

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Printing Reduction
Reference:	CUS1
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Technology & Change
Service/Team area:	Information Management & Technology (IMT)
Cabinet portfolio:	Democracy, Refugees and Accountability
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Reduce printing: saving of £100,000	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
IMT lead on the Lewisham aspects of the Council's technology needs, including printing and scanning requirements, and client Lewisham's technology support via the shared service with Brent.
Cuts proposal
Reduce printing across the Council. Lewisham has reduced the print budget by 50% over the past two years with the help of iPads and laptops and a targeted communication campaign. As the use of these devices continues to grow there is an opportunity to reduce print spending further with ongoing HR/OD support to train staff to work differently.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
This cut will impact members and officers and reduce spend and environmental impact.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Clear policy and messaging that allows a certain group to continue to print i.e. those who have a real need. Support for all staff to move away from paper usage as part of our general organisational development.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	5,282	(398)	4,884	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Reduce printing:	100	-	-	100

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
saving of £100,000				
Total	100	-	-	100
% of Net Budget	2%	%	%	2%
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		

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		
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	
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:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what			

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact

mitigations are proposed:

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 Council must meet the access to information requirements set out in the Local Government Act 1972 and associated regulations.

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 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Income Generation – Increase of Garden Waste Subscription Charge
Reference:	CUS2
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Environment
Service/Team area:	Environment (Commercial & Customer Services Team)
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
£20 increase in garden waste subscription: £763k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Residents can currently pay a subscription of £60 per year (1 April – 31 March) for a weekly collection of garden waste. The service started in June 2016 and has seen an increase in subscribers from 8,250 in 2016/17 to 10,188 in 2017/18.
This provides a convenient service to residents who do not have access to vehicles to dispose of their garden waste, and reduces the need for journeys to the council's Re-use and Recycling site, for those that do.
Rather than going into the residual waste bin or being fly-tipped, garden waste is composted and contributes towards the national target of recycling, re-using or composting 50% of waste by 2020. With the introduction of the scheme, the borough saw an increase in its recycling figures.
Cuts proposal
To increase the subscription by £20 in 2019/20 to a total payment of £80
To increase the subscription by a further £20 in 2020/21 to a total payment of £100

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Some subscribers may find the increased cost prohibitive and will not renew their subscriptions.
An increase in complaints related to the subscription increase.
With less subscriptions more garden waste could enter the residual stream as residents place in their refuse bin, increasing tonnage sent to SELCHP (and associated costs of incineration) and reducing the proportion of waste that is composted.
An increase in fly-tipping and associated costs.

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

A significant reduction in subscriptions would lead to a reduction in operational staff needed to collect garden waste bins and office staff needed to answer calls and emails.

The Reuse and recycling site may also see an increase in garden waste being brought in as it continues to be free to dispose of there. This facility has limited capacity and any increased volume of waste will cause additional burden on the staff both in terms of managing increased waste as well as the burden of having to implement restrictions. This could also lead to an increase in individual car journeys.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The impact of the increased cost of the garden waste subscription will be reviewed after the first 12 months and before a further increase is implemented.

Reduction in subscriptions - Updates to our IT system will enable an improvement to service which is expected to lead to an improvement in customer service satisfaction and new and repeat subscriptions. Our existing IT system is inflexible with annual subscriptions running from 1st April -31st March, with a subscription always ending on the 31st March irrespective of when residents subscribed. Updates to our IT system will enable pro-rata or a full 12 months of subscription from any start date in the year.

Increase in Complaints – Would need to ensure all current subscribers are contacted in advance of price increase and that a communications plan was in place so that residents understood the need for the price increase and the benefits of the service.

Reduction in Operational Staff need to collect garden waste bins - This would need to be addressed by the Operational Waste Team

Reduction in Office Staff answering calls/taking payments/dealing with queries – Ensure learning and development plan in place for the 2 members of staff concerned so they could be utilised within the wider Commercial and Customer Services Team

Increase in Fly-Tipping - Would need the Clean Streets (Enforcement) Team to have an action plan in place to address any increase in fly tipped garden waste

Increase in residual disposal costs- increase administrative and enforcement processes/team to ensure residents don't place garden waste in their refuse bin.

