Appendix 7 – F – Better demand management

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Environmental Operations Review
Reference:	F-15a
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Zahur Khan
Service/Team area:	Cleansing
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Sophie McGeevor - Cabinet Member for Environment and
	Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
	Υ	N - Statutory	Υ
		Y - Informal	

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

- The current service model for street cleansing is a barrow-based, beat street sweeping service, currently delivered on a weekly frequency to residential streets. Higher frequency sweeping is provided to town centres and areas with a higher footfall. In addition to sweeping streets, street sweepers are also responsible for emptying litter bins, reporting fly-tipping and graffiti, weeding pavements, helping Highways to grit icy pavements and clearing large amounts of leaf-fall during autumn.
- This programmed approach is used by many other authorities, many with higher levels of mechanisation.
- We believe there are efficiencies to be made within the service, which will
 reflect the Council's ambitions for the borough, to do things differently and
 provide a good service for residents, while finding the cuts we need to make.
- In December 2020, Mayor and Cabinet approved proposals to conduct a strategic review of all environmental operations, to provide a full operational and management model for the borough based on a menu of options and approaches, using best practice and industry standards. This review would inform the future shape of services including any efficiencies and capital requirements.

3. Description of service area and proposal

 It is proposed that on top of the 5% cut to the waste service, approved in December, an additional 10% cut is made by finding efficiencies within the review.

Cuts proposal*

It is proposed to remove a further 10% - or £567k - from the overall environmental services budget.

This would focus on the Street Cleansing budget.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

It is proposed that a service review, for all environmental operations – including street cleansing services - be undertaken in 2020/21, to provide a full operational and management model for the borough based on a menu of options and approaches, using best practice and industry standards.

This review would inform the future shape of services, including any efficiencies and capital requirements, and will give the opportunity next summer as part of the 2022/23 budget cycle, to decide on any further reductions in 2022/23 and 2023/34 based on a detailed and evidenced piece of work which also may allay fears and allow for greater efficiencies.

This would look for efficiencies across the whole of Environmental Operations which would mean, by adopting new agile ways of working, minimising the impact on on-street service delivery around cleansing.

The current service model requires investment in mechanical sweeping machines to enhance and improve the service for the residents of the borough, along with other changes in how the service operates, which could provide long term efficiency savings. This is linked to the growth proposals around an Integrated Intelligence Hub and Environmental Enforcement

2 Pilots were trialled in 2019 and reported to the September 2019 Sustainable Development Committee September 2019 Cleansing Pilots

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- Frequency on residential roads reduced. This would need an assessment on the frequencies roads require and appropriate approaches to minimise any adverse impact such as increased mechanisation and litter picking. However this will mean that the current beat approach would see the once per week visit for all streets change to a more graduated service with some areas seeing visits on 2-3 weekly basis.
- Street Sweepers blue bags and small fly tips will remain out on the streets longer.
- With only 3 mobile teams to cover the whole of the borough, we will have to
 prioritise work more effectively and efficiently, and undertake to provide a more
 agile service but there would be delays and work assessed and dealt with on
 priority and impact.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

- There will be a number of staff affected that may have to be made redundant.
 All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible.
- There will be an increase in the number of complaints by residents, as evidenced by the 2019 Pilots
- Increased demand on enforcement services
- An adverse impact on the perception of the borough in terms of cleanliness, attractiveness and management of the local environment, with a build-up of litter and detritus on the streets.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

Depending on the outcome of the review, the current frequency of residential sweeping could be impacted. In addition, the service could become more reactionary rather than pro-active and strict prioritisation of work/impact could need to be implemented.

Pending the outcome of the review, achieving the savings could require a significant restructure of the service, with potential redundancies. All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	6,323	340	5,983	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	0	567	0	567
Total	0	567	0	567
% of Net Budget	%	10%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
1. Making Lewisham greener Corporate priorities				
	1. Open Lewisham			
2. Good governance and operational	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis			
effectiveness	3. Giving Children and young			
3. Building safer communities	people the best start in life			
	4. Building an inclusive local			
	economy			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in orde	6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
4. Open Lewisham	5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				
5.	6. Making Lewisham greener				
	7. Building safer communities				
6.					
	8. Good governance and				
7.	operational effectiveness				
8.					

