

# Overview and Scrutiny



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Agenda

Tuesday, 23 January 2024

**7.00 pm**, Civic Suite, Catford, London SE6 4RU

The meeting can also be observed via the Council's website at  
<https://lewisham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

For more information contact: Timothy Andrew (020 8314 7916,  
[timothy.andrew@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:timothy.andrew@lewisham.gov.uk))

This meeting is an open meeting and all items on the agenda may be audio recorded and/or filmed.

### Part 1

Item		Pages
1.	Minutes of the meeting held on 3 October and 6 December 2023	1 - 7
2.	Minutes of the task and finish group meetings held on 4 and 5 July 2023	8 - 12
3.	Declaration of Interests	13 - 16
4.	Budget Savings Proposals	17 - 198

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members

Members of the Committee, listed below, are summoned to attend the meeting to be held on Tuesday, 23 January 2024.

Jeremy Chambers, Monitoring Officer  
Monday, 15 January 2024

<p><b>Members</b></p> <p>Councillor Rudi Schmidt (Chair)</p> <p>Councillor Ese Erheriene (Vice-Chair)</p> <p>Councillor Chris Best</p> <p>Councillor Mark Ingleby</p> <p>Councillor Joan Millbank</p> <p>Councillor Stephen Penfold</p> <p>Councillor James Rathbone</p> <p>Councillor James Royston</p> <p>Councillor Luke Sorba</p> <p>Councillor Liam Shrivastava</p>	
--	--

The public are welcome to attend committee meetings. However, occasionally, committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of reports can be made available in additional formats on request..

## MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 3 October 2023 at 7.00 pm

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Mark Ingleby, Ese Erheriene (Vice-Chair), Chris Best, Joan Millbank, Stephen Penfold, James Rathbone, James Royston, Rudi Schmidt (Chair), Luke Sorba and Liam Shrivastava

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Brenda Dacres (Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing Development and Planning), Charlotte Dale (Head of Scrutiny and Policy), Patrick Dubeck (Director of Inclusive Regeneration) and Kplom Lotsu (SGM Capital Programmes)

ALSO PRESENT VIRTUALLY: Tom Brown, Helen Buttivant, Councillor Coral Howard, Dr Catherine Mbema and Spike van der Vliet-Firth

NB: Those Councillors listed as joining virtually were not in attendance for the purposes of the meeting being quorate, any decisions taken or to satisfy the requirements of s85 Local Government Act 1972

### 1. Minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2023

1.1 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2023 be agreed as an accurate record of proceedings.

### 2. Declarations of Interest

2.1 None declared.

### 3. Response to the Community Food Growing and Workspaces Task and Finish Groups

3.1 The Committee discussed the Mayoral response to the Community Food Growing Task and Finish Group (TFG) and heard from Catherine Mbema.

3.2 The creation of a new fixed term “Community Food Growing Officer” post, using one-off funding from the Public Health Grant, to kick start work in the food justice and community food growing arena was welcomed. It was noted that this would not duplicate the work of members of the “Good Food Lewisham Team” at Lewisham Local.

3.3 Councillor Howard, Chair of the Community Food Growing TFG, welcomed the response and highlighted the importance of this policy area given the cost of living crisis and the positive benefits that community food growing could have on mental health. She reported that Members of the (now disbanded) TFG would be very interested to find out more about how the new post would be oriented, and how it might provide support to both food

justice and the excellent, but under resourced, work of the “Good Food Lewisham Team” at Lewisham Local.

3.4 The Mayoral response to the Workspaces TFG was discussed and welcomed by the Chair of that body, Councillor Schmidt. Councillor Ingleby also commented on the response and the need to keep the affordable workspace strategy under review. In response to a question from Councillor Millbank, the Committee discussed meanwhile use and the balance between ensuring sites could be utilised for community benefit prior to development, and ensuring their intended future use could still be secured without impediment. With respect to meanwhile use, Patrick Dubeck suggested that there needed to be a fair split on liability for building maintenance, in order to protect the Council’s interests but also, to not deter groups who could ensure a beneficial use of the space.

3.5 It was noted that the workspace provider forum was well attended and affordability for providers and those using the workspaces was considered, although the Council’s first duty was to secure value for money for its residents, rather than subsidise people using workspaces for their own commercial activity.

3.6 **RESOLVED:** That the responses be noted.

#### 4. Membership

4.1 It was noted that the membership of the Private Rented Sector TFG had been agreed at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting on 4 July 2023, but that Councillor Cooper was now a member of the Executive and could no longer serve on the TFG.

4.2 **RESOLVED:** That Councillor Stephen Penfold be appointed to the Private Rented Sector Task and Finish Group in place of Councillor Will Cooper.

#### 5. Asset Management

5.1 The Chair introduced the item and Patrick Dubeck introduced the report. It was noted that the Council was responsible for an eclectic portfolio of circa 900 assets and a new asset management strategy was currently being developed. It was further noted that important considerations in the development of the strategy included maintaining operational assets; meeting statutory obligations; supporting corporate priorities; and effectively dealing with deteriorating assets. Other points noted in the introduction:

- Regularising the leasing and other arrangements pertaining to community centres was being looked at presently. (Amongst other things, this would ensure that sub tenants were not inappropriately benefitting from subsidies; and nurseries operating from community centres paid fair rents as commercial businesses).
- Disposals were an important source of income (generating money that could be reinvested) and often sensible, where assets were in very poor condition

- Acquisition opportunities could be difficult to take advantage of, given current financial constraints.
- Partnership working was important and could assist in meeting locally shared objectives.

5.2 In the discussion that followed, the following key points were noted:

- The consultants assisting with the development of a new asset management strategy had been selected after an open procurement process with five responses to tender.
- Historical record keeping around assets was poor; many acquisitions and disposals occurred prior to computerisation and paper records had not always been kept correctly. Digitisation of all asset records was a council aspiration, but the priority was understanding significant/important assets.
- It was accepted that the asset register on the website might not be 100% accurate, including current usage, but officers were confident that all 'built structures' owned by the council were on the register. Work was ongoing to ensure the categorisation of assets was up to date.
- There were tried and tested ways of establishing an asset's financial value but social value was harder to quantify. For community assets a value figure proxy for social value was established.
- A 'red book' valuation would take place first with best value considerations considered. Economic, monetary and social value were all important.
- Best value was ensured in a variety of ways and rent reviews were a good opportunity to take stock.
- Where a peppercorn rent was charged the difference between that rent and market rent was effectively the council subsidy, provided in exchange for the social value generated for the community from the asset.
- There was a desire to move towards longer leases as any repairs/associated liabilities were more manageable for the tenant and they would find it easier to raise funding if they had a long lease.
- Non-key decisions were delegated to officers. Some committee members felt that councillors should still be consulted on non-key decisions if the assets were key community assets.
- If a community asset was earmarked for disposal officers would need to make an assessment on the community provision available/planned locally. Officers would also carry out an EIA prior to declaring an asset surplus to service requirements.