Decrease in recycling targets- have to look at alternative initiatives to increase recycling

Increased tonnage taken to Reuse & recycling site- need to implement restriction policy at gate to prevent excessive tonnage taken to the site.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	1,298	(550)	748	
HRA				
DSG				

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
£20 increase in garden waste subscription: £763k	278	485		763
Total	278	485		763
% of Net Budget	37%	65%	%	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
D		A. Strengthening Community input 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		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive if residents re-subscribe at increased price		
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
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – Not Applicable			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact			
		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:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The Controlled Waste Regulations 1992 and Section 45(3) of the EPA 1990 allow the Council to recover a reasonable charge for the collection of garden waste from the person who made the request.

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 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Income Generation- Events in Parks
Reference:	CUS3
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Environment
Service/Team area:	Green Scene
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
Income generation from events in parks and open spaces £500k	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Parks and open spaces management – income generation
During 2017/18 a total of 499 events were held in the boroughs parks and open spaces, these ranged from small family fun days to the large OnBlackheath music festival. With demand for events, both large and small, increasing there is an opportunity to generate much needed additional revenue.
The Councils Joint Events Policy for Blackheath allows for 2 large commercial events annually with only one being held to date. There is also growing interest in Beckenham Place Park as venue for commercial income generating events.
Cuts proposal
It is proposed to increase the number of large commercial events/ festivals held on Blackheath from 1 to 2 and to market Beckenham Place Park to promoters as a new venue.
It is anticipated that income of £200k will be generated in 2019/20 and £300k in 2020/21. This will allow for a corresponding reduction in service budgets for those years.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The details of all proposed large events must be presented to the Councils Event Safety Advisory Group (ESAG) who may advise that additional input from partner organisations (police etc.) and other council service (Env Health etc.) is required to allow an event to take place safely.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
There will always be some risk that large outside event fails to take place, however officers will ensure that event proposers are suitably experienced and have robust and

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

comprehensive event management plans.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	3,200	(103)	3,100	
HRA	N/A	N/A		
DSG	N/A	N/A		
Health	N/A	N/A		
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) Income generation	200	300		500
Total				
% of Net Budget	7%	11%	%	18%
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
D		A. Strengthening Community input 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
10	9	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Specific
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Blackheath, Bellingham, Downham

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

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The Council's General Events Policy and Blackheath Events Policy would need to be amended to reflect the changes proposed and this will require a full report.

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	Budget reduced

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Income Generation – Increase in Commercial Waste Charges
Reference:	CUS4
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Environment
Service/Team area:	Environment (Commercial & Customer Services)
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
Increase in commercial waste charges: £450k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
All businesses in the borough are legally required to have a trade waste contract. The authority competes with other trade waste companies for contracts with local businesses. This includes both the collection and disposal of refuse and recycling.
The authority currently provides trade waste contracts for approximately 3,000 businesses in the borough.
Cuts proposal
To increase the current charges for both refuse and recycling by 7.5% in 19/20 and a further 7.5% in 20/21.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Businesses may find the increased charge prohibitive and cancel their contract/s with us either to move over to a private waste carrier or possibly fly-tip their waste within the borough.
A further potential unintended consequence is that the loss of businesses will lead to a decrease in Lewisham's recycling figures. National recycling targets are to achieve 50% by 2020.
A significant reduction in contracts would have an impact on the efficiency of collection crews.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Businesses cancelling their contract – Sales Team to speak to existing customers to highlight the advantages on staying with us for their waste collection. In addition, a review of customer satisfaction and commercial competitiveness will be under-taken within the first 12 months of the price increase being implemented.
Potential reduction in efficiency of collection crews managed by the Waste Team

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Increase in fly-tipping of business waste – increase in Enforcement processes/team to pursue businesses where evidence found of this.

Decrease in recycling targets- have to look at alternative initiatives to increase recycling

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	1,368	(2,353)	(985)	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Increase in commercial waste charges: £450k	150	300		450
Total	150	300		450
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
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
D		A. Strengthening Community input 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 – if businesses stay with Council for their waste collections		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive – if businesses stay on contract with the Council		
Level of impact on	Level of impact on	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

main priority – High / Medium / Low	second priority – High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Low		

8. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

9. Service equalities impact

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

10. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: No	No
---	----

11. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Under Section 47 of the EPA 90 A waste collection authority may, at the request of any person, supply him with receptacles for commercial or industrial waste which he has requested the authority to arrange to collect and shall make a reasonable charge for any receptacle supplied unless in the case of a receptacle for commercial waste the authority considers it appropriate not to make a charge.

