer of the existing staff. The remainder of the service would be reduced and refocused to deliver a £300,000 annual budget reduction. The service would be focused on the resettlement of individuals from supported accommodation and temporary accommodation in order to free up capacity for those with the highest needs. It has been identified that a focus of attention towards 'move-on/resettlement' from supported housing would be appropriate due to the fact that the council's own in-house prevention offer has been sufficiently enhanced since the commissioning of this service due to the changes in responsibilities under the homelessness reduction act. However, ensuring that there is sufficient supported accommodation for those with the highest needs remains a challenge therefore, in the absence of the ability to commission extra capacity, moving people on from this type of service in a timely manner is a key priority. Overall the proposal will reduce the capacity of the service by just under 50%. Some redundancy costs may need to be met from existing budgets.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
This represents an overall cut in service and may lead to an increased number of individual becoming homeless. This will not impact on current service users as the provision is time limited to three months so those currently receiving support will have move on by the time the cut is implemented. However, it will mean that the available preventative offer for those approaching the council in the future will be reduced and this will have a direct impact on the current SHIP/Housing Options service as more people will need to be seen by this service.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The risks associated with this proposal are outlined above but it is possible they would be partially mitigated by the following factors: • The in-sourcing and integration of the YP element of the service should reduce duplication and hand-off points. If this resource is included as part of an overall new offer it will also increase the ability of those designing the 'front-door' to do so in a flexible and inclusive manner • By refocusing on move-on from supported accommodation the remaining commissioned service will create vacancies to ensure those in need of this type of provision can access it in a timely fashion. Given that these individuals are those in highest need they are usually the most complex and take up a disproportionate amount of time for officers seeking to undertaken prevention work when an accommodation solution is not available. Given that their needs are such that this prevention activity is unlikely to be successful anyway it

4. Impact and risks of proposal
makes more sense to fast track them into service allowing increased time to focus activity on those for whom homelessness prevention is a reality.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	6,566	973	5,245	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a)	300			300
Total	300			300
% of Net Budget	6%	%	%	6%
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. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
E	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
M	L	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 21. Community leadership and empowerment 22. Young people's achievement and involvement 23. Clean, green and liveable 24. Safety, security and a visible presence 25. Strengthening the local economy 26. Decent homes for all 27. Protection of children 28. Caring for adults and the older people 29. Active, healthy citizens 30. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
6	8	
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	
M	M	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Borough wide
	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:	High	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Medium
Gender:	High	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	High	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Medium	Overall:	Medium
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Males and those from a Black Caribbean background are over represented in the current service caseload so are likely to disadvantaged by the service reduction. However, males are significantly over presented within the supported housing population so are likely to benefit from any refocusing on move on from hostel accommodation. The impact on the Black Caribbean population will also be reduced due to the fact that these service users are also more likely to be young people – a cohort for whom the service offer will not reduce and will hopefully improve. As such the overall impact is considered medium due to the fact that there will be a service reduction but overall the elements of the service that will be retained will mitigate the most significant disproportionality.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes – new posts will be created.
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			

10. Human Resources impact					
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosexual.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There will be a TUPE transfer of 3 members of staff currently employed by One Support (part of the One Housing Group).

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 cuts timetable for 2019/20 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings
November 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	
1 April 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	1-Reorganisation of crime enforcement and regulation service 2- removal of problem solving resources 3- review of CCTV
Reference:	COM10
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Protection and Safety
Service/Team area:	Crime, enforcement and regulation
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Safer Communities
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) Review of the CER Licensing/ Trading Standards/ ASB/ Statutory Nuisance Service - which would consider a reduction in staffing / reorganisation – **Approx. £215K** (19/20)	Yes	No	Yes
b) Review of Problem Solving resource and service transport resource – **Approx. £40k** (19/20)	No	No	No
c) Review CCTV Service and potential reduction in viewing hours from 24 hours to 12 hours - **Approx. £161k(20/21)**	Yes	Yes	Yes

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

There are a number of Statutory requirements which the Council must meet within the Crime, Enforcement & Regulation Service area. These include:

Statutory Area of Activity	Duty of Local Authority
Weights & Measures	Appoint chief inspector and enforce legislation. No level of activity specified
Fair Trading & Product Safety	Enforce legislation and consider certain types of fair trading complaint
Noise	Investigate complaints and serve abatement notice if considered a statutory nuisance
Crime and Offender management	Statutory responsibilities to reduce reoffending. S17 to prevent crime and disorder.
Anti-Social Behaviour	New duty to develop a Community Trigger protocol for ASB, advertise and implement. ASB & Policing Act 2014
Domestic Violence	Duty to implement a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) following any domestic homicide. Includes duty to appoint independent DHR Chair and report back to Home Office

In addition the service is responsible for Domestic abuse and gender based violence services, hate crime, serious violence unit, PREVENT and countering extremism and received some external funding to deliver on these areas.

The restructuring and amalgamation of the crime, enforcement and regulatory services, along with food safety and environmental protection in August 2015 resulted in a cut of £800,000 to the Local Authority. This saving had an impact on the ability on the new Services to deliver services and focused on statutory elements and where timescales are not specified extended response times to meet capacity.