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

8. Service equalities impact				
Expected impact on service	e equalities fo	or users – High / Medium / Lo	ow or N/A	
Ethnicity:	N	Pregnancy / Maternity:	M/L	
Gender:	N	Marriage & Civil	N	
		Partnerships:		
Age:	M/L	Sexual orientation:	N	
Disability:	M/L	Gender reassignment:	N	
Religion / Belief:	N	Overall:	N	

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

The removal of these services would affect all residents and visitors however some increases in litter and detritus may have an impact on those with mobility issues.

- Older people can be less steady on their feet and more prone to trip hazards.
 A build-up of detritus on footways and carriageways may lead to increased accidents and reduced confidence in going out in public.
- For those with a disability, the same as the above applies but especially
 important with certain impairments such as poor vision, limited mobility or
 wheelchair users. Navigating around rubbish, spillages or broken glass is not
 always easy, causing general inconvenience, burst tyres and a potential loss
 of confidence.
- Women who are heavily pregnant may be at increased risk of falls as they may be unsteady on their feet.

The service will prioritise all incidents using a risk based approach to reduce the impact on equality groups but waiting times will be longer with reduced resource

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

9. Human F	Resources imp	act			
Will this cut	s proposal hav	e an impact o	n employe	es: Yes / No	Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts		FTE		Vaca	nt

9. Human R	9. Human Resources impact					
	Headcount	in post	Establi	Agency /	Not covered	
	in post		shment	Interim cover		
			posts			
Scale 1 – 2	83	83		46		
Scale 3 – 5	29	29				
Sc 6 – SO2	2	2				
PO1 – PO5	12	12				
PO6 – PO8	2	2				
SMG 1 – 3	1	1				
JNC	0	0				
Total	129	129		47		
Gender	Female	Male				
	6	123				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known		
	44	74	3	8		
Disability	Yes	No	PNTS	Unknown		
	7	84	27	11		
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexu	PNTS/Not	Other	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian	al	disclosed		
	86	1		29/11	2	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The Environmental Protection Act 1990 and DEFRA Code of Practice

11. 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				
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers				
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities				
	assessment and initial HR considerations)				
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C				
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing				
December 2020					
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where				
December 2020	required) prepared				
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments				
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest				
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget				
March 2021 – March	There would be a need to ensure that the Environmental				
2022	Operations review and the subsequent procurement tie in				
	with the timeline for the 1 st April 2022				
April 2022	Cuts implemented				

Appendix 1 Public Realm Budget and Delivery Approach 2020-2024

1. Overview

1.1 This appendix sets out:

- the approach to making more significant service changes and efficiencies over the next 3-year budget cycle, linking the current proposals for savings/cuts with complementary investment proposals
- current proposals including those that are deemed high risk

2. Strategy and Staging for change and improvement

- 3.1 To move the Division forward to a point where it operates on the basis of agile, demand led and prioritised services, with the potential to deliver further efficiencies, a twin track approach is required.
- 3.2 This approach will comprise:

Stage 1 – Development

- A small element of initial investment to address fundamental flaws in the current operation, as already submitted as part of the 2021/22 budget process. This will provide a small strategic resource to develop the forward planning and delivery capacity required to address future growth and pressures as well as corporate and political priorities.
- Concurrent to this, a number of service reviews will be undertaken to look at the current situation, future pressures and demands and to assess alternative service delivery models.

Stage 2 – Implementation

- Following the above work, a fuller, evidenced picture of the nature and shape of services will be available as well as details of the challenges and opportunities facing them in coming years.
- In most areas, there will be options and associated outcomes identified that will provide a menu-based approach based on intelligence and priority and corresponding opportunities around cost.

4. Stage 1 – Development

4.1 At this stage, a small element of initial investment required to move forward the necessary service development and change. Table A shows the investment put forward as growth within the 2021/22 budget process.