- New developments might create new community assets not owned by the Council.
- A change of use from community use would require consultation with the local planning authority (the Council).
- The corporate estate management plan focussed on the asset repairs needed in relation to operational assets. £4.9m of repairs was scheduled for the current 3-year programme to 2024 – there was insufficient funding to complete all the repairs identified in the 2018/19 condition reviews – compliance was the baseline. Sometimes assets were mothballed as the capital cost of investment was not affordable but the case for disposal was not compelling.
- Disposals brought in one-off money, the opportunity cost was future usage. Disposals tended to be a last resort, the value of a one-off capital receipt needed to be carefully considered. It had to be accepted that some of the Council’s assets were beyond repair for the Council.
- The Asset Review Board considered all potential options for assets, including disposal but also change of use. Ward members were also consulted on significant changes and every disposal.
- Identifying grant funding and other additional funding was essential for most Council asset projects to go ahead.
- There might be a business case for some Adult Social Care investment due to the need having a statutory basis.
- The Mayow Road independent living units were a good example of investing to save, but the health system was poor at identifying the need for capital investment in housing propositions. The Health sector tended to focus almost completely on the clinical estate. Nonetheless, there were sites where the Council was keen to work with the NHS and was actively trying to unlock barriers.
- Taking a place-based approach to asset management was important, especially with regard to the creative sector.
- No decision on the “Willow Way” project had been taken yet but a feasibility study had resulted in options.
- A wide range of structures were always considered in order to manage financial exposure.
- The Southwark Land Commission had made a range of recommendations and Lewisham’s Asset Management Strategy would pick up on many of the Commission’s themes.
- It was noted that Southwark had disposed of a lot of assets and delivered a lot of private housing so was in a different position to Lewisham on land.

- Lewisham had a history of community land use, stretching back to the 1980s Walter Segal cul-de-sac in Honor Oak to, more recently, Citizens House in Sydenham. However, providing council land for free required its utility for other purposes to be considered and community land use was not always the best, or fairest, option.
- Officers tried to be as responsive as possible to enquiries about the community use of vacant assets and would test business cases if appropriate. Letting a property for less than market value required a lot of due diligence.
- The Council had been prudent not to engage in high risk commercial acquisitions like some councils, but some acquisitions did take place and were driven by need (e.g. temporary accommodation provision). If agents approached the council with potential opportunities, officers would investigate these, subject to capacity. However, generally the council had sufficient land in relation to its capacity to finance activity on it.
- Garages were reviewed as usage could be low, but some tenancies required access to a garage. Garages only tended to be useful for a change of use if they could be clustered. Sometimes they could be used creatively, for example as rehearsal space.
- The Local Plan, which governs land use in the borough, involved a high level of public consultation. There was no capacity to publicly consult on a site by site basis but consultation in the planning domain was integral.

5.3 The Committee discussed the climate emergency in relation to asset management and the following points were noted:

- De-carbonisation surveys were being carried out and around 30 operational sites had been surveyed thus far. The surveys had identified that the cost of decarbonisation for these 30 sites alone would be upwards of £30m. The corporate management plan currently had approximately £5M on a 3-year programme to 2024 to deliver essential backlog repairs to the operational estate. This was much less than what was required to deliver improvements to the estate.
- Government decarbonisation funding only provided between 10 and 20% of the funding required, the market was not very sophisticated yet and installing a gas boiler in a commercial building was around 3-6 times cheaper than the green alternative which would require substantial additional work to improve the fabric of the building.
- Officers were working with the Cabinet Member to develop a clearly costed plan for decarbonisation and external funding would be required given the level of government funding available. (It was noted that it was also difficult to bid for funding as insufficient time was often given to make the bid).

- It would be important to ensure that the refurbishment of Lewisham Library using Levelling Up and other funding, ensured that the building was effectively retrofitted.
- It was easier to quantify the costs of decarbonising housing stock as this could be done *en masse*, due to the low level of variation between properties.
- Maintaining a smaller, but higher quality estate would assist the Council’s environmental aspirations. Another organisation might be able to fund the decarbonisation of the disposed asset and the Council could use the capital receipt to fund the decarbonisation of its retained assets. Sitting on a degrading asset was not environmentally responsible.

5.4 **RESOLVED:** That a referral be made to Mayor and Cabinet recommending that:

1. The asset management strategy should come to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to its consideration by Mayor & Cabinet (at the Committee’s meeting on 6 February 2024, if timelines allow)
2. There should be a wider consideration of the value of land - its economic value, geographical location and social value should all be key considerations in the decision-making process for the development or disposals of assets
3. Master planning for the long-term use of the Council’s assets should take place, including combined use, creative zones and industrial units
4. The Council should consider a wider acquisition strategy
5. A more ambitious investment partnership strategy should be adopted
6. All assets proposed for disposal or change of use should be highlighted to scrutiny, and ward councillors, including those below the key decision threshold of £1.5m\*
7. Equalities considerations should be part of all asset management decisions, with Equalities Analysis Assessments (EAAs) carried out where required
8. Ongoing clarity should be provided in relation to existing and potential plans for meeting net zero ambition, including planned and necessary works, as well as secured funding and gaps.

*\*This recommendation was not unanimous (Councillor Rathbone opposed).*

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm

Chair:

-----

Date:

-----



# MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 6 December 2023 at 6.50 pm

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Rudi Schmidt (Chair), James Rathbone and Luke Sorba

APOLOGIES: Councillors Ese Erheriene, Chris Best, Mark Ingleby, Joan Millbank, Stephen Penfold, James Royston and Liam Shrivastava

## 1. Appointment to the Housing Select Committee

- 1.1 **RESOLVED:** That Councillor Dawn Atkinson be appointed to the Housing Select Committee.