Cuts proposal

The following cuts are proposed within the Crime, Enforcement & Regulation Service for 2019-21

- Review of the CER Licensing/ Trading Standards/ ASB/ Statutory Nuisance Service - which would consider a reduction in staffing / reorganisation and an impact on officer's response times – **Approx. £215K** (19/20)
- Review of Problem Solving resource and service transport resource – **Approx. £40k** (19/20)
- Review CCTV Service and potential reduction in viewing hours from 24 hours to 12 hours - **Approx. £161k(20/21)**

Equates to a Service cut of approximately **£416K** over 2 years

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

a) Impact on service users: with reduced resources and officer numbers there will be an impact on the ability to deliver statutory services in a time frame that is currently locally set. This means complaints will be responded to and investigated over longer

4. Impact and risks of proposal
time frames and dependant on the complexity. The ability to do more proactive responses such as target hardening areas will be limited. **Impact on partners**: the reduced capacity of officers to work in a problem solving, multi-agency manner with partners such as the police, RSLs, fire and voluntary sector to jointly act on issues to resolve in the short, medium and longer term. **Impact on other council staff:** the service supports and often leads on complaints where there are complex and interconnected issues across areas such as planning, rogue landlords, highways, street enforcement, markets etc. – the reduced staff numbers and capacity will impact on our ability to do so. Supporting events both council led and otherwise will be limited. B) **impact on service users** : the reduced resource to be able to support communities in problem solving actions such as gating/ mobile cameras/ environmental changes etc. will impact on the ability of the partnership and council to assist in resolving issues **Impact on partners:** the service works closely with other agencies such as the police, fire, probation services and the voluntary sector. The reduction in resources and ability to support some of the multi-agency responses needed will mean some actions needed will not be able to be undertaken through lack of funds. This would have the impact of possible ongoing issues with no resolution. **Impact on other council staff:** the work of the division crosses and supports other parts of the council in resolving complaints and issues that affect residents. This reduction in funding will reduce the ability of the council to do this C) **Impact on service users**: residents will see the impact through a possible reduction in prosecutions, less immediate responses to offences as currently the CCTV unit can directly contact police when they see something occurring. There is a possibility that there may be an increase in fear of crime. **Impact on partners:** the police primarily rely on the CCTV capability of 24/7/365 to support in crime detection and prevention. The police require evidence and will ascertain this from CCTV where possible. There is a London wide review of CCTV being undertaken by MOPAC and this may assist in understanding the impacts for partners. The businesses also rely on the CCTV suite for support in relation to shoplifting which will not be available during the times the suite is not staffed. **Impact on other council staff:** the CCTV suite supports a range of cameras across the borough such as Parking in some places which will have an impact. In addition, Lewisham Homes fund an element of their cameras to be streamed and viewed by the 24/7/365 suite. This will need to be consulted upon.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Risks: 1- Risk to delivering statutory functions - For example complaints of ASB may take longer to investigate and resolve with less officers able to deal with cases. 2- Risks to escalation of statutory nuisance/ ASB / trading standards matters as there will be delays in response on occasions where the matter is not deemed high risk. 3- Risks to responding quickly to issues that will impact negatively on residents and businesses 4- Risks to delivering a multi-agency response that would resolve the issue for the medium and long term 5- There are a number of cuts and changes within our external partners i.e. the police which will have a cumulative impact on the response and ability to act 6- Detection and prosecution of crime when the CCTV is not viewed proactively

4. Impact and risks of proposal
7- Lewisham homes CCTV continuation **Mitigation :** 1- Review the locally set indicators to delivering the service where not a mandated time frame such as licencing 2- Continue to use a risk based approach to focus on those issues of high harm or high levels of complaints 3- Working with departments in the council to understand the impacts and clarify what the Council collectively can and cannot respond to 4- Working with partners to agree a new set of expectations and roles and responsibilities 5- Consultation regarding CCTV for both Lewisham homes and more widely exploring options with other boroughs

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	3,153		2,065	
HRA				
DSG	-			
Health	-			
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) reorganisation of the statutory functions within the Crime Enforcement and Regulation service area	Approx. 215			**Approx. 215**
b) Review CCTV Service and potential reduction in viewing hours from 24 hours to 12 hours		Approx. 161		**Approx. 161**
c) Review of Problem Solving resource and service transport resource	Approx. 40			**Approx. 40**
d)				
Total	255	161		416
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	20%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	yes	-	-	-
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities**

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
		A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
A	-	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
H	-	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** 31. Community leadership and empowerment 32. Young people's achievement and involvement 33. Clean, green and liveable 34. Safety, security and a visible presence 35. Strengthening the local economy 36. Decent homes for all 37. Protection of children 38. Caring for adults and the older people 39. Active, healthy citizens 40. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
4	3	
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**	
High	High	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	All
	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:	High	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	n/a
Gender:	High	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/a
Age:	High	**Sexual orientation:**	n/a
Disability:	High	**Gender reassignment:**	n/a
Religion / Belief:	n/a	**Overall:**	High
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
There will be a full EAA completed both in respect of the service and impact to residents and in relation to the reorganisation and impact on staff .			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			yes

10. Human Resources impact				
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No				Yes
Workforce profile:				
Posts		**FTE**		**Vacant**

10. Human Resources impact					
	Headcount in post	in post	Establishment posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2	**3**	3			
PO1 – PO5	**34**	34			
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3	**1**	1			
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
	17	21			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	14	22	**2**		
Disability	Yes	No			
	5	33			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosexual.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
	17	1	**0**	**20**	

11. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The statutory nature of many of the activities delivered by the services outlined in this report is recognised. At the heart of the proposed new delivery model is the need to ensure that the Council's statutory obligations are addressed but that we are realistic about what is really needed, about what we can deliver and that enforcement action is targeted and proportionate to the circumstances. In most cases the level of statutory activity required is not explicitly set out which implies that it is for the Council to exercise their discretion on levels of local provision.