Table A – Invest to Save/Develop

Investment	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Commercial operations and			
Development	100	50	
Integrated intelligence Hub	60	60	
Environmental Enforcement	125	250	125
Waste Strategy and Delivery	60	60	
	500k-1m Capital		
	plus		
Environmental Operations - Street	£25konone-		
Cleansing	off		

Note: figures shown are £000,000

- 4.2 This investment will need to be supplemented by a number of reviews and service changes of which the following 3 in particular are linked directly to the budget proposals and more detail is contained within specific proposals:
 - Environmental Operations Review
 - Commercial and Green Waste Commercial Review and Marketing Strategy
 - Lewisham Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan

5. Stage 2 - Implementation

- 5.1 Following the above work, and other reviews that will be undertaken in and across Public Realm, a fully evidenced and deliverable programme for service change with options will be available. This will then be able to provide a range of choices for members to consider.
- 6. Efficiencies for 2021/22 and beyond
- 6.1 Table B shows the efficiencies proposed for 2021/22 onwards in the first round of the 2021/22 budget cycle process.

Table B – Savings proposed for 2020/21 to 2023/24

Saving	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	RAG
Waste Minimisation			ТВС		
Cleansing Option 1 (5%)			330		
Cleansing Option 2 (10%)			650		
Cleansing Option 3 (15%)			970		
Climate Change – Parking Zones			1000		
Climate Change - Safety	250	250			

Total 1,830 min.			
2,470 max.			

Note: figures shown are £000,000

- 6.2 In the main, these were straight forward basic cuts to services or radical changes to our approach around waste disposal: Expand a bit
 - Waste minimisation This would be linked to our new Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan and would look to reduce tonnages produced within the Borough. This requires a mix of extensive engagement and behaviour change, waste restriction on bins and longer frequencies for collections (towards 3 weeks) amongst others. This requires much more detailed work, including independent challenge and analysis, for a more detailed figure and to map out longer term gains such as direct savings as well as importantly providing necessary cost aversion.
 - Street Cleansing cuts. These would be purely on-street reductions and although we would try to minimise the impact of these by being agile etc., none of the benefits of a full review and an alternative service model would be applicable if taken in advance, e.g. before 2022/23. Given the sensitive nature of street cleansing on the perception of the borough, it is recommended that the reviews mentioned above be undertaken before any decision is taken.

5% - £330k
 10% - £650k
 15% - £970k

- Climate Change Safety To expand the current function within Parking, for the use of enforcement cameras for box junctions. This would primarily be targeted towards improving road safety and reducing injuries within the borough and meeting our and the Mayor for London's targets.
- Climate Emergency Parking Zones One of our strongest tools to reduce car dependence and increase more sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling, is the use of parking controls. To meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency in Lewisham, extending our CPZs borough wide would be a key tool as part of the Councils approach to tackling the Climate Emergency and reducing the impact of the car on the environment and health. In doing so, and thereby protecting the Borough, there would be a by-product of increased income associated with this corporate objective.

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Changes to Children's Social Care services - reduction in
	court proceedings, legal advocacy and specialist
	assessments for court proceedings.
Reference:	F-19
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Lucie Heyes
Service/Team area:	Children's Social Care
Cabinet portfolio:	Childrens Services and School Performance – Cllr Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
Reduction in court proceedings, the advocacy and specialist assessments for court proceedings.	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

A range of services and functions sitting within Children's Social Care and in particular the budget for providing placements for children and young people in care or who are care leavers. This budget is currently over-spending.

Cuts proposal*

It is important to note that the budget for child placements is significantly overspending at present. The saving listed below is in train already and is contributing to a reduction in the overspend in this financial year. The saving will be achieved through a reduction in court proceedings, legal advocacy and specialist assessments for court proceedings.

As part of the CSC improvement plan a key aim was to reduce the numbers of children subject to court proceedings, through introducing the Signs of Safety Practice Framework in 2019. Through 2019/20 court proceedings have already reduced and are forecast to remain lower this year. During the second half of the 20/21 financial year, commissioning external legal advocacy for court proceedings was ceased for all but the most complicated cases. Alternatively the in-house legal team are expected to represent the Local Authority in Family Public Proceedings. The estimated saving for 20/21 is £150k and £500k in 21/22. Judges frequently demand the Local Authority

3. Description of service area and proposal

undertake additional specialist assessments during proceedings. Work has also started on reducing the number of additional assessments required, strengthening the quality of existing assessments and exploring better value commissioning and quality assurance arrangements for specialist assessments. It is not possible to quantify the cost savings for this at this stage.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Actions currently underway have generated a significant reduction in expenditure. The actions listed above should continue with this direction of travel.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The actions listed above should not have a negative impact on the quality of care and in many cases should lead to an improvement in the service offer. These proposals do not involve denial or downgrading of services to protect children and young people: quite apart from the Council's strong commitment to the safety and wellbeing of our most vulnerable children, the services concerned are governed by strict statutory requirements.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