The meeting ended at 6.52 pm

Chair:

-----

Date:

-----

# Agenda Item 2

## Minutes of the Community Food Growing Task and Finish Group

Tuesday, 4 July 2023 at 6.00 pm

In attendance: Councillors Coral Howard (Chair), Natasha Burgess, Will Cooper, Laura Cunningham and Sian Eiles

Also present: Councillor Mark Ingleby, Timothy Andrew (Scrutiny Manager)

### 1. Minutes of the last meeting

- 1.1 **Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2022 be agreed as an accurate record.

### 2. Declarations of interest

- 2.1 Councillor Laura Cunningham declared an interest as a member of the Brockley Society (which worked closely with the Breakspears Mews allotment society)
- 2.2 Councillor Coral Howard declared an interest as an allotment holder at Trewsbury Road allotments.

### 3. Draft final report

- 3.1 Councillor Coral Howard addressed the Task and Finish Group – thanking members for their work, noting the key Groups' key findings, and emphasising the potential for community gardening in Lewisham.
- 3.2 Timothy Andrew (Scrutiny Manager) introduced the report – highlighting the outcome of the Groups' evidence gathering and inviting members to comment on, and agree, the recommendations.
- 3.3 In Committee discussions - the following key points were noted:
  - That consideration should be given to the funding available from section 106 to improve social value.
  - That there were opportunities in new developments to create new community gardens – particularly those being led by the Council.
  - Schemes being delivered by the Council could serve as pilots – to show what was possible.
  - That any work with schools should be led by people with knowledge of the education system.
  - That schools often had knowledge about the importance of community gardening but not the capacity to deliver on their ambitions.
  - That the Group would welcome additional resources and officer time to support community gardening.
  - That the Council should be bold in its approach.
  - Members would welcome further updates on the implementation of the recommendation as well as opportunities to be involved in the delivery of community gardening initiatives in the future.

- 3.4 **Resolved:** that the Task and Finish Group report and recommendations be agreed for referral to Mayor and Cabinet.

The meeting ended at 6.30 pm

Chair:

-----

Date:

-----

# MINUTES OF THE WORKSPACES TASK & FINISH GROUP

Wednesday, 5 July 2023 at 6.00pm

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Liam Shrivastava (Chair), Billy Harding, Mark Ingleby and Aliya Sheikh

NB: Those Councillors listed as joining virtually were not in attendance for the purposes of the meeting being quorate, any decisions taken or to satisfy the requirements of s85 Local Government Act 1972.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and AGREED that Cllr Liam Shrivastava be appointed as the Chair for this meeting in the absence of Cllr Rudi Schmidt.

## 1. Minutes of the last meeting held on 16 November 2022

1.1. RESOLVED: that the minutes of the last meeting be agreed as a true record.

## 2. Declarations of interest

2.1. Councillor Mark Ingleby declared a personal interest in item 3 as he was a member of the Musicians' Union.

## 3. Draft Final Report

The Task and Finish Group members discussed their draft final report. The following key points were noted:

- 3.1. It was discussed that the Task and Finish Group's final report should recognise and promote the flexibility component of workspaces as it was as important as affordability.
- 3.2. The revamping of Lewisham Library provided the Council with a great opportunity to increase its provision of affordable and flexible workspaces. This library was centrally located and had great transport links to other parts of the borough. This meant people from all over the borough could benefit from the facilities in this library.  
In light of this, Councillor Aliya Sheikh proposed that an additional recommendation be added to the Group's final report that focused on optimising the provision of affordable and flexible workspaces in Lewisham Library that could cater to a diverse range of age groups, incorporating flexible workspaces for adults and informal study areas for young people. This recommendation would ask the Council to consider the Group's findings while planning the transformation of Lewisham Library, ensuring the expansion of workspaces to meet the community's needs.
- 3.3. It was hoped that this recommendation around Lewisham Library was something that could be implemented quickly and therefore have an immediate positive impact on the provision of flexible and affordable workspaces in the borough.
- 3.4. It was agreed that under the 'Key Findings' section of the draft report, another point would be added after point 4.54 to reflect that Councillor Aliya Sheikh had visited Lewisham Library on multiple occasions and had participated in various focus groups and user consultation sessions around the revamping of the library. A

photograph of Councillor Aliya Sheikh at the Lewisham Library would also be included in the final report.

- 3.5. A member of the Group mentioned that spaces used by the local community for various purposes such as churches, libraries and community centres had great footfall and exploring the possibility of providing workspaces in underused areas of these community spaces could lead to the formation of 'cultural hubs'. For example, Catford Mews was one such multi-purpose and flexible space that was a cinema and a social space that also provided residents with free wi-fi so that they could work from there.
- 3.6. The Group agreed that workspaces generated investment and attracted creatives and businesses, but it was important that all the residents of Lewisham felt that these spaces were for them as well. It was important that all workspaces were inclusive and accessible to all.
- 3.7. A member of the Group stated that it was a well written and clear report with a strong set of recommendations. It dovetailed nicely with the Council's upcoming Affordable Workspace Strategy.
- 3.8. Provision of music venues and rehearsal spaces for musicians was also briefly discussed by the Group. Workspaces mentioned in the report cover a broad range of spaces which included spaces for music rehearsals. The Group was hopeful that the implementation of its recommendations would help increase the provision of music rehearsal spaces as well. Currently, Lewisham had the Music Room on New Cross Road which provided rehearsal studios and Sister Midnight, a community-owned music venue that was due to open soon would also be providing music practice spaces upstairs.
- 3.9. Under the 'Key Findings' section of the draft report, point 4.47 mentioned that the Group hoped that the Council would build upon the dialogue initiated by the Group with the Musicians' Union to inform the implementation of its cultural strategy. A few members of the Task and Finish Group had a discussion with national officers from the Musicians' Union and hoped that the Council would continue this dialogue with Musicians' Union members from South London. Councillor Mark Ingleby had also spoken with the London Secretary of Musicians' Union about progressing this dialogue.
- 3.10. It was discussed that following consideration of the report by the Mayor and Cabinet, one way forward could be to share a questionnaire with Musicians' Union members to ask if they were aware of or had any suggestions for spaces that they thought could work as live music performing venues or music rehearsal spaces.
- 3.11. Under the 'Key Findings' section of the draft report, point 4.53 mentioned the Lewington centre managed by L&Q in the north of the borough that was not being utilised to its full potential and had the potential to provide workspaces. It was discussed that when the Group analysed the Council's asset register, it had found more potential spaces that were unused or being underused such as the space in Northover. A member of the Group enquired whether the list of those assets could be shared with the Task and Finish Group. Members were informed that the list of assets identified by the Group had been shared with the Council's Estates team who was currently reviewing them to establish the current status of each of the assets on the list. Once that review was finished, the list of assets would be shared with the members of the Group.
- 3.12. It was also discussed that as part of the Affordable Workspace Provider survey, some workspace providers had suggested a few spaces across the borough that they thought were underused or unused. This list would also be shared with members of this Group and the Council's Estates team.