Pursuant to s.17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1988, every local authority has a statutory "duty to …exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area."

It is understood that as a consequence of the proposals within this report, there will be no loss of any specific statutory function; accordingly, the broad statutory obligations pursuant to the provisions of the said Crime & Disorder Act 1998 will continue to be complied with. So too, will the other relevant statutory enforcement obligations continue to be complied with by the Council consequent upon the specific proposals specified within this report.

Ss. 18 & 19, so as to enforce the necessary health and safety provisions as a statutory 'enforcement authority', with a necessary authorized Inspector, S. 69 and Part VI of the Weights and Measures Act 1985, S. 3 Licensing Act 2003, as a Licensing Authority for the purposes of all the Licensing Act functions and S. 2 Gambling Act 2005 when acting as a Licensing Authority for the purposes of all Gambling Act functions.

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 cuts timetable for 2019/20 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.**	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Hub Libraries cuts to staffed opening hours
Reference:	COM11
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Culture and Community Development
Service/Team area:	Library and Information Service
Cabinet portfolio:	Member for Community Sector
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Consult on options and staff reorganisation £450k	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Library and information service discharges the local authority's statutory duty to provide a "Comprehensive and Efficient" library service to residents.
The service consists of 4 hub libraries, 9 community libraries, an online library collection, the Archives and Local History Service, and the Home Library Service.
Of the Hub Libraries, only Lewisham is a standalone facility and also houses the reference collection, the archives, the Local History Centre, and the Home Library Service. It is anticipated that Lewisham Library will be refurbished or redeveloped in the future as part of a wider capital scheme. This could bring opportunities to redesign the library to deliver efficiencies and increase income potential but there are no concrete proposals for this yet. Downham is part of the PFI Health and Leisure Centre, Deptford Lounge includes Tidemill Academy and it is managed by the Albany. Catford is part of Laurence House.
73% of the Service's budget is Employees' Costs. The other major costs include

a. the Deptford Lounge contract which was added to the original Service's budget and has been relet and reduced recently, and
b. the book fund which is essential for delivering any kind of library service. This includes the online resources as well as the books.

The Service has looked at a number of options to deliver back office and management savings including mergers or outsourcing, but none of these were deemed to be deliverable.

Cuts proposal

It is proposed to reduce the staffed opening hours across Lewisham Library, Deptford Lounge and Downham Library. Two options for delivering a saving of approximately £450k will be consulted on:
Option 1) – remove library staff from Downham and Deptford making these self-service facilities with occasional support from the peripatetic team.
Option 2) – reduce staffed opening hours across Downham, Deptford and Lewisham by 45% from 64 hours per week to 35 hours per week. The buildings would remain open on a self-service basis outside those hours, although access in Lewisham would be restricted to the ground floor.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The reduction of staffed opening hours would greatly reduce access to digital support and information services for residents in those areas. The buildings would remain open for people to use for work / study and to access computers and library resources on a self-service basis.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The £450k reduction would follow earlier substantial reductions in the Service's budget. Further cuts may involve substantial opposition from staff, residents, campaigners, and could result in a call-in by DCMS to test whether the council continues to meet its statutory duty. Full public and staff consultations will be required to try to prevent a ministerial challenge and/or Judicial Review of any changes to the service. The risk of antisocial behaviour in the library spaces – which is already felt with current staffing levels – is likely to increase during unstaffed hours. Management arrangements for unstaffed hours would need to be carefully planned for Lewisham with access restrictions put in place to limit the public to the ground floor. Management arrangements for unstaffed hours would need to be negotiated with the Albany and One Life for Deptford and Downham respectively, potentially leading to contract variations. Any incidents during unstaffed hours are more likely to result in a negative impact on the Council. As the council is moving services online, library staff provide vital support to residents in the area of digital. Staff reductions would impair the council's ability to rely on library staff for support and services such as parking permits, freedom passes, eAdmissions, online form filling, digital learning, printing service, job seeking, and more.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	3,537	(371)	3,165[1]	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Consult on options and staff reorganisation £450k	0	450	0	450
Total	0	450	0	0
% of Net Budget	%	14%	%	14%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Y	N	N	N

[1] Please note that this figure includes the Library and Information Service budget and the Deptford Lounge budget, which have now been combined.