The current proposals are being closely monitored by both the Executive Director for Children and Young People and the Executive Director for Finances and Resources, together with the two Cabinet Members. All of these savings have been achieved in other Local Authorities.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	56,103	-3,834	52,269	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Reduction in court proceedings & advocacy	500			500
Total	500			500
% of Net Budget	2.9%	2.9%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	Yes	No	yes
If DSG, HRA, Health		Re-		Some
impact describe:		alignment of		recharge to

5. Financial information		
	some costs	the CCG for
	to the DSG	health
	HNB	related costs

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in orde	r of DECREASING impact
1.	Corporate priorities
	1. Open Lewisham
2.	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
	3. Giving Children and young
3. Giving Children and Young People the best	people the best start in life
start in life	4. Building an inclusive local
4.	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
7.	8. Good governance and
	operational effectiveness
Good governance and operational	
effectiveness	

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

Ethnicity:	low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	low
Gender:	low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	low	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	low
For any High impact ser mitigations are proposee		reas please explain why and v	what

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No				No	
Workforce p	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency /	Not
				Interim	covered
				cover	

9. Human R	esources imp	act			
Scale 1 – 2	·				
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	ВМЕ	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

None

11. Summary timetable	le control of the con		
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and			
implementation of pro	implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),		
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:		
Month	Activity		
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers		
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities		
	assessment and initial HR considerations)		
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C		
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing		
December 2020			
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where		
December 2020	required) prepared		
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments		
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest		
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget		
March 2021	Cuts implemented		
	·		

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Emission based charging for Short Stay Parking
Reference:	F-20
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Zahur Khan – Director, Public Realm
Service/Team area:	Parking
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Sophie McGeevor - Cabinet Member for Environment and
	Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
	Υ	Υ	N
		Statutory	

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

In 2020, the Council, as a response to the declared Climate Emergency, introduced an emissions based policy and charging regime for parking permits.

In summary, new banded charges for resident and business parking permits were introduced based on a vehicle's CO2 emissions. Permits for those with the least polluting vehicles were cheaper than previous permits, whilst those with the most polluting vehicles paid more.

However, due to technical issues with infrastructure, this change did not allow the Council to cover the Councils short stay, Pay & Display parking with the same approach.

Cuts proposal*

This proposal considers the particular adverse environmental and health impacts of fossil fuel emissions on short stay parking and proposes implementing an emission based parking regime similar to that for parking permits within Lewisham. This involves a CO2 based regime on short stay parking visitors, in order to deter the use of such vehicles and reduce the emissions arising. In addition a levy on diesel vehicles is proposed.

New infrastructure now allows this policy to be extended over the Short Stay Pay and Display area but the production and delivery timelines will, as with most current procurement, be subject to delay due to Coid-19 and will mean a later start in 2021/22 with a half year of benefits in that financial year.

3. Description of service area and proposal

Initial analysis indicates that a full CO2 regime will require modelling but could be similar in approach and operation to the regime currently in place for Permit holders in Lewisham.

This is estimated to potentially generating £140,000.

A Diesel surcharge is in place in other similar inner London authorities and it is proposed to charge a comparable amount of £3 surcharge on diesel vehicles, on top of a CO2 regime. It is estimated this proposal will generate £100,000. However the infrastructure issues highlighted above will mean a half year of benefits in 2021/22.

The proposal will require £60k in 2021/22 for staff time to start up, implementation and consultation/traffic order making/amending.

This proposal is aimed at improving air quality, reducing the harmful effects of pollution to people, especially the young and the elderly and supports the Lewisham's air quality aims and the Mayor of London's Ultra-Low Emission Zone.

To enable this approach, the remaining 65 P&D machines will require a capital upgrade of £400k capital investment. With cashless transactions at around 80%, it would be sensible to consider a full cashless regime. Paypoints can be arranged in shops with 100m of all P&D locations, should motorists still wish to pay by cash. However Members have previously indicated that they wish to retain machines in a number of areas and therefore, if this route is agreed then this will need to be tied in with the proposal for introducing emission based charging for motorcycles and the necessary capital investment.