- 3.13. The Group praised recommendation 5.4 about the Overview and Scrutiny Committee having asset management on its agenda for in-depth scrutiny.
- 3.14. A member of the Group mentioned that along with the mention of the GLA's Cultural Infrastructure Map, the report also needed to focus on a local resource that listed workspaces and other community spaces specifically in Lewisham. The Group was informed that SHAPES Lewisham website held a directory of workspaces and other community spaces in the borough and that this was mentioned in the draft report at point 4.37.
- 3.15. Recommendation 5.11 in the draft report referred to SHAPES Lewisham and recommended that the Council should update the SHAPES Lewisham website to correctly display all the workspaces in the borough and also look into improving its accessibility. It was discussed that this recommendation should also mention that the Council could consider the possibility of incorporating a map of workspaces on the Lewisham Council website similar to what Brent Council had done. This would provide a user-friendly resource for individuals seeking information on affordable workspaces in Lewisham.

RESOLVED: That

- the report and recommendations be agreed subject to the inclusion of additional comments and the recommendation put forward at the meeting:  
 "The transformation of Lewisham Library offers the Council a golden opportunity to optimise the provision of affordable workspaces and promote the idea of flexible workspaces. The revamped space could cater to a diverse range of age groups, incorporating flexible workspaces for adults and informal study areas for young people. In light of this, the Task and Finish Group recommends that the Council consider the Group's findings while planning the transformation of Lewisham Library, ensuring the expansion of workspaces to meet the community's needs."

The meeting ended at 6.37 pm.

Chair:

-----

Date:

-----



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

### Declarations of Interest

**Date:** 23 January 2024

**Key decision:** No

**Class:** Part 1

**Ward(s) affected:** All

**Contributors:** Director of Law and Corporate Governance

### Outline and recommendations

Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

## 1. Summary

1.1. Members must declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda. There are three types of personal interest referred to in the Council's Member Code of Conduct:

- (1) Disclosable pecuniary interests
- (2) Other registerable interests
- (3) Non-registerable interests.

1.2. Further information on these is provided in the body of this report.

## 2. Recommendation

2.1. Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

### 3. Disclosable pecuniary interests

3.1 These are defined by regulation as:

- (a) Employment, trade, profession or vocation of a relevant person\* for profit or gain
- (b) Sponsorship –payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than by the Council) within the 12 months prior to giving notice for inclusion in the register in respect of expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member or towards your election expenses (including payment or financial benefit from a Trade Union).
- (c) Undischarged contracts between a relevant person\* (or a firm in which they are a partner or a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest) and the Council for goods, services or works.
- (d) Beneficial interests in land in the borough.
- (e) Licence to occupy land in the borough for one month or more.
- (f) Corporate tenancies – any tenancy, where to the member's knowledge, the Council is landlord and the tenant is a firm in which the relevant person\* is a partner, a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest.
- (g) Beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
  - (a) that body to the member's knowledge has a place of business or land in the borough; and
  - (b) either:
    - (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that body; or
    - (ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person\* has a beneficial interest exceeds 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that class.

\*A relevant person is the member, their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they live as spouse or civil partner.

### 4. Other registerable interests

4.1 The Lewisham Member Code of Conduct requires members also to register the following interests:

- (a) Membership or position of control or management in a body to which you were appointed or nominated by the Council
- (b) Any body exercising functions of a public nature or directed to charitable purposes, or whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy, including any political party
- (c) Any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25.



## 5. Non registerable interests

- 5.1. Occasions may arise when a matter under consideration would or would be likely to affect the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect the wellbeing of those in the local area generally, but which is not required to be registered in the Register of Members' Interests (for example a matter concerning the closure of a school at which a Member's child attends).

## 6. Declaration and impact of interest on members' participation

- 6.1. Where a member has any registerable interest in a matter and they are present at a meeting at which that matter is to be discussed, they must declare the nature of the interest at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered. The declaration will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. If the matter is a disclosable pecuniary interest the member must take not part in consideration of the matter and withdraw from the room before it is considered. They must not seek improperly to influence the decision in any way. **Failure to declare such an interest which has not already been entered in the Register of Members' Interests, or participation where such an interest exists, is liable to prosecution and on conviction carries a fine of up to £5000**
- 6.2. Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest they must still declare the nature of the interest to the meeting at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered, but they may stay in the room, participate in consideration of the matter and vote on it unless paragraph 6.3 below applies.
- 6.3. Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest, the member must consider whether a reasonable member of the public in possession of the facts would think that their interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair the member's judgement of the public interest. If so, the member must withdraw and take no part in consideration of the matter nor seek to influence the outcome improperly.
- 6.4. If a non-registerable interest arises which affects the wellbeing of a member, their, family, friend or close associate more than it would affect those in the local area generally, then the provisions relating to the declarations of interest and withdrawal apply as if it were a registerable interest.
- 6.5. Decisions relating to declarations of interests are for the member's personal judgement, though in cases of doubt they may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer.

## 7. Sensitive information

- 7.1. There are special provisions relating to sensitive interests. These are interests the disclosure of which would be likely to expose the member to risk of violence or intimidation where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that such interest need not be registered. Members with such an interest are referred to the Code and advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance.

## 8. Exempt categories

- 8.1. There are exemptions to these provisions allowing members to participate in decisions notwithstanding interests that would otherwise prevent them doing so. These include:-
- (a) Housing – holding a tenancy or lease with the Council unless the matter relates to your particular tenancy or lease; (subject to arrears exception)
  - (b) School meals, school transport and travelling expenses; if you are a parent or

guardian of a child in full time education, or a school governor unless the matter relates particularly to the school your child attends or of which you are a governor

- (c) Statutory sick pay; if you are in receipt
- (d) Allowances, payment or indemnity for members
- (e) Ceremonial honours for members
- (f) Setting Council Tax or precept (subject to arrears exception).