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
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Increase Charge for the collection of Domestic Lumber from households
Reference:	CUS5
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Environment
Service/Team area:	Cleansing
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
Increase Charge for the collection of Domestic Lumber from households £30k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The authority provides a collection service of bulky unwanted goods for a fee of £15 for three items.
Cuts proposal
An increase in the charge for the collection of domestic lumber from households in the borough from £15 to £20. This will be accompanied by an increase in service as residents will be able to have up to four items collected rather than just three. This effectively meaning that price per item remains the same
The £15 charge has been in place since the year 2000 and never been increased.
By increasing the charge by £5 (an increase of 33.3 percent) then there is the potential of increasing the revenue (currently approximately £100k per year) to £133k per year, based on current figures.
Current costs of providing service are £100k

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Increase in charges could lead to an increase in fly tipping and a loss of customers to commercial contractors and associated loss of income.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Some residents may find the increase in charges prohibitive and use other contractors or fly-tip – customer experience should be improved by an update of the council website and underlying IT system. This, in addition to the increase in the number of items that can be disposed of with a single payment (increased from three to four), should mitigate the increased charge.

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Increase in fly-tipping– increase in Enforcement to pursue residents where evidence found of this.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	97	(106)	(9)	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a)	30			30
b)				
c)				
d)				
Total	30			30
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
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
D	N/A	A. Strengthening Community input
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
Medium	N/A	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3	N/A	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	N/A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
N/A	N/A	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

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, Sydenham, Forest Hill

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:			
N/A			
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:
By virtue of The Controlled Waste Regulations 1992 and Section 45(3) of the EPA - the authority may recover a reasonable charge for the collection of domestic lumber from the person who made the request. Any charge must therefore be reasonable.

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 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Bereavement Services increase income targets
Reference:	CUS6
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Environment
Service/Team area:	Environment, Waste & Recycling, Air Quality, Parks & Open Spaces
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Parks, Neighbourhoods and Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Reduction in cremation fees: £134k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal																					
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:																					
Cremation fees are being reviewed.																					
The authority provide burial and cremation services to the bereaved through our offices at Hither Green Crematorium, Verdant Lane. The cost of cremation and burial is typically just a small proportion of the total cost of a funeral provided by an undertaker.																					
Cuts proposal																					
To increase burial and memorial charges by 15% over two years and <i>reduce</i> cremation fees by 7.5% from the current standard price of £703 to £650.																					
The authority has limited burial space and under-utilised capacity for cremation. It is likely that cremation price increases and local competition over the past decade has been partly responsible for a recent reduction in the proportions of cremations taking place at Lewisham.																					
An increase in the number of cremations of 16.5% (203 extra PA) would deliver slightly more income than a 7.5% increase in cremation fees (assuming such a high fee increase didn't result in a further reduction in the overall number of cremations).																					
An increase in the number of cremations is likely to stimulate additional income in associated memorial purchases.																					
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Service</th> <th>Current price</th> <th>- 7.5%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Half hour cremation service</td> <td>£584</td> <td>£540.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45 minute Cremation Service</td> <td>£703</td> <td>£650.28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Saturday Service</td> <td>£1,055</td> <td>£975.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>+ 15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resident Burial Digging Fee</td> <td>£1,500</td> <td>£1,725</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resident cheapest grave purchase (incl. first interment)</td> <td>£2,938</td> <td>£3,378</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Service	Current price	- 7.5%	Half hour cremation service	£584	£540.20	45 minute Cremation Service	£703	£650.28	Saturday Service	£1,055	£975.88			+ 15%	Resident Burial Digging Fee	£1,500	£1,725	Resident cheapest grave purchase (incl. first interment)	£2,938	£3,378
Service	Current price	- 7.5%																			
Half hour cremation service	£584	£540.20																			
45 minute Cremation Service	£703	£650.28																			
Saturday Service	£1,055	£975.88																			
		+ 15%																			
Resident Burial Digging Fee	£1,500	£1,725																			
Resident cheapest grave purchase (incl. first interment)	£2,938	£3,378																			

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal

Non-resident Burial Digging Fee	£5,716	£6,573
Non-resident cheapest grave purchase	£11,150	£12,822

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

A reduction in cremation charges might not lead to an increase in the number of overall cremations. However, a reduction in charges is likely to enhance our reputation, assist our residents and establish how sensitive to price increases our cremation service actually is. This would be a more useful risk to take than a further substantial price increase in cremation costs.

Cremation charges have increased by over 122% since 2006, an increase of 15% over two years would take that figure to over 155%.

This service competes with other neighbouring facilities, a large price increase could reduce overall business and income.