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
C	A	
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**
9	2	
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**	
High	High	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	Impact varies depending on which option is followed but it is likely to be visible across the whole borough.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Lewisham Central, Ladywell, Deptford, Catford, Downham, Whitefoot, Bellingham, Evelyn

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	H
Gender:	H	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	H
Age:	H	**Sexual orientation:**	H
Disability:	H	**Gender reassignment:**	H
Religion / Belief:	H	**Overall:**	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The support that library staff provide to individuals trying to access information and online services will be substantially reduced. These individuals are some of the most vulnerable in our society and will have been signposted to the library service by other public sector bodies such as Job Centre Plus, Central Government departments, council services, GPs etc.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	**Headcount in post**	**FTE in post**	**Establish-ment posts**	**Vacant**	
				Agency / Interim cover	**Not covered**
Scale 1 – 2	0	0	0	0	0
Scale 3 – 5	24	17.12	31	2	5
Sc 6 – SO2	33	25.75	39	3	3
PO1 – PO5	7	7	7	0	0
PO6 – PO8	0	0	0	0	0
SMG 1 – 3	1	1	1	0	0
JNC	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**65**	**50.87**	**78**	**5**	**8**

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 sets the statutory duty to provide a "comprehensive and efficient" libraries service on the local authority. The proposed cuts could be subject to JR and ministerial challenge in this regard.

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 cuts timetable for 2019/20 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.**	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review – public consultation opens
February 2019	Public consultation closes
March / April 2019	Outcome of Public Consultation reported to Safer Stronger Select
May 2019	Staff Consultation commences
June 2019	Staff Reorganisation selection process
October 2020	Staff Reorganisation implemented and service reduction commences

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Cut to Main Grants budget
Reference:	COM12
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Culture and Community Development
Service/Team area:	Cultural and Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Community Sector
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Main grant budget reduced by £1m	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
LB Lewisham provides funding to voluntary sector organisations operating in the borough via a number of channels including grants. Grants are used to promote innovation and allow for a collaborative approach to service development which is often absent in directly commissioning provision against a particular specification. Lewisham's main grant programme was last fully let in 2015 following a full public consultation on the revised framework which was agreed by Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) on 12 November 2014. In summary the criteria invited applications relating to one or more of 4 broad themes with the below summary of each theme made available at that time: **Strong and Cohesive Communities** – this theme seeks to develop and maintain strong communities and build a more inclusive and cohesive borough. It is divided into two strands, one to support Borough-wide provision and the other to fund a network of neighbourhood community development projects. With the reduction in statutory resources, residents and communities are being asked to do more for themselves. This theme seeks to ensure that there is an infrastructure across the borough that can encourage and capitalise on active citizenship, supporting grass roots activity. The theme also funds services that provide equalities support to ensure equal access to services. **Communities that Care** – the overall intention of this theme is to fund a range of organisations that together provide support to vulnerable adults to assist them in accessing services, prevent their needs from escalating, reduce the burden on statutory services and provide links between statutory services, VCS and communities in relation to working together to support vulnerable adults. The activities funded through this theme form an important part of the borough's preventative strategy. **Access to Advice Services** – the advice sector provides an essential service to some of the borough's most vulnerable residents. Advice organisations provide independent, high quality advice to individuals to ensure that they receive the benefits

3. Description of service area and proposal

they are entitled to, are supported to manage debts, address financial exclusion and deal with housing issues. Statutory services work closely with the advice sector as addressing these issues are of mutual benefit.

Widening Access to Arts and Sports – this theme seeks to ensure that the rich and diverse contribution that the borough's Arts and Sports organisations make to the quality of life of residents is maintained. The Arts and Sports sectors are adept at attracting resources from external funding, earned income and volunteers. However, the sectors still require a level of core funding to enable them to continue to attract these resources that would otherwise be lost to the borough. The focus of our support is on increasing participation particularly by those who are less able to participate due to disability, economic disadvantage and age.

Cuts proposal

Reduce the available budget by £1,000,000 when the programme is relet later in the year.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The impact of budget reductions within the main grants programme is more difficult to accurately assess ahead of time than in other areas due to the following factors:

- The range of different activity and organisations funded
- The priorities agreed ahead of the application process for the next round of grants
- The quality of applications received
- The number of 'new entrants' as part of the letting process

The most effective way of controlling for this uncertainty is to tightly define the type of services that will be funded but this approach essentially runs counter to the purpose of the programme which is designed to promote innovation from the sector and find new ways to deliver services and meet need.

There is currently a public consultation seeking views on priorities for the programme and asking how best any remaining funding might best be used. Only once this consultation has closed, priorities have been agreed by Mayor and Cabinet and application shave been received and scored will it be possible to undertake a full assessment

However, in order to give an indication of the types of services that would be impacted if the cut were simply applied against current recipients the current themes and level of funding against each is set out below:

Strong and Cohesive Communities

Organisation Name	2018 - 19 funding	Sub-theme
Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network	£30,000	Equalities
Lewisham Pensioners Forum	£33,896	Equalities
METRO (The Metro Centre Ltd)	£28,247	Equalities
Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust	£34,586	Equalities
Ackroyd Community Association	£20,338	Neighbourhoods - Crofton Park

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Bellingham Community Project Ltd	£27,032	Neighbourhoods - Bellingham
Corbett Estate Neighbourhood Forum	£20,338	Neighbourhoods - Catford South
Goldsmiths Community Association	£20,338	Neighbourhoods - Whitefoot
Lee Green Lives	£15,600	Neighbourhoods - Lee Green
Somerville Youth & Play Provision (neighbourhood)	£20,338	Neighbourhoods - Telegraph Hill
Teatro Vivo	£29,377	Neighbourhoods - Borough wide
Voluntary Action Lewisham	£210,000	Infrastructure
TOTAL	**£490,090**	