This will require a borough wide statutory consultation as part of the Traffic Order Making process and can be delivered halfway through 2021/22.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

None

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- This measure maybe unpopular with users
- Will further support the Council's climate agenda.
- Will contribute to benefitting those most vulnerable to poor air quality.
- Will encourage, along with other measures, to motorists investing in cleaner emission vehicles.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,041,880	10,397,000	6,355,120	
HRA				

5. Financial information				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
CO2 surcharge	70	70		140
Diesel surcharge	50	50		100
Total	120	120		240
% of Net Budget	0.0018%	0.0018%	%	0.0037%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Υ	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

	Corporate priorities
	1. Open Lewisham
2. Good governance and operational	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
effectiveness	3. Giving Children and young
3.	people the best start in life
	4. Building an inclusive local
4.	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
7.	8. Good governance and
	operational effectiveness
8.	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	All Wards within Controlled Parking Zones
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities in Expected impact on ser		for users – High / Medium / Lo	ow or N/A
Ethnicity:	N	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N
Gender:	N	Marriage & Civil	N
		Partnerships:	
Age:	N	Sexual orientation:	N
Disability:	N	Gender reassignment:	N
Religion / Belief:	N	Overall:	N
		areas please explain why and v	what
mitigations are propose	ed:		

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

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No
Workforce pi	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Subject to statutory consultation under the Traffic Management Act with regard to introduction and setting a fee,

11. Summary timetable			
Outline timetable for r	Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and		
implementation of pro	implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),		
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:		
Month	Activity		
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers		
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities		
assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C		
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing		
December 2020			
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where		
December 2020	required) prepared		
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments		
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest		

11. Summary timetable			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget		
March 2021 Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Road Safety – Enhanced Enforcement
Reference:	F-21
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Zahur Khan – Director, Public Realm
Service/Team area:	Public Realm
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Sophie McGeevor - Cabinet Member for Environment and
	Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
	Y	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Lewisham has, over the years, implemented a great number of traffic measures to manage traffic flow, improve road safety and to prioritise sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and bus priority. These schemes have included banned turns, one way systems and other restrictions to limit vehicular movement, mainly in the more residential areas, to increase safety or address local environmental issues.

When such measures are complied with, it allows traffic to move freely and reduces road danger, whilst improving air quality. However, if such measures are contravened, road danger increases for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Such conflicts can also cause delays and congestion, leading to a loss of amenity and negatively affect air quality.

The vast majority of these are not regularly enforced.

Cuts proposal*

To complement the proposal for the Council to enforce yellow box junctions, it is proposed that a similar programme of enforcement be undertaken to support the Councils priorities around road safety and local environment.

The proposal is to review existing restrictions and initially enforce those with the highest number of contraventions and those contraventions where a high risk of occurrence and personal injury is highlighted.

The proposal will be developed and implemented by Traffic and supported by Parking and our Parking contractor NSL Ltd on CCTV and maintenance functions. This will involve:

 As part of our on-going annual work on road safety and reducing personal injuries within Lewisham, an assessment of accident hotspots along with

3. Description of service area and proposal

surveys and restrictions will be undertaken to provide a prioritised list of locations with contraventions.

 A list of around a dozen sites will be initially be made and will be assessed to ensure camera enforcement can be administered.

This will help manage safety and congestion on our roads, improve air quality and confidence for all vulnerable road users and motorists that these sites are being managed correctly. This will also assist in meeting our and the Mayor for London's targets.

Some of the proposals can be implemented in 2021/22, with 5 sites of the initial 12 and the remainder in the following year. Exact sites will be dependent on surveys, which will need to be commenced first.

Costs for the necessary capital investment, including cameras, will be required, on an invest to save basis. As such a capital investment of £360,000, with £100,000 in 21/22 and £175,000 in 22/23 is required.

As a by-product of our reinforcing the effectiveness of our traffic management measures it is anticipated that there will be net income as follows

	2021/22	2022/23
Income	£250k	£375k

The production and delivery timelines will, as with most current procurement, be subject to delay due to Coid-19 and will mean a later start in 2021/22 with a half year of benefits in that financial year.