Current Resident Comparative Prices with neighbouring boroughs

Borough	Standard Cremation
Lewisham	£703
Southwark	£748
Greenwich	£687
Bromley	£1,070*

* Bromley Council do not operate their own crematorium. Dignity Funerals privately run Beckenham Crematorium.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk to the authority's reputation if it appears that we are increasing income at the expense of our vulnerable, recently bereaved residents. This proposal reduces the charge for a cremation service where we have additional capacity. There is a risk that this change will not generate increased numbers of cremations and income. This is arguably a more acceptable risk than increasing cremation charges again and further reducing overall demand and income. There are reputational risks associated with increasing burial and memorial charges, particularly in cases where residents have reserved grave spaces for future burials, or have burial space remaining in graves already in use and feel that increases in charges, exceeding inflation, are unfair.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	458	(1,013)	(555)
HRA			
DSG			
Health			

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Reduction in cremation fees	67	67		134
Total	67	67		134
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
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
E		A. Strengthening Community input 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
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact			
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Section 9 of the Cremation Act 1902 empowers the Council as burial authority to “demand payment of charges or fees, for the burning of human remains in any crematorium provided by them ...” No Regulations or guidance on the calculation of the fee have been published and the amount of the fee is therefore a matter for the Council to determine.

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 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduce sweeping frequency to residential roads to fortnightly.
Reference:	CUS7
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Environment
Service/Team area:	Cleansing
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Parks, Neighbourhoods and Transport
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Reduce sweeping frequency to residential roads to fortnightly £823k	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Residential streets are currently swept at least once per week. This is being reviewed as staff costs are the single biggest cost to Environmental Services. Very regrettably, it is not possible to make the levels of cuts required without considering redundancies.
Cuts proposal
Reduce sweeping frequencies to all residential roads within the borough to a minimum frequency of once a fortnight.
Currently residential roads are swept a minimum of once a week. This proposal would reduce frequencies to once a fortnight for all residential roads, however, all main sweeping areas on beats where there are small shopping parades will still be swept daily (Monday to Friday).
Reducing residential street sweeping to once per fortnight would require a full reorganisation of every street sweeping beat across the borough.
These cuts would affect a number full time street sweeping staff. The savings could not be achieved by just reducing the number of agency staff we currently have covering vacant posts. This cut would lead to a loss of approximately 12 full time staff posts and approximately 18 agency staff.
Consultation would also need to take place with full time Street Sweeping staff as their new sweeping beats would be increased in size and some would have to be moved to other areas of the borough.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
These proposals will have a detrimental impact on the standards of street-cleaning to all residential roads across the whole of the borough.
There would be a heavier build-up and accumulation of litter and detritus to all areas

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

and cleanliness standards would be reduced.

The council's ability to comply with the legal standards contained within the Environmental Protection Act 1990 would become increasingly difficult.

There might be an increase in complaints from residents and members of the public.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Three small mechanical sweeping machines would be leased to ensure we could deliver new service in the new areas as effectively and efficiently for residents.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	5,738	(340)	5,398	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Reduce sweeping frequency to residential roads to fortnightly	-	823	-	823
Total				
% of Net Budget	%	15%	%	15%
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
N/A		A. Strengthening Community input 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	
N/A		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

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

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Negative		
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
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	All Wards in Borough

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:			
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					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					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Under Section 89(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, the Council is under a statutory duty to ensure that open land under its direct control and to which the public have access is, so far as practicable, kept clear of litter and refuse. Under Section

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

11. Legal implications

89(2), the Council is also under a statutory duty, so far as is practicable, to ensure that public highways within its area are kept clean. In deciding what standard is required, the Council must have regard to the character and use of the land or highway, as well as the measures which are practicable in the circumstances. Under Section 89(10), the Council is also required to have regard to the code of practice published by the Secretary of State from time to time. In particular, the code requires the Council to allocate its land into different types or "zones" which must be publicised. The code then sets out cleanliness standards for the different types of land and maximum response times for cleaning an area which has been littered. The duty applies seven days a week. Members of the public may complain to the Magistrates Court where they consider that there is a breach of Section 89. The code of practice is admissible in evidence and the court may take into account any relevant provision in the code of practice. The guidance is provided as a practical guide to the discharge of the duty, but it remains the case that what is appropriate in a particular instance is for the Court to agree. If the complaint is successful, a litter abatement order will be made, failure to comply with which is an offence. The court may also award costs if it is satisfied that there were reasonable grounds for bring the complaint, even if by the time the complaint is heard, the litter has been cleared away or the lack of cleanliness rectified. In considering any savings proposals in relation to these matters, the Mayor must therefore be satisfied that the Council will still be able to comply with its duties under Section 89 and the requirements contained in the code of practice.