Communities that Care

Organisation Name	2018 - 19 funding	Sub-theme
Community Connections Consortium (Age UK)*	£336,000	Connecting and Supporting
Albany	£80,187	Connecting and Supporting
Parent Support Group (PSG)	£4,271	Connecting and Supporting
Rushey Green Time Bank	£76,266	Connecting and Supporting
Noah's Ark Children's Venture	£21,156	Connecting and Supporting
Voluntary Services Lewisham	£78,259	Connecting and Supporting
Ackroyd Community Association	£21,185	Older Adults
Age Exchange	£27,541	Older Adults
Ageing Well in Lewisham	£25,637	Older Adults
Deptford Mission – Disabled People's Contact	£6,144	Older Adults
Eco Communities	£33,896	Older Adults
Entelechy Arts	£33,896	Older Adults
Grove Centre, The	£16,524	Older Adults
Lewisham Elders Resource Centre (Seniors)	£38,669	Older Adults
Sydenham Garden	£33,147	Older Adults/Mental Health
Heart n Soul	£58,472	Adults with learning disabilities
Lewisham Mencap	£30,000	Adults with learning disabilities
Lewisham Speaking Up	£73,441	Adults with learning disabilities
Wheels for Wellbeing	£28,925	Adults with learning disabilities
Bromley & Lewisham Mind	£29,579	Mental Health
999 Club	£8,474	Adults with complex social needs
Deptford Reach	£16,948	Adults with complex social needs

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Noah's Ark Children's Venture	£15,000	Support for families with disabled children/young carers
Contact a Family	£60,606	Support for families with disabled children/young carers
Voluntary Services Lewisham (Access Lewisham)	£83,215	Transport
Lewisham Community Transport Scheme	£40,675	Transport
Total	**£1,278,113**	
Better Care Fund (Community Connections)*	£250,000	
Overall total	**£1,528,113**	

Access to Advice Services

Organisation Name	2018 - 19 funding
170 Community Project	£110,727
Advice Lewisham - Lewisham CAB	£44,234
Age UK Lewisham & Southwark (Advice)	£81,350
Evelyn 190 Centre	£175,129
Lewisham Citizens Advice Bureau	£424,486
Lewisham Disability Coalition	£87,565
Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network	£44,503
Lewisham Multilingual Advice Service	£34,743
Total	**£1,002,737**

Widening Access to Arts and Sports

Organisation Name	2018 - 19 funding	Sub-theme
Albany	£187,103	Arts
Lewisham Education Arts Network	£32,201	Arts
Deptford X	£8,474	Arts
Greenwich & Lewisham Young People's Theatre	£68,530	Arts
IRIE! (WATAS)	£21,105	Arts
Lewisham Youth Theatre	£36,559	Arts
Midi Music Company, The	£44,092	Arts
Montage Theatre Arts	£8,474	Arts
Second Wave Centre for Youth Arts	£45,017	Arts
Sydenham Arts Ltd	£8,474	Arts
Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance	£76,831	Arts
South East London Tennis (Tennis Lewisham)	£25,140	Sports
Boxing Allocation	£15,000	Sports
Saxon Crown Swimming Club	£6,667	Sports
London FA on behalf of Lewisham Football Network	£21,185	Sports

4. Impact and risks of proposal		
London Thunder - Lewisham	£21,185	Sports
Total	£626,037	

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

As set out above the impact of this cut is very difficult to assess ahead of the letting process but there is no doubt that it would represent a significant reduction in local VCS provision with associated impacts on a range of activity including community development and social prescribing.

A £1,000,000 reduction in the main grants budget represents 29.5% of the current net spend but it is important to note that £229,056 is current committed to the London Councils grants programme and this is anticipated to continue at broadly similar levels. As such, the actual percentage reduction to local provision from this cut would be 32.7% per cent.

It should also be noted that in 2014/15 the main grants budget was £5,889,000 and was reduced to £4,389,000 as part of the re-letting of the programme in 2015 (a reduction of £1,500,000 or around 25%) with a further £1,000,000 reduction applied to the existing grants in 2017.

The proposed cut means that the budget will have gone from £5,889,000 to £2,383,771 in 5 years – a 60% cut.

The only mitigation against the impact of the cut is to ensure that funded groups work together, and with other services, as efficiently and effectively as possible but the current programme is already founded on excellent partnership work so it is unlikely that this would have much of an impact.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	3,666	(282)	3,384	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Main grant budget reduced by £1m	600	400	0	1,000
Total	600	400	0	1,000
% of Net Budget	18%	12%	%	30%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Y	N	N	N

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services**
A	E	

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
High	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 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
9	1	
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	
High	High	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Borough wide
	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:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	H
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	M
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	H
Disability:	H	Gender reassignment:	H
Religion / Belief:	M	Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The above assessment simply assumes a blanket pro-rata cut to all existing provision.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

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

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

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:	
Month	**Activity**
26th July 18	Consultation opens
25th Oct 18	Consultation closes
4th Nov 18	Safer Stronger Select Committee – report on outcome of consultation
10th Nov 18	Despatch date for M&C reports for 21st Nov
21st Nov 18	Mayor and Cabinet – results of consultation, recommendation to approve new criteria and open for applications
late Nov 18	Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel – potential call in
3rd Dec 18	Open for applications
4th Feb 19	Application deadline
6th-12th Feb	Initial Officer Assessments
w/c 18th Feb	Assessment panel meetings
w/c 4 March	Draft recommendations to organisations – with a letter confirming that this is 4 month notice of potential change to their funding. Information about appeals process.
12 March	Safer Stronger Select Committee – draft allocations (Part 2)
w/c 1 April	Appeals Meeting
18th April	Funding agreed at Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts – Part 2)
1st August 2019	New grants begin