## **9. Report author and contact**

- 9.1. Jeremy Chambers, Director of Law and Corporate Governance, 020 83147648, [Jeremy.Chambers@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:Jeremy.Chambers@lewisham.gov.uk),



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Report title: Overspend Reduction Measures 2023/24 and 2024/25**

**Date:** 23 January 2024

**Key decision:** No.

**Class:** Part 1.

**Ward(s) affected:** None specific

**Contributors:** Acting Director for Finance, Acting Executive Director for Corporate Resources, Executive Director for Children and Young People, Executive Director for Community Services, Executive Director for Housing, Executive Director for Place, and Director of Law, Governance and Elections

## Outline and recommendations

The purpose of this report is to present Overview and Scrutiny Committee with officers' draft proposals for overspend reduction measures identified to date. The Council's published Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) assumed that the level of growth required to support services could be contained within the funding envelope for 2024/25 and that no new savings would need to be identified and implemented. However, during the course of 2023/24 the persistent and increasing overspend in childrens social care, adults social care and temporary accommodation, due to specific demand and market pressures, has meant that overspend reduction measures are required for both 2023/24 and 2024/25 to ensure that a balanced budget can be set in 2024/25.

The provisional Local Government Finance (LGFS) settlement was published on the 18 December 2023 and largely confirmed that the MTFS assumptions would hold, however there has not been significant new or increased funding provided and as such these measures are required. The proposals presented in this report equate to £8.423m (of which £2.118m is for 2023/24 and £6.305m for 2024/25) and build upon the £2.315m of initiatives identified and approved in 2021/22 and 2022/23 for delivery in 2024/25. Of the proposals put forward, £1.108m require Mayor and Cabinet approval and £7.315m are officer decisions for implementation.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee are recommended to:

Review the £8.423m of proposals appended to this report which will be tabled at Public Accounts Select Committee on the 29 January 2024 before being included within the Council's 2024/25 Budget Report on the 7 February 2024.

Note that of these proposals £xxm are for officers to proceed with the preparation of these, consulting where required, to enable delivery from the 1 April 2024.

## Timeline of engagement and decision-making

7 February 2024 – draft 2024/25 Budget Report to M&C

29 January 2024 – draft 2024/25 Budget Report to PASC

18 December 2023 – provisional Local Government Finance Settlement

30 November 2023 – Medium Term Financial Strategy Update to PASC

19 July 2023 - Medium Term Financial Strategy to M&C

## 1. Summary

- 1.1. The Council published its MTFS on the 19 July 2023, utilising assumptions available at that time to forecast what the likely funding shortfall would be for the period 2024/25 – 2027/28. This analysis produced a cumulative budget gap over the four year period of

**Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Page 18

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

circa £15m, but with no budget gap requiring savings to be found in 2024/25.

- 1.2. That position was updated and revised over the Summer, notably to reflect increased service pressures in childrens and adults social care and temporary accommodation, as well as more stubborn than expected inflation. This culminated in a revised MTFS going to Public Accounts Select Committee in November 2023.
- 1.3. Given the increased costs arising from this, and the lack of expectation that Government would provide new or additional funding (which was confirmed in the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement on 18 December 2023), officers began the process to identify measures to reduce both the 2023/24 overspend and the 2024/25 pressures requiring funding.
- 1.4. This process identified £8.423m (of which £2.112m is for 2023/24 and £6.305m for 2024/25) and build upon the £2.315m of initiatives identified and approved in 2021/22 and 2022/23 for delivery in 2024/25. Of the proposals put forward, £1.108m require Mayor and Cabinet approval and £7.315m are officer decisions for implementation.
- 1.5. These are tabled for review by Overview and Scrutiny Committee and will be incorporated into the draft 2024/25 Budget Report which will be presented to PASC on 29 January and Mayor & Cabinet on 7 February.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1. Overview and Scrutiny Committee are recommended to:
- 2.2. Review the £8.423m of proposals appended to this report which will be tabled at Public Accounts Select Committee on the 29 January 2024 before being included within the Council's 2024/25 Budget Report on the 7 February 2024.
- 2.3. Note that of these proposals £xxm are for officers to proceed with the preparation of these, consulting where required, to enable delivery from the 1 April 2024.

## 3. Policy Context

- 3.1. The Council's strategy and priorities drive the Budget with changes in resource allocation determined in accordance with policies and strategy. The Council launched its Corporate Strategy in 2022, with seven corporate priorities as stated below:

### Corporate Priorities

- 3.2. The Council's corporate priorities are:
  - Cleaner and Greener
  - Strong Local Economy
  - Quality Housing
  - Children and Young People
  - Safer Communities
  - Open Lewisham
  - Health and Wellbeing
- 3.3. The Council also takes account of the 'Mayor's pledges', as outlined in the 2022 Labour Manifesto. These pledges are as follows:
- 3.4.
  - Place - We want Lewisham to be a place for everyone.
  - Community - We will be relentlessly focused on local.
  - Diversity - We will celebrate Lewisham's diversity.

- Inward investment and Opportunity - We will work to attract inward investment.
  - Innovation and New Ideas – We will take risks to innovate and seize new opportunities.
- 3.5. The inclusion of the budget reduction measures will enable the Council to set a balanced budget for 2024/25 and therefore directly supports the achievement of the Council's corporate priorities.

#### Values

- 3.6. Values are critical to the Council's role as an employer, regulator, securer of services, and steward of public funds. The Council's values shape interactions and behaviours across the organisational hierarchy, between officers and members, between the council and its partners and between the council and citizens. In taking forward the Council's Budget Strategy, we are guided by the Council's five core values:
- Ambitious;
  - Inclusive;
  - Collaborative;
  - Accountable;
  - Trustworthy.
- 3.7. Very severe financial constraints have been imposed on Council services with significant reductions made year on year for over a decade. This on-going pressure is addressed in this report.

## 4. Background

- 4.1. The Council published its MTFS on the 19 July 2023, utilising assumptions available at that time to forecast what the likely funding shortfall would be for the period 2024/25 – 2027/28. This analysis produced a cumulative budget gap over the four year period of circa £15m, but with no budget gap requiring savings to be found in 2024/25.
- 4.2. During the summer it became clear that the 2023/24 budget was not holding balanced, with persistent overspends in temporary accommodation, and childrens and adults social care. Whilst some of these pressures had been predicated for pressures funding in 2024/25, this was not to the extent materialising in the budget monitoring.
- 4.3. Furthermore, some of the economic assumptions underpinning the MTFS, mainly inflation, had also moved as the UK grappled with record levels of inflation which were not dropping in line with national forecasts.
- 4.4. This necessitated a revision to the MTFS, tabled at PAS on the 30 November 2023, which increased pressures funding to better fund the 2023/24 position, and adjusted inflation funding.
- 4.5. However, the revised MTFS could not fully fund services to the extent of the current forecast outturn overspend for those services with persistent budget pressures. Therefore in the Autumn the Executive Management Team (EMT) took the decision to collectively identify across the Council measures which could be implemented in both 2023/24 and 2024/25 to reduce the overspend and ensure that the revised MTFS could remain stable.
- 4.6. The provisional Local Government Settlement was announced on the 18 December 2023, and this aligned with and supported the revised MTFS position, meaning that the measures identified will need to be taken forward and implemented in order to be able to set a balanced budget in 2024/25.