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 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Close the four remaining automated public toilets within the Borough
Reference:	CUS8
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Environment
Service/Team area:	Cleansing
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
Close Automated Toilets £92k	Yes	Yes - Consultation took place on previous closures prior to setting up current Community Toilet Scheme in borough	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
There are four automated public toilets in the borough at Sydenham x 1, Blackheath x2 and Forest Hill x 1. This service is provided at an annual cost to the authority of £100,000 per year
Cuts proposal
Close the four remaining Automatic Public Toilets

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There will be no 24hr free accessible toilets left within borough.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
An increase in street urination and defecation.
Community Services have set up a Community Toilet Scheme within the borough. This does not however provide a 24 hour service to residents like the automated toilets do. Public toilets are also provided to residents and members of the public within the borough's parks.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	92		92	
HRA				
DSG				

**APPENDIX 3
CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS**

5. Financial information				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Close Automated Toilets	92			92
Total				
% 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 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 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	N/A	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	N/A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	N/A	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Yes
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which? Blackheath, Sydenham, Forest Hill

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:	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

8. Ward impact			
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
N/A			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications	
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
<p>The provision and maintenance of public toilets in public places is at the discretion of local authorities who have a power under section 87 of the Public Health Act 1936 to provide public conveniences, but no duty to do so. The decision as to whether or not to provide facilities and the extent of the provision provided is determined by each authority and balanced against other local service demands.</p>	

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
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

USAGE FIGURES OF TOILETS ARE ON NEXT PAGE

**APPENDIX 3
CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS**

Usage Figures of the 4 Public Toilets situated on the Public highway from July 2017 – June 2018

The figures are based on the number of times the automated doors are opened and closed, this is the only way figures are gathered so they cannot be fully accurate on the actual number of times used.

APC = Automated Public Toilet

DPC = Disabled Public Toilet

	Jul-17	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17	Nov-17	Dec-17	Jan-18	Feb-18	Mar-18	Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Totals
Blackheath Grove DPC	0	204	253	140	183	102	0	252	99	121	144	219	1,717
Blackheath Grove APC	1,111	1,088	962	1,101	652	840	0	1,641	1,001	1,020	1,079	1,244	11,739
Forest Hill APC / DPC Combined	1,243	975	902	1,285	1,151	1,011	1,123	861	814	1,070	981	1,264	12,680
Sydenham APC / DPC Combined	547	449	916	1,435	1,383	1,264	909	900	1,389	1,039	45	11	10,287

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Cost reductions in homelessness provision – income generation and net budget reductions
Reference:	CUS9
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Strategic Housing
Service/Team area:	Strategic Housing
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet member for Housing
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Housing Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) To generate new income through the construction of new alternatives to nightly paid temporary accommodation: £460k	No	No	No
b) To reduce the net budget for Nightly Paid Temporary Accommodation, as new permanent homes become available: £641k	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<p>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</p> <p>The Council accommodates more than 2,000 homeless households in temporary accommodation of all kinds, of which 570 households are in “nightly paid” accommodation which is the most expensive and poorest form.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Division’s strategy is to drive down the use of this form of accommodation, by continuing to focus on homelessness prevention, and where cases are in need of emergency housing, to provide better and cheaper alternatives to be obtained by both building and buying new homes.</p> <p>The current net budget for providing emergency nightly paid accommodation, which cannot be recovered from rents or from Government funding, is £2.8m. The current income budget from alternatives to nightly paid accommodation that have already been delivered, such as PLACE Ladywell and Hamilton Lodge is £370k.</p> <p>Diverting households away from nightly paid accommodation will generate a saving on the £2.8m budget, and providing income generating alternatives will provide additional income to grow the £370k budget.</p> <p>The strategy from the Strategic Housing Division is therefore to pursue both routes to achieve its required budget reduction, and this is therefore one of two linked proposals in that regard.</p>

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal

Cuts proposal

Proposal A: income generation

It is proposed that the Council invests in further developments such as PLACE/Ladywell which, as well as providing better accommodation for our homeless households, also generate a net financial return to the Council. PLACE/Ladywell, for instance, generates £220k pa which has already been taken as a saving in previous budget setting rounds.

Mayor & Cabinet has already approved the delivery of a successor to PLACE/Ladywell on Edward Street in Deptford. This project will deliver 34 new two-bed and three-bed homes for homeless families, alongside ground floor non-housing uses which at present are expected to include a community nursery among other uses. The project is awaiting a Planning decision and will start on site in 2019.