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in arts, development, and events funding
Reference:	COM13
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Culture and Community
Service/Team area:	Cultural and Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Community Sector
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
£145k stop all funding for arts, development and events funding apart from London Youth Games and talent bursaries	N	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Council continues to hold budget which it contributes to support a number of arts and sports development initiatives, and events. The main ones being:

- People's day £69k
- Blackheath fireworks £40k
- Festivals / Event funds that supports a range of cultural events across the borough £36k

<u>People's day</u>
Lewisham People's Day has been running for over 30 years and is the borough's annual celebration encompassing professional and community performers. Public Sector, community and private sector stalls and displays.

<u>Blackheath fireworks</u>
Blackheath Fireworks is the largest free Guy Fawkes display in London. The display site spans both Lewisham and Greenwich boroughs but the event is managed by Lewisham. Greenwich make a contribution to the costs which was £15k in 2018.

The events officer raises £176k of external and earned income across the two events annually. Increasing this income target to cover the full costs of the events is not considered to be feasible. In addition to the core budget, there are £17k of recharges to other council services related to the events. Both events are currently policed free of charge by the Metropolitan Police.

NB the part time events officer post is not included in this budget but is part of the Cultural and Community Development Staffing budget saving proforma.

<u>Festivals / events</u>
This is an open fund and the nature of events funded each year differs.

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal
Cuts proposal
The proposal is to cut these budgets and cease supporting these initiatives / events – saving £145k. An option that could be considered is for People's Day to happen every other year which would reduce the saving by £35k to £110k. Work will continue to seek alternative funding or sponsorship to enable as many of these to continue, in particular people's day and the Blackheath fireworks.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
All these initiatives / events are well supported and valued by the community. If they do not continue there will be a loss of additional income generated from partners, sponsors, earned income being committed to the Borough. Some of the smaller events that access the fund may not be able to source alternative funding and may cease to operate, diminishing the cultural richness of the borough.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
In order to mitigate the loss of these events the council could continue to publicise grassroots neighbourhood events such as Brockley Max, Lark in the Park, Bellingham Festival, Croft Fest etc. although the viability of these will be affected by savings proposals in other areas such as Festival Fund, Local Assemblies Fund and Main Grant reductions.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	370	(193)	177	
HRA	**0**			
DSG	**0**			
Health	**0**			
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a)	145			145
Total	145			
% of Net Budget	82%	%	%	82%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Y	N	N	N

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services**
A	E	

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	**C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
High	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 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
9	1	
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**	
Low	Low	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	Specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Blackheath ward for Fireworks and Rushey Green ward for Peoples Day.

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:**	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The events attract participants and audiences from all equalities strands, although some may be geared to groups with particular characteristics and these vary.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Local Assemblies Fund
Reference:	COM14
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Culture and Community Development
Service/Team area:	Cultural and Community Development Service
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Community Sector
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Reduction of Local Assemblies Fund £270k	No	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Local Assemblies Fund enables ward councillors working through their local assemblies to take forward local projects that meet their agreed ward priorities. This is largely delivered through small grants to community organisations. The £15k per ward includes £2.5k of Councillor Discretionary Fund that Councillors can choose to allocate directly without involving the Local Assembly. Each assembly also has a devolved budget of £3,200 that they use to hire venues, pay for door to door publicity and any other costs related to assembly meetings. The remaining £60k is for borough wide costs related to the programme such as equipment and stationary. NB This budget area does not include the staffing support for assemblies which is included within the general Cultural and Community Development Service staff budget.
Cuts proposal
It is proposed to cease the Local Assemblies Fund. Instead, local assemblies will be involved in the allocation of the neighbourhood element of the Community Infrastructure Levy. Funding from neighbourhood CIL will have tighter parameters attached to it but the level of available funds and the impact could be significantly greater. Option 1 – is to cease the Local Assemblies Fund completely saving £270k Option 2 – is to retain £5k per ward that Cllrs can allocated to support local projects that meet their agreed ward priorities saving £180k Option 3 - is to cease the Local Assemblies Fund but retain a central pot of £50k that ward based projects could bid to for initiatives that fall outside of CIL parameters. Saving £220k