## 5. Proposals and Approach

- 5.1. The process was the initial identification of measures and the completion of proformas which set out the nature of the proposal and the implications for staff, services, other Council services and external partners. It set out whether these were:
  - once off measures for 2023/24 to reduce the overspend (and hence use of reserves);
  - permanent measures to be implemented in 2023/24 which would permanently reduce service spend;
  - once off measures in 2024/25; or
  - permanent measures implemented in 2024/25 which would permanently reduce service spend;
- 5.2. Given that the Council has made significant and challenging cuts for more than twelve consecutive years, and has sometimes struggled to deliver these in full, it was also agreed that each proposal would include a 'deliverability confidence factor' which allowed officers to clearly set out the likelihood of achieving these in full.
- 5.3. The proposals were reviewed in detail by EMT and refined, prior to engagement with Mayor and Cabinet towards the end of 2023.
- 5.4. The proposals vary in terms of the scale and nature of the measures proposed, with many of these being minor operational changes, and others either more significant or requiring policy change, consultation or Member agreement prior to implementation.
- 5.5. Furthermore, for each proposal the Council's Equalities Analysis Assessment Toolkit was utilised to ensure that each of these was screened to assess whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact. It also identifies whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.
- 5.6. Finally it is a means to identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for the proposal.
- 5.7. Appendix 2 contains the proposals which will require agreement from Mayor and Cabinet prior to implementation, and Appendix 3 is the proposals which Officers are able to agree under the Councils' Constitution.
- 5.8. Each proposal will be separately or individually agreed via the appropriate decision making route.
- 5.9. Given that the Council cannot set a balanced budget for 2024/25 without either unsustainable levels of reserves or the implementation of these measures, the draft budget will be prepared on the basis that these are agreed and implemented in full. These will therefore be included with the draft 2024/25 Budget Report presented to Public Accounts Select Committee at its meeting on the 29 January 2024.
- 5.10. Overview and Scrutiny Committee is invited to review these proposals and consider whether it wishes to make any comments or referrals on these to PASC to consider as part of its scrutiny of the draft 2024/25 Budget Report.

## 6. Financial implications

- 6.1. This report is concerned with the budget reduction proposals to enable the Council to address the current and future financial challenges it faces. The setting of the Council's budget and policy framework is a function of the Council, and it is the responsibility of the Executive to make decisions which accord with it. The

management of the Council's financial affairs are conducted in accordance with the financial regulations set out in section K of Part IV of the Constitution. It is therefore the responsibility of officers to take the necessary actions required to ensure that they remain within the budget framework set by Council and the proposals contained within this report are necessary to support this in both 2023/24 and 2024/25. There are no direct financial implications arising from the report other than those stated in the report and appendices itself.

## 7. Legal implications

### Statutory duties

- 7.1. The Council has a variety of statutory duties which it must fulfil by law. The Council cannot lawfully decide not to carry out those duties. Even where there is a statutory duty there is often a discretion about the level of service provision. Where there is an impact on statutory duty that is identified in the report. In other instances, the Council provides services in pursuit of a statutory power, rather than a duty, and though not bound to carry out those activities, decisions about them must be taken in accordance with the decision making requirements of administrative law.

### Reasonableness and proper process

- 7.2. Decisions must be made reasonably taking into account all relevant considerations and disregarding all irrelevant matters. These are particular to the service reductions proposed and are set out in the body of the report. It is also imperative that decisions are taken following proper process. Depending on the particular service concerned, this may be set down in statute, though not all legal requirements are set down in legislation. For example, depending on the service, there may be a need to consult with service users and/or others and where this is the case, any proposals in this report must remain proposals unless and until that consultation is carried out and the responses brought back in a further report for consideration with an open mind before any decision is made. Whether or not consultation is required, any decision to discontinue a service would require appropriate notice. If the Council has published a procedure for handling service reductions, there would be a legitimate expectation that such procedure will be followed.

### Staffing reductions

- 7.3. If service reductions would result in redundancy, then the Council's usual redundancy and redeployment procedure would apply. If proposals would result in more than 20 but fewer than 100 redundancies in any 90 day period, there would be a requirement to consult for a period of 30 days with trade unions under Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (consolidation) Act 1992. The consultation period increases to 45 days if the numbers are 100 or more. This consultation is in addition to the consultation required with the individual employees. If a proposal entails a service re-organisation, decisions in this respect will be taken by officers in accordance with the Council's re-organisation procedures.

### Equalities Legislation

- 7.4. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 7.5. In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.



- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
  - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 7.6. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other prohibited conduct, or to promote equality of opportunity or foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. It is a duty to have due regard to the need to achieve the goals listed in the paragraph above.
- 7.7. The weight to be attached to the duty will be dependent on the nature of the decision and the circumstances in which it is made. This is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. The Mayor must understand the impact or likely impact of the decision on those with protected characteristics who are potentially affected by the decision. The extent of the duty will necessarily vary from case to case and due regard is such regard as is appropriate in all the circumstances.
- 7.8. The Equality and Human Rights Commission has issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at:
- <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/equality-act-codes-practice>
  - <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/equality-act-technical-guidance>
- 7.9. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty.
  - Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making.
  - Engagement and the equality duty: A guide for public authorities.
  - Objectives and the equality duty. A guide for public authorities.
  - Equality Information and the Equality Duty: A Guide for Public Authorities.
- 7.10. The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:
- <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty-guidance#h1>
- 7.11. The EHRC has also issued Guidance entitled “Making Fair Financial Decisions”.
- <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/making-fair-financial-decisions>. It appears at Appendix 4 and attention is drawn to its contents.