Four further temporary accommodation projects are at an early stage of development and are expected to be presented to Mayor & Cabinet in the autumn of 2018 for further consideration, approval and budget setting. In total, these five projects are expected to deliver at least 90 new purpose-built homes as alternatives to nightly paid accommodation, and to generate a net income to the Council of £460k pa when they are complete. This is considered to be a reasonable and prudent estimate of the level of income that may be generated.

In addition to the net income to the Housing division from these proposals, one of the potential projects also includes provision for adults with learning disabilities which has the potential to drive cost savings to the Adult Social Care budget of up to £310k.

Proposal B: net budget reductions

There are currently more than 575 households in nightly paid (NP) temporary accommodation at a net cost to the Council of £2.8m pa. This expenditure cannot be reclaimed through rents or from Central Government. It is therefore a cost to the general fund incurred due to a lack of alternatives to nightly paid for people in emergency housing need.

In addition to generating income by building and owning alternative housing provision that makes a net income, the strategy for the Housing Division is also to drive down the number of households in NP overall.

This aim is expected to be achieved in the following ways:

- By building on the success of the Lewisham Homes property acquisition programme by reviewing options for, and then implementing, a further programme to obtain properties for homeless households as alternatives to TA
- By continuing the focus of the Housing Needs team on preventing homelessness, which has seen the number of homeless acceptances fall by 17 per cent from 726 in 16/17 to 602 in 17/18
- Through the delivery of a large proportion of the 500 Council homes which were approved before March 2018 and which are now at the delivery stage. This programme of projects which now nearly all have planning consent will deliver 410 social housing completions over the coming three years.
- Through the delivery of Council-developed purpose-built alternatives to NP contained in Proposal A.

In total, these measures are predicted to reduce the NP usage level by approximately

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal

110 to 130 placements, which is equivalent to a cost reduction of £641k profiled as £405k in 19/20 and £236k in 20/21.

In addition, and in particular through a potential extension of the property acquisition programme, it is expected that this approach could target the highest cost NRPF cases and drive a further reduction of £500k in that budget, which is not held in Housing and as such is a potential wider Council benefit from this approach.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The provision of additional accommodation, which is of a better standard than nightly paid temporary accommodation provides positive benefits to the homeless families who are allocated to it. It enables them to stay locally rather than move away from Lewisham, breaking social and employment links. It also enables them to be housed in stable accommodation while they await permanent social housing, rather than being required to move on a number of occasions.

The proposals benefit the Council's housing division on that they provide further alternatives to nightly paid, which help strategically with the discharge of the Council's statutory housing duties and help financially with the costs of not having sufficient options to meet needs.

The proposals also potentially benefit the Adult Care Service, in that they include provision of six homes for adults with learning disabilities which have the capacity to drive a cost saving of around £310k, and the Children's Services Directorate, in that they have the capacity to drive NRPF cost savings of around £500k.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The main risk to the income generation strand is that the projects in scope either cannot be delivered at all, or are delayed. Of the five projects, one is fully funded and planning consent is expected in the autumn of 2018, at which point it will be fully deliverable. Three further schemes are at a more advanced stage, with consultants being appointed at present and further details and consultation expected in the autumn. The fifth scheme has yet to commence.

As such, there are risks in relation to consultation, planning and construction which may delay or entirely remove the capacity to generate income on some of these projects.

These risks can be mitigated as follows:

- By using cautious assumptions around income per scheme and around delivery programme, which has been done
- By continuously seeking to build on this programme, so that alternative substitute sites can be used if any of these prove undeliverable
- By continuing to grow the operational and delivery capacity of the Council and Lewisham Homes as its development partner
- By maintaining close management focus on the delivery of these projects, managing risks and addressing issues at pace.

The main risks to the cost reduction element are similar to the above, in that to a large part these reductions are dependent on driving up the pace of new housing delivery.

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Additional risks however include the continuing crisis of housing affordability, which means demand is likely to remain high over the coming period, and the impacts of the Homelessness Reduction Act which widens the group of residents to whom the Council potentially has a duty.

The mitigation for these risks again is mainly close management focus on performance and delivery, and the continuous drive towards both greater prevention of homelessness and towards a much higher supply of social housing.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	28,700	(23,200)	5,500	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) To generate new income through the construction of new alternatives to nightly paid temporary accommodation		460		460
b) To reduce the net budget for Nightly Paid Temporary Accommodation, as new permanent homes become available	405	236		641
Total	405	696		1,101
% of Net Budget	7.4%	12.7%	%	20.0%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	Yes
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				May potentially drive ASC cost savings.