As these measures exist, no consultation will be required and appropriate signs will be added to the restrictions, as necessary.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- A wide range of positive impacts around environment, from local streetscape to air quality.
- Perceived impact on personal access and business
- Not popular with some residents and businesses
- Reinvestment into local environmental improvements and transport and accessibility initiatives and services as per Section 55
- Income raised through fines is spent on running of the parking services and any surplus is used to subsidise the costs of concessionary fares and maintaining our roads.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,042	10,397	6,355	
HRA				

5. Financial information				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Road Safety – enhanced enforcement	250	375		625
Total	250	375		625
% of Net Budget	2.75%	5.5%	%	8.25%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
1. Building safer communities	Corporate priorities			
	1. Open Lewisham			
2. Making Lewisham greener	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis			
	3. Giving Children and young			
3. Good governance and operational	people the best start in life			
effectiveness	4. Building an inclusive local			
4.	economy			
	5. Delivering and defending:			
5.	health, social care & support			
	6. Making Lewisham greener			
6.	7. Building safer communities			
7.	8. Good governance and			
	operational effectiveness			
8.				

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	Wards identified in the priority list
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

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

8. Service equalities impact	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what	
mitigations are proposed:	ı

Ν

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

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No
Workforce p	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 - 2					
Scale 3 - 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	ВМЕ	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

All income must be applied via the hierarchy specific in Section 55 of the Road Traffic regulation Act 1984

11. Summary timetabl	11. Summary timetable		
Outline timetable for r	main steps to be completed re decision and		
implementation of pro	pposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),		
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:		
Month	Activity		
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers		
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities		
assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C		
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing		
December 2020			

11. Summary timetable			
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where		
December 2020	required) prepared		
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments		
December 2020	Commence surveys and draft proposals		
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest		
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget		
March 2021	Procurement commences		
September 2021	Installation programme commences over next 12 months		

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Motorcycle Parking Charges
Reference:	F-22
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Zahur Khan – Director, Public Realm
Service/Team area:	Parking
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Sophie McGeevor - Cabinet Member for Environment and
	Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
	Υ	Υ	N
		Statutory	

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Motorcycles currently park free of charge in Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and on any permit holder, pay-and-display or dual purpose bay within Lewisham. In addition some motorcycle parking is available in car parks.

As part of our commitment to improve local air quality and reduce CO₂ emissions in Lewisham, we are proposing to introduce parking permits for motorcycles. This is aimed at tackling air pollution from motorcycles by encouraging people to switch to less polluting models or more sustainable forms of transport. It will also bring all motorcycle parking charges in line with other vehicles, which have had emissions-based permits since last year.

Poor air quality contributes to an estimated 10,000 premature deaths every year in London. As vehicle emissions are the primary source of air pollution in London, it is crucial that Lewisham plays its part in tackling this source of pollution.

Cuts proposal*

As part of our Local Implementation Plan and Parking and Enforcement Plan, Lewisham is committed to encouraging people to travel more sustainably, increasing walking and cycling rates, and promoting public transport use. This also is in-line with our approach to the declared Climate Emergency.

These proposals are aimed at encouraging motorcyclists who need to ride to switch to less polluting and zero-emission motorcycles. The proposals would also bring Lewisham in line with the majority of other inner London boroughs that already charge for motorcycle parking.

3. Description of service area and proposal

Motorcycles have not been charged to park in the borough up to now, largely because it has not been possible to display a permit securely on a motorcycle. Developments in technology offer a practical solution in the form of cashless parking and e-permits as used currently within the borough.

In support of the Council Climate agenda it is proposed to, within controlled parking zones:

- Introduce a requirement for motorcycles to hold a valid permit to park in any permit holder bay, which would be charged based on emissions.
- Making it a requirement for visitors travelling by motorcycle to display either a visitor e-voucher when visiting friends and family, or purchase a cashless parking session when parked in short-stay bays.

This would mean:

- Motorcycle bay parking will be free for electric motorcycles.
- Motorcyclists could park for £1 a day.
- Each daily permit can move between motorcycle bays during the same day without any further charge.
- Longer term permits have also been proposed below, with the same concession. The proposal will allow motorcycles to park in bays they currently do, but with a charge.

At this stage, the proposed prices shown below are indicative and subject to further change following further research and analysis, including a possible emission based regime.

Permit duration	Price
1 day	£1
1 week	£3
1 month	£10
1 quarter	£30
1 year	£100

The proposal is expected to generate £80k income in 2022/23, but will require £60k in 2021/22 for staff time to start up, implementation and consultation/traffic order making/amending.