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
A wide range of very local grass roots activity would be impacted by this cut including activities for young people, older people, community events, tree planting, other greening projects etc.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Reduced ability of local assemblies to deliver change at a ward level. This would be mitigated through the use of Neighbourhood CIL which would give local assemblies the opportunity to bring forward local level infrastructure projects such as improvements to community facilities, greening projects and initiatives that offset any negative impact of development. In order to allocate Neighbourhood CIL the following process would be followed: - Ward priority setting exercise - Creation of a project bank of projects that meet CIL parameters and ward priorities - As CIL money becomes available projects would be fully worked up with PIDs to be approved by Capital Programme Board and funding released. - Projects delivered and monitored. It is proposed that the ward priorities and project bank are refreshed every four years. The project banks could also be used if other external funding opportunities arise such as GLA or central government funds. Some areas of the borough have much higher levels of CIL collected. It is possible to agree a structure to group wards or redistribute CIL to an extent. CIL is reliant on development coming forward in the borough. It is anticipated that there would be sufficient CIL collected over the next 8 years to allow for a meaningful scheme to be run borough wide. The management of CIL spend will require a different approach to staff resourcing. This is explained further in the Cultural and Community Development Staff saving template. There is the option to manage some aspects of Neighbourhood CIL on a borough wide basis – such as the greening fund to facilitate the most efficient delivery and implementation of projects.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	388	0	388	
HRA	0			
DSG	0			
Health	0			
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Reduction of Local Assemblies Fund	270	0	0	270
Total	270			270
% of Net Budget	70%	%	%	70%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Y	N	N	N

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input**

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
A		B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation 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** 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
1		
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**	
Medium		

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	Some wards have lower levels of CIL and could therefore be disproportionately impacted depending on the approach to redistribution.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Lee Green, Grove Park, Whitefoot, Bellingham, Forest Hill, Sydenham, Catford South, Downham, Perry Vale

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:	medium	**Sexual orientation:**	
Disability:		**Gender reassignment:**	
Religion / Belief:		**Overall:**	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The Local Assembly Fund supports a range of grass roots activity for older people and young people.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			TBC

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

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

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Broadway Theatre
Reference:	COM15
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Culture and Community Development
Service/Team area:	Broadway Theatre
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Parks, Neighbourhoods and Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Reduction to operating subsidy £100k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Broadway Theatre is a Grade II listed Art Deco venue built in 1932. It has an 800 seat main auditoria and studio theatre. The theatre is directly managed by the council with a core team of 2.5 staff members. Catford Regeneration budget is supporting a minor capital works programme and feasibility work around business development and larger scale redevelopment linked to the regeneration of Catford.
Cuts proposal
Improve the Broadway Theatre's operating environment through minor capital improvements and increased staffing capacity in order to maximise earned income potential and reduce the council subsidy. There is the potential to increase income in the following areas; maximising ancillary income from bar sales. Hire of underutilised space in the building or conversion to other uses (function rooms and current staff office and longer term Town Hall Chambers). Improved marketing of in house promotions and co-promotions such as club nights and panto.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Reducing the theatre subsidy further before redevelopment plans have come to fruition will inhibit the theatre's ability to extend it's programming to reach wider audiences. The focus would have to be very commercial and include hires that the Theatre has traditionally restricted such as church hires. Community based activity could only be afforded if the theatre managed to return a surplus which is challenging given its' current physical restrictions.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Limited capacity could impair ability to achieve increased income targets. Failure to deliver residents aspirations around a broader programme. Ensure good specialist advice taken in planning new ancillary income. Build in-house marketing capacity. The future development of the Broadway Theatre is linked to the regeneration of Catford. Some minor improvements can be made in the next 2 years but larger issues such as the get in and full disabled access are unlikely to be realised until the Town Hall site is redeveloped. The use of Town Hall Chambers as part of a bigger cultural hub for

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Catford would provide the potential for substantial increased earned income that could cross subsidise the theatre but this is unlikely to be realised by 2020/21.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	313	(200)	113	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a)	0	50	50	100
Total	0	50	50	100
% of Net Budget	%	44%	44%	88%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Y	N	N	N

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
D		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / 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
9	5	
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**
	One or more
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Rushey Green and Catford South

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:**	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The Broadway Theatre will continue to host events for a range of equalities strands.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January – April 2019	Develop business plan
April 19 – March 20	Implement business plan and increase income
March 20	Achieve First £50k saving
March 21	Achieve Second £50k saving

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Cultural and Community Development Service Staffing
Reference:	COM16
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Culture and Community Development
Service/Team area:	Cultural and Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Parks, Neighbourhoods and Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Reorganise staff team £150k	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Cultural and Community Development Service has a team of 19 officers who manage a wide range of services within a matrix working model. They coordinate 18 local assemblies, 4 neighbourhood community development fora, the positive ageing council, lead officers for 70 organisations main grants, manage the two leisure contracts, 5 directly provided community centres and provide advice and expertise on community engagement, arts, sports, third sector, events etc.
Cuts proposal
There are a number of savings proposals that could have an impact on the staff resource required from this team, including Local Assembly Fund, Events, Sports, Festival Fund and Main Grants. The work of the team is likely to change as a result of decisions around these areas although in some instances (such as the introduction of Neighbourhood CIL), there could be the need for more resource or a different skill set. There are also changes to the way that community centres are managed that will require a change to staffing. It is intended to undertake a reorganisation to ensure that the development team is structured in the most efficient way to deliver on changing priorities. As well as taking into account the areas highlighted above the reorganisation will also consider reducing the management capacity on the basis that managers would no longer attend Local Assemblies and that they would be supported solely by the PO2 officers working with Councillors. The timing of the reorganisation needs to take into account the capacity of the team to undertake main grants assessments for the new grants programme.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Impact of this cut on service delivery should be minimal. The removal of manager support to assembly meetings as standard may impact on assembly coordinating groups.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Management support would still be available for assembly meetings on occasions if extra capacity was required.

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	1,076	0	1,076	
HRA	0			
DSG	0			
Health	0			
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a)	75	75		150
Total				
% of Net Budget	7%	7%	%	14%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
A		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / 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
1	9	
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?