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	D	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
6	10	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	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?

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:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	Medium
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>There are <u>positive</u> impacts for the selected protected groups. These groups have been shown to be more commonly service users of the service in question and therefore, as the proposals are to provide more and better alternatives for these services users, locally to Lewisham, they are potentially positively impacted as a result.</p>			
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 specific legal implications as the proposals relate to means by which the council will fulfil its homelessness duties.

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

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 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Invest to save – create revenues protection team
Reference:	CUS10
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public services
Service/Team area:	Revenues
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Invest to save – improve debt collection (collection fund): £1.2m	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Revenues Service administers and collects Council Tax, Business Rates, HB overpayment recovery, sundry debt and processes all financial transactions.
Cuts proposal
In 2017/18, the Council carried out a Council Tax Single Person Discount review and raised approximately £1.1m of additional ongoing revenue. The cost of the data matching and analytics was £120K plus internal resource. By 31/3/2018, the Council had collected £800K of this additional revenue. The Council made a £500K saving as a result of this work.
The proposal is to use this saving to invest to create greater savings by the creation of a Revenues Protection Team. The programme of work will initially constitute the following but may be broadened where opportunities arise. All estimates of revenue raised are indicative only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Backdate single person discount review of 17/18 to date of discount award (c. £500K) • Further single person discount review (c. £400K) • Empty Property review (c £50K + new homes bonus) • Concessionary awards review (c. £250k) <p>Total gross revenue raised = c. £1.2m.</p>
The approx. data matching costs are 12% subject to supplier chosen (£144K). The Revenue Protection Team cost (to bill, collect, enforce and deal with all enquiries court action etc. 5 x S01 + 1 x PO3) £250K pa. Total cost £394K. Net saving in year 1 = £806K plus additional £394K in future years.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no negative impact on service users, partners and staff.

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that the investment will not result in the projected return. However, the projections are based on the experience of other boroughs. If the targets are not being met, the project will be closed down.

There is a risk that the revenue protection work will be perceived negatively. The team will work with the Communications to ensure this is managed.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Improve debt collection	806	394		1,200
Total	806	394		1,200
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
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
D		A. Strengthening Community input
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	B. Sharing Services
High		C. Digitising our Services
		D. Income Generation
		E. Demand Management

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
Positive		3. Clean, green and liveable
Level of impact on main priority –	Level of impact on second priority –	4. Safety, security and a visible presence
		5. Strengthening the local economy
		6. Decent homes for all
		7. Protection of children
		8. Caring for adults and the older

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

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

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

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:			
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
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The creation of a revenues protection team to enhance debt collection is consistent with Council's fiduciary duty.

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
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Process automation in Revenues and Benefits
Reference:	CUS11
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Services
Service/Team area:	Revenues
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Invest to save – use of automated processing: £250k	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Revenues Service administers and collects Council Tax, Business Rates, HB overpayments, sundry debt and processes all financial transactions. The Benefits Service administers Housing Benefit, Council Tax Reduction, adult social care financial assessments and concessionary awards.
Cuts proposal
The Revenues and Benefits service recently updated its on line forms in preparation for the implementation of automated processing of new claims and changes for Housing Benefit and for Council Tax discounts, moves and direct debit set up. The use of automated processing is new and will require investment in technology and staff to support it.
If successful, the Council could further improve the speed of processing and reduce costs. Investment could lead to other processes being identified for automation but these are not included in costs or savings.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no negative impact on service users and partners. There will be an impact on staff as the number needed for processing will reduce but there will be a lower number of new roles needed to oversee and manage the automation.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
There is a risk that the investment will not result in the projected return. The technology is new and has not been widely applied in this area before. To mitigate this the project team will review services where this technology has already been deployed to learn from their experience and reduce the risks.

5. Financial information

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,590	(2,861)	1,729	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Use of automated processing		250		250
Total		250		250
% of Net Budget	%	14%	%	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
C		A. Strengthening Community input 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		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / 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?
9. Service equalities impact	

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

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

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this 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	11				
Sc 6 – SO2	60				
PO1 – PO5	21				
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3	1				
JNC					
Total					

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The introduction of automated processing will have to comply with the provisions of the GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018. Advice will need to be sought from Legal Services and the DPO before implementation to ensure compliance. General staffing implications will apply