To enable this approach, the remaining 65 P&D machines will require a capital upgrade of £400k capital investment. With cashless transactions at around 80%, it would be sensible to consider a full cashless regime. Paypoints can be arranged in shops with 100m of all P&D locations, should motorists still wish to pay by cash. However Members have previously indicated that they wish to retain machines in a number of areas and therefore, if this is the route agreed, then this will need to be tied in with the proposal for introducing emission based charging for short stay P&D and the necessary capital investment.

This proposal can be delivered for 2021/22 and will need to align with the procurement and infrastructure required for the proposal for emissions based Short Stay pay and

3. Description of service area and proposal

display. Production and delivery timelines will, as with most current procurement, be subject to delay due to Coid-19 and will mean a later start in 2021/22 with a year of benefits in 2022/23

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Not applicable

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- This measure maybe unpopular with users
- Will further support the Council's climate agenda.
- Could lead to displacement of parking into adjoining areas without parking controls.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

There are interest groups who have views on the proposed roll out for charging for motorcycles, such as the Motorcycle Action Group. We shall engage with such groups as the proposals are developed and consulted on.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	4,042	10,397	6,355	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Motorcycle Parking		80		80
Total		80		80
% of Net Budget	%	<1%	%	<1%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No				
	Υ	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact			
1. Making Lewisham greener	ewisham greener Corporate priorities		
	1. Open Lewisham		
2. Good governance and operational	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis		
effectiveness			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order	6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
3.	3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life				
4.	4. Building an inclusive local economy				
5.	5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				
6.	6. Making Lewisham greener7. Building safer communities				
7.	8. Good governance and				
8.	operational effectiveness				

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	Zones
impact by ward:	Those Wards with Controlled Parking Zones
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impa	ict			
Expected impact on service	e equalities fo	or users – High / Medium / L	ow or N/A	
Ethnicity:	N	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N	
Gender:	N	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N	
Age:	Ν	Sexual orientation:	N	
Disability:	N	Gender reassignment:	N	
Religion / Belief:	N	Overall:	N	
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 N				

9. Human R	9. Human Resources impact				
Will this cuts	proposal hav	e an impact o	n employees:	Yes / No	No
Workforce p	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2				COVEI	
Scale 1 – 2					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			

9. Human R	9. Human Resources impact				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal: Requirement to undertake consultation under the Road Traffic Act

11. Summary timetabl	11. Summary timetable			
	main steps to be completed re decision and			
	oposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:			
Month	Activity			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Order Making and procurement commences			
September 2021	Installation programme commences over next 12 months			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Review transport services to secure efficiencies
Reference:	F-23
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Angela Scattergood
Service/Team area:	Home to School Transport
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	CYP Select

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed: Home to School Transport

There is a statutory requirement to provide home to school transport for children with Educational Health & Care Plan where the plan specifies a transport service.

From 2015 to 2019, the number of EHCPs in Lewisham increased by 65.5% from 1,408 to 2,344. The number of ECHPs in Lewisham now stands at 2,873, representing a further 22.5% increase since the January 2020 SEN2 census date. There are 2 aspects within the transport service- passenger services (Lewisham buses) at £2.2M and use of taxis at £1.1M. The annual budget of has typically overspent by £2M. For this year the forecast is 2.6M overspend, some of this is due to COVID.

Cuts proposal*

The proposal is to review passenger services and use of taxis to identify a strategy to secure a reduction in spend of £250,000

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

This review is seeking to identify efficiencies in our transport processes and not a reduction in service to those children who are eligible for transport support.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

This risk with this proposal arises from the increasing numbers of children and young people with EHCP, particularly those accessing education out of borough. A mitigation plan has been devised to increase in borough capacity. However, this is a demand-led budget within a statutory framework. A previous planned review of the service was paused as a consequence of the Covid 19 pandemic.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	3,265	0	3,265	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Home to school	250			250
transport				
Total	250			250
% of Net Budget	7.7%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in orde	r of DECREASING impact
Giving children and young people the best start in life	Corporate priorities
2. Delivering and defending: health, social	Open Lewisham Tackling the Housing Crisis
care and support	3. Giving Children and young
3. Building an inclusive economy	people the best start in life
	4. Building an inclusive local
4. Good governance and operational	economy
effectiveness	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
7.	8. Good governance and
	operational effectiveness
8.	