8. Ward impact	

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:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
It is not anticipated that there will be any impact on service equalities for users.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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:	
Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
April 2019	Reorganisation consultation

12. Summary timetable	
May 2019	Selection
August2019	Reorganisation implemented

APPENDIX 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Ending the Small and Faith Fund
Reference:	COM17
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Culture and Community Development
Service/Team area:	Cultural and Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Community Sector
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committees

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Ending the Small and Faith Fund £100k	No	Yes – currently referenced in main grant consultation	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The small and faith fund gives small grants (under £10,000) to local groups for short term projects or capacity building activity. It is expecting that match funding of at least 35% of the overall project is secured as part of the grant making process either via a dedicated crowdfunding site or though applications to other funders.
Cuts proposal
The proposal is to end the fund. The current budget is £100,000 per annum.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The exact impact of budget reductions within the main grants programme is more difficult to accurately assess ahead of time than in other areas due to the following factors: • The range of different activity and organisations funded • The quality of applications received However, combined with associated proposals to apply cuts to the main grants programme, the Assembly grants and the festival fund there will be significantly less resource available for the voluntary sector in Lewisham. The small and faith fund also allows funding to be made available, at relatively short notice, to groups who are not funded through the main grant programme. In order to give an indication of the sort of projects that would go unfunded without the small and faith fund the projects that received support in 2017/18 are listed below. As can be seen, overall, the projects raised nearly 200% of the council's contribution in match funding. **<u>Direct Applications</u>**

Organisation	Project Name	Level of Match	LBL recommended contribution

4. Impact and risks of proposal

		Funding Achieved	
Entelechy Arts	Meet Me in the South	£15,205	£10,000
Bellingham Community Project	Connecting Lives – Arts and Sports Access in Bellingham	£3,456	£6,274
Lee Green Lives	Lee Green Lives	£8,638	£5,500
Arts Committee of St John the Baptist Church, Catford	St John's Festival of the Arts	£1,005	£3,195
Manor Park User Group	Arts and Music Events in Manor Park and Arts Café as part of HCGA Project	£2,000	£1,400
Crofton Park Railway Garden Friends Group	The Sensory Railway Garden of Crofton Park	£40,538	£5,000
Grove Park Carnival and Chinbrook Dog Show	Grove Park Carnival and Chinbrook Dog Show	£4,500	£7,241
Max Media Arts CIC	Art in the Park	£3,662	£2,942
Total		**£79,004**	**£41,552**

Crowdfunded Projects

Organisation	Project	Level Matched Funding Achieved	Council Contribution
Horniman Museum	World Gallery Project	£32,000	£8,000
Supersets	Catford Superset	£40,856	£6,000
Sydenham Garden	Community Pond	£6,000	£3,500
Rushey Green Timebank	Rushey Green Festival	£3,750	£750
Goldsmiths Community Centre	Apple Tree Cafe	£7,590	£5,000
Chris Church Bellingham	Bellingham Big Sing	£460	£350
Frendsbury Gardens	Outdoor Class Room	£6,944	£2,000
The Albany	Theatre Trip for Every Child	£5,500	£4,500
Catford Film Festival	Catford Free Film Festival	£3,039	£5,000
Brockley Street Art Festival	Brockley Street Art Festival	£1,500	£2,000
Deptford Mission	Collage Project for Elderly/Disabled	£2,984	£1,791
REAP Community CIC	REAP Youth Development Programme	£3,000	£4,000

4. Impact and risks of proposal

LWS	New Beginnings Programme	£8,290	£1,750
Dalmain Football Club and St Saviour's Church	Walk in Space Youth Club	£1,200	£1,800
Bloom Bakery and Catering	Bloom Training	£14,500	£1,500
GRACE	Not for Profit Community Hub	£11,000	£4,000
AFRIL	Helping Hands Food bank	£13,480	£3,000
Brockley Max Festival	Brockley Max Festival	£7,645	£1,805
The Irish Community Centre	Community Allotment	£2,625	£4,875
Voluntary Services Lewisham	Access Lewisham	£4,375	£8,125
Inspiring your Imagination	Pepys Music Hub	£3,039	£5,000
Catford Arts	Catford Arts Trail	£9,600	£6,000
Total		**£157,377**	**£80,746**

NB The above list includes c£20,000 of projects funded from the 2016/17 budget.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is an option to split the remaining main grants budget to provide some degree of short term funding through a single programme but this would simply mitigate against there being no funding available on an annual basis rather than the cut itself as the weight of service reduction would simply be transferred to the main grant recipients.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £,000	Income £,000	Net Budget £,000	
	100	0	100	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a)	100		0	100
Total	100		0	100
% of Net Budget	100%	%	%	100%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
		A. Strengthening Community input

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
A	E	B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	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 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
9	1	
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**	
High	High	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	Borough wide
	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:	H	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	M
Gender:	M	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	M
Age:	H	**Sexual orientation:**	M
Disability:	H	**Gender reassignment:**	L
Religion / Belief:	H	**Overall:**	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The above assessment simply assumes that the cut were applied to the services that received funding in the last full year of the programme. A significant number of the funded activities are aimed at a particular target group who would be disadvantaged if the funding were not available.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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

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:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
March 2019	Cut implemented