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
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2020	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Invest to save – improve Housing Benefit overpayment recovery
Reference:	CUS12
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Services
Service/Team area:	Revenues
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Invest to save – improve HB debt collection: £480k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Revenues Service administers and collects Council Tax, Business Rates, HB overpayment recovery, sundry debt and processes all financial transactions.
Cuts proposal
The Council is implementing a new debt collection system (Ash) which will improve management information and automate some of the recovery processes leading to faster/better recovery. The new system is being implemented with new procedures and a new approach to debt management. The new arrangements will lead to improved collection rates and a reduction in requirement for Bad Debt Provision.
This invest to save proposes increasing the number of staff working on HB overpayments to improve collection before the transfer of Housing Benefit to Universal Credit commences for existing cases. Case studies elsewhere suggest a return on investment of 3:1. The performance of the additional ‘team’ will be closely monitored to ensure they are on target and the first 6 months will be considered a proof of concept.
The saving is a one off but for each of the years the ‘invest to save’ is made.
It is estimated that 6 additional officers at £40k p.a. would give a net return of £480K p.a. for at least the next 2 years but at some point the return will reduce and need review.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no negative impact on service users, partners and staff. There is a small chance the Benefit Service will see an increase in enquiries.

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that the investment will not result in the projected return. The new Ash system will provide comprehensive performance reports which will be closely monitored and action taken where collection is off target. The first 6 months are a proof of concept to ensure the project is viable.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	213,100	213,100	-	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Improve HB debt collection	480			480
Total	480			480
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

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

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		11. Community leadership and empowerment
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	12. Young people's achievement and involvement
Positive		13. Clean, green and liveable
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	14. Safety, security and a visible presence
High		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,

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		effectiveness and equity

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

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

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Measures to enhance debt recovery are consistent with the Council's fiduciary duty

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 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Invest to save – improve sundry debt collection
Reference:	CUS13
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Services
Service/Team area:	Revenues
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Invest to save – improve sundry debt collection: £480k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Revenues Service administers and collects Council Tax, Business Rates, HB overpayments, sundry debt and processes all financial transactions.
Cuts proposal
<p>The Council is implementing a new debt collection system (Ash) which will improvement management information and automate some of the recovery processes leading to faster/better recovery. The new system is being implemented with new procedures and a new approach to debt management. The new arrangements will lead to improved collection rates and a reduction in requirement for Bad Debt Provision.</p> <p>This invest to save proposes increasing the number of staff working on sundry debt following the implementation of Ash to improve collection rates. No data is available on potential return on investment so it is proposed a proof of concept project is undertaken for a 6 month period on all sundry debt collection to demonstrate a business case for further investment.</p> <p>This saving is based on a 'return on investment' of 3:1.</p> <p>The performance of the additional 'team' will be closely monitored to ensure they are on target and the first 6 months will be considered a proof of concept. It is estimated that 6 additional officers at £40k p.a. would give a net return of £480K p.a. This would need to be reviewed in future years subject to performance and arrears.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no negative impact on service users, partners and staff. There is a small chance Council services that raise charges may see an increase in enquiries.

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that the investment will not result in the projected return. The new Ash system will provide comprehensive performance reports which will be closely monitored and action taken where collection is off target. The first 6 months are a proof of concept to ensure the project is viable.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	259	(46)	213	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Improve sundry debt collection		480		480
Total		480		480
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

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

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

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

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Measures to enhance debt recovery are consistent with the Council's fiduciary duty

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 2020	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Parking Service – revenue review
Reference:	CUS14
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Services
Service/Team area:	Revenues
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
Parking Service revenue review: £500k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Parking Service is responsible for the management of the Council's parking arrangements on street, in controlled parking zones and in car parks. The service is delivered via a contract with NSL Ltd.
Cuts proposal
The demand for parking across the borough continues to increase and as a consequence so does the requirement for controlled parking zones which are continuing to increase in numbers. This is resulting in increased permit sales and increased enforcement action. A review of the budget has identified that the service is able to offer up £500K income.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no negative impact on service users, partners and staff.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
There is a risk that over time the budgeted income may change. Performance of this aspect will be monitored closely.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	2,304	(7,621)	-(5,317)	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Parking Service	500			500

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
revenue review				
Total	500			500
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes			

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	
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
4		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact as parking controls exist across the borough
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low

APPENDIX 3 CUSTOMER SERVICES PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact

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

--

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	No
---	----

10. Human Resources impact

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

11. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Under section 45 RTRA 1984, local authorities have the power to designate parking places on the highway, charge for use of them and issue parking permits for a charge. Such charges are prescribed within a local designation order. Funds raised must be placed in a ring fenced account and surpluses must be applied for other transport purposes.

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