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

8. 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	N/A	
		Partnerships'		

8. Service equalities impact					
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 i	mpact assess	ment required: Yes / No	NO		

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					no
Workforce p	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Legal implications will be considered

11. 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

11. Summary timetable				
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020				
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	ASC Review
Reference:	F-24
Directorate:	Communities
Director of Service:	Tom Brown
Service/Team area:	Adult Social Care/ Joint Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Chris Best (Health and Adult Social Care)
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/	Public Consultation No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation No and Statutory vs informal
	No	No	No
		- 10	

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

A full scale service wide review will be completed for Adult Social Care with the objective of reducing costs whilst improving the outcomes for our residents. The review will be expected to build on the first round cuts proposed and deliver second round savings of £4m through:

- Working with our NHS partners to ensure people have access to rehabilitative therapies and recovery
- Better demand management through promoting independence and supporting a strength based model, working with service users to determine how their needs are best met through the assessment process
- Assessing our performance, productivity and our unit costs by benchmarking against our statistical neighbours
- Improved commissioning and contract management arrangements for our domiciliary, residential, nursing and day care services to ensure the services delivered are of good quality and offer value for money
- To assess the providers in the market place to determine whether the alternative offer is better placed to meet our residents' needs (to include a review of Enablement & Linkline services replacing F-07 & F-08)
- Modernising and transforming our building based day centre provision

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The delivery of this proposal is in addition to £3m cut proposed F-01 and must comply with legislative requirements for ASC, but this proposal aims to ensure that in the first instance we help people to be independent and / or use informal and community resources. Through transforming the way we work with people we aim to empower them to access non-institutional care wherever possible.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Building on existing ways of working we want to support staff to be creative and coproductive in approaches to the commissioning and delivery of support.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

Decisions are made on an individual basis taking account of the presenting concerns, assessed needs and how these can be met, and by taking into account any risks that are identified to service users and carers or any safeguarding concerns that may need to be investigated.

Adopting a co-productive approach and using positive risk management we seek to transform the way that people meet their needs.

All re-assessments will follow the guidance within the Care Act 2014. However, there may be an increase in the levels of formal complaints received if choices and preferences regarding the care and support offered are not realised.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	121.5m	55.4m	66.1m	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
ASC Review	3849	430	0	4279
Total	3849	430	0	4279
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
1.5	Corporate priorities			
	1. Open Lewisham			
2.1	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis			
	3. Giving Children and young			
3.2	people the best start in life			
	4. Building an inclusive local			
4.3	economy			
	5. Delivering and defending:			
5.4	health, social care & support			
	6. Making Lewisham greener			
6.8	7. Building safer communities			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
7.7	8.	Good governance and		
8.6		operational effectiveness		

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

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

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

People who are in receipt of care and support from ASC will have a disability or be an older resident or carer. Any changes to the care and support plans that are already in place will take place following a reassessment of need in accordance with legislation. There are higher levels of young working age adults in receipt of Direct payments.

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: No

9. Human Resources impact							
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: / No							
Workforce profile:							
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vacant			
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency /	Not		
				Interim	covered		
				cover			
Scale 1 – 2							
Scale 3 – 5							
Sc 6 – SO2							
PO1 – PO5							
PO6 – PO8							
SMG 1 – 3							
JNC							
Total							
Gender	Female	Male					
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known			
Disability	Yes	No					

9. Human Resources impact							
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not			
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed			

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

ASC is a statutory service that implements the legislative guidance accordingly. All decisions made regarding how a care and support plan are changed will be influenced by the re-assessment of needs in line with the Care Act guidance.

There are care arrangements in place that have prioritised the choices and aspirations of individual service users and carers when considering how needs can be met.

The re assessments of these arrangements will follow care act guidance by taking into account the strengths and assets that individuals can contribute to support themselves, for example, looking at what family and community networks can provide, and whether there are sufficient finances to self-fund support required.

11. 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				
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers				
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities				
	assessment and initial HR considerations)				
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C				
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing				
December 2020					
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where				
December 2020	required) prepared				
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments				
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest				
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget				
March 2021	Cuts implemented				