- 7.12. The equalities implications pertaining to the specific service reductions are particular to the specific reduction.
- The Human Rights Act
- 7.13. Since the introduction of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) the rights set out in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) have been incorporated into UK law and can be enforced in the UK courts without recourse to the European courts.
- 7.14. Those articles which are particularly relevant in to public services are as follows:
- Article 2 - the right to life
  - Article 3 - the right not to be subject to inhuman or degrading treatment
  - Article 5 - the right to security of the person
  - Article 6 - the right to a fair trial
  - Article 8 - the right to a private and family life, home and correspondence
  - Article 9 - the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion
  - Article 10 - the right to freedom of expression
  - Article 11 - the right to peaceful assembly
  - Article 14 - the right not to be discriminated against on any ground
- 7.15. The first protocol to the ECHR added
- Article 1 - the right to peaceful enjoyment of property
  - Article 2 - the right to education
- 7.16. Some of these rights are unconditional, such as the right not to be tortured or subject to degrading treatment. Others may be limited in finite and well defined circumstances (such as the right to liberty). Others are qualified and must be balanced against the need of the wider community – such as the right to a private and family life. Where there are human rights implications associated with the proposals in this report regard must be had to them before making any decision.
- Best value
- 7.17. The Council remains under a duty under Section 3 Local Government Act 1999 to secure continuous improvement in the way its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. It must have regard to this duty in making decisions in respect of this report.
- 7.18. Specific legal implications
- 7.19. Members' attention is drawn to the specific legal implications arising in relation to particular proposals set out in the relevant proforma in Appendices 1 and 2 of this report.
- Equalities Implications
- 7.20. Detailed policy and equality implications arising in relation to particulare proposals are set out in the relevant proforma in Appendices 1 and 2.

## 8. Equalities implications

- 8.1. Proformas included in Appendix 1 and 2 consider the service equalities impact for each proposal. This identifies whether the proposal is expected to have a high, medium or low impact on service users with protected characteristics, as well as mitigations that can be put in place and whether a full equalities impact assessment is required.

## 9. Climate change and environmental implications

- 9.1. Section 40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 states that “every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions to the purpose of conserving biodiversity”
- 9.2. The specific climate change and environmental implications identified as arising from the current cuts proposals will require further consideration, however, none of the new proposals are likely to impact negatively on our ability to conserve biodiversity.

## 10. Crime and disorder Implications

- 10.1. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires the Council to have regard to the likely effect on crime and disorder when it exercises its functions, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area.
- 10.2. Whilst there are no specific crime and disorder implications as yet identified as arising from the current proposals, any specific implications will be carefully considered by the relevant decision maker prior to agreement.

## 11. Health and wellbeing implications

- 11.1. Any specific health and wellbeing implications identified as arising from the current cuts proposals will require further consideration by the relevant decision maker prior to agreement.

## 12. Background papers

- 12.1. Previous reports setting the financial context:
- 12.2. 30 November – Medium Term Financial Strategy Update to PASC
- 12.3. 19 July 2023 - Medium Term Financial Strategy to M&C
- 12.4. 1 March 2023 – 2023/24 Budget Report to Council
- 12.5. 7 December 2022 – Budget Reductions for 2023/24
- 12.6. 2 February 2022 – Budget Cuts Report to M&C (“M&C”)

## 13. Glossary

Term	Definition
<b>Baseline Funding Level</b>	The amount of a local authority’s start-up funding allocation which is provided through the local share of the estimated business rates aggregate (England) at the outset of the scheme as forecast by the government. It forms the baseline against which tariffs and top-ups are calculated.
<b>Budget Requirement</b>	The Council’s revenue budget on general fund services after deducting funding streams such as fees and charges and any funding from reserves. (Excluding Council Tax, RSG and Business Rates)
<b>Business Rates Baseline</b>	The business rates baseline is equal to the amount of business rates generated locally in a specific year.
<b>Capping</b>	This is the power under which the government may limit the maximum level of local authority spending or increases in the

Term	Definition
	level of spending year on year, which it considers excessive. It is a tool used by the government to restrain increases in Council Tax. The Council Tax cap, currently 2%, means that any local authority in England wanting to raise Council Tax by more than 2% in 2015/16 must consult the public in a referendum, Councils losing a referendum would have to revert to a lower increase in their bills.
<b>CIPFA</b>	The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy are one of the UK accountancy institutes. Uniquely, CIPFA specialise in the public sector. Consequently CIPFA holds the responsibility for setting accounting standards for local government.
<b>Collection fund</b>	A statutory account maintained by the Council recording the amounts collected from Council Tax and Business Rates and from which it pays the precept to the Greater London Authority.
<b>Contingency</b>	This is money set-aside centrally in the Council's base budget to meet the cost of unforeseen items of expenditure, such as higher than expected inflation or new responsibilities.
<b>Council Tax Base</b>	The Council Tax base for a Council is used in the calculation of Council Tax and is equal to the number of Band D equivalent properties. To work this out, the Council counts the number of properties in each band and works out an equivalent number of Band D equivalent properties. The band proportions are expressed in ninths and are specified in the Local Government Finance Act 1992. They are: A 6/9, B 7/9, C 8/9, D 9/9, E 11/9, F 13/9, G 15/9 and H 18/9, so that Band A is six ninths of the 'standard' Band D, and so on.
<b>CPI and RPI</b>	The main inflation rate used in the UK is the CPI (Consumer Price Index), the Chancellor of the Exchequer bases the UK inflation target on the CPI. The CPI inflation target is currently set at 2%. The CPI differs from the RPI (Retail Price Index) in that CPI excludes housing costs. Also used is RPIX, which is a variation on RPI, one that removes mortgage interest payments.
<b>Dedicated schools grant (DSG)</b>	This is the ring-fenced specific grant that provides most of the government's funding for schools. This is distributed to schools by the Council using a formula agreed by the schools forum.
<b>Financial Regulations</b>	These are a written code of procedures set by a local authority, which provide a framework for the proper financial management of the authority. They cover rules for accounting and audit procedures, and set out administrative controls over the authorisation of payments, etc.
<b>Financial Year</b>	The local authority financial year commences on 1st April and finishes on the following 31 March.
<b>General Fund</b>	This is the main revenue fund of the local authority, day-to-day spending on services is met from the fund. Spending on the provision of housing however, must be charged to the separate Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

## Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Page 26

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</b>	GDP is defined as the value of all goods and services produced within the overall economy.
<b>Gross Expenditure</b>	The total cost of providing the Council's services, before deducting income from government grants, or fees and charges for services.
<b>Housing Revenue Account (HRA)</b>	A separate account of expenditure and income on housing that Lewisham must keep. The account is kept ring-fenced from other Council activities. The government introduced a new funding regime for social housing within the HRA from April 2012.
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	This is gross expenditure less services income, but before deduction of government grant.
<b>Revenue Expenditure</b>	The day-to-day running expenses on services provided by Council.
<b>Revenue Support Grant (RSG)</b>	All authorities receive Revenue Support Grant from central government in addition to its baseline funding level under the local government finance system. An authority's Revenue Support Grant amount plus its baseline funding level together comprises its Settlement Funding Assessment.
<b>Section 151 officer</b>	Legally Councils must appoint under section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972 a named chief finance officer to give them financial advice, in Lewisham's case this is the post of the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration.
<b>Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA)</b>	A Local Authority's share of the local government spending control total which comprises its Revenue Support Grant for the year in question and its baseline funding level.
<b>Specific Grants</b>	As the name suggests funding through a specific grant is provided for a specific purpose and cannot be spent on anything else e.g. The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for schools.

## **14. Report author(s) and contact**

- 14.1. Katharine Nidd, Acting Director of Finance, [katharine.nidd@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:katharine.nidd@lewisham.gov.uk)
- 14.2. Comments for and on behalf of the Executive Director for Corporate Resources
- 14.3. Katharine Nidd, Acting Director of Finance, [katharine.nidd@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:katharine.nidd@lewisham.gov.uk)
- 14.4. Comments for and on behalf of the Director of Law and Corporate Governance
- 14.5. Melanie Dawson, [melanie.dawson@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:melanie.dawson@lewisham.gov.uk)

## **15. Appendices**

- 15.1. Appendix 1 – Budget Reduction Proposals for Member decision making
- 15.2. Appendix 2 – Budget Reduction Proposals for Officer decision making

**Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Page 27

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

	Communities, Partnership and Leisure			
<b>Director</b>	James Lee			
<b>Service area</b>	Bereavement Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Communities, Refugees - Cllr Campbell			
<b>Reference</b>	COM 11a Bereavement services			
<b>Saving title</b>	In-year overspend savings proposal			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Implementation of 2023-24 fees and charges in line with other Coronial Consortium Burial and Cremation Authorities has achieved an overachievement on income, this overachievement will be offset to achieve an underspend of 100k in year 2023/24 to support a balanced budget and a permanent underspend for 2024/25.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	29,249	<b>Net £k</b>	14,144
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	2,521	<b>Net £k</b>	-288
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	The use of overachieved income through fees and charges may result in the service not being able to spend on improvements or new equipment or offset against any unexpected expenditure, however this can be managed via the revenue budgets or through business case, on a case by case basis, where required.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	An unexpected drop in Lewisham deaths.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Member			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>N</b>	None		
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>N</b>	None required		
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>N</b>	None	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	None			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None			

### Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

No impact, however, increasing fees and charges must be managed carefully to prevent Socio-economic inequality, cost variety must be considered to ensure funeral services are affordable for all. Increasing fees and charges must be in line with finance recommendations to achieve full cost recovery incl overheads and not to generate profit and recover overspend. These savings proposals are based on surplus income achieved through an increase in Lewisham deaths.				
<b>Staff</b>				
Positive impact, offering surplus income to support balance budget means that staffing levels can be maintained and no change to working conditions, however these are regularly reviewed to ensure the service remains cost effective and sustainable				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No impact				
<b>Partners</b>				
No impact				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality			X	
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No	

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

### Children & Young People

<b>Directorate</b>	CYPS - FQC				
<b>Director</b>	Sara Rahman (Pinaki Ghoshal – Executive Director)				
<b>Service area</b>	FQC				
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Children & Young People- Cllr Barnham				
<b>Reference</b>	CYP11 - FQC Reduction in Business Support CYP12 – FQC Grant Maximisation CYP13 – FQC Sale of Capital Asset CYP14 – FQC Children’s Centre Revenue CYP15 – FQC Staffing Costs Reduction				
<b>Cut title</b>	<p>1. <u>Reduction in Business Support to FQC.</u> Following changes in responsibilities across both Children’s Social Care and Families Quality &amp; Commissioning changes in business support. In addition grant funding will be used for some of the administrative support where appropriate</p> <p>2. <u>Grant maximisation (inc Children’s Centres).</u> Increasingly Families Quality &amp; Commissioning have been in receipt of a range of different grants, including the Family Hub grants and Enhance grants from the DfE. Other smaller grants from the VRU have also been gained. Some substitution of spend is possible here. In addition there is a review of spend within both the overlapping Children’s Centre and Family Hubs programmes</p> <p>3. <u>Sale of a capital asset (one off).</u> The directorate has continued responsibility for a building in Honour Oak (Honour Oak Depot), which historically was used to support Children’s Centre delivery. It has not been doing this for some years and is currently used for accommodating a small service which could be delivered elsewhere. The building is within the Honour Oak estate (and Opposite the Honour Oak Youth Centre which is about to become a Family Hub. It is valued at £850k. Given its location it would be suitable to be redeveloped for social housing (HRA funding) or temporary accommodation</p> <p>4. <u>Children’s Centre Revenue saving.</u> With the changes to service delivery there is expected to be a permanent saving of running costs for a current Children’s Centre</p> <p>5. <u>Reduction in staffing costs (one off).</u> The division has already been managing with a number of vacant posts following previous restructures. It is projected that this will deliver an additional saving of £350k over and above previous projections. Once off</p>				
<b>Description of cut</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<b>Saving</b>	<b>2023/24</b>	<b>2024/25</b>	<b>2025/26</b>	<b>Total</b>
	FQC 1	0	100	0	<b>£100</b>
	FQC 2	150	0	0	<b>£150</b>
	FQC 3*	0	850	0	<b>£850</b>
	FQC 4	0	50	0	<b>£50</b>
	FQC 5*	350	0	0	<b>£350</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>£1500</b>
	<b>*Denotes one off savings</b>				



## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Division budget	Gross £k	15,141	Net £k	8,328
Service area budget	Gross £k	15,141	Net £k	8,328
Savings proposed	2023/24 £k	£500k	2024/25 £k 2025/26 £k	£1m £0
<b>Risks:</b>				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	70%			
Impact of making the cut	<p>FQC 1: Potential impact on business support capacity – low risk</p> <p>FQC 3 : This assumes the sale of a capital asset as a one off cost saving to the General Fund</p> <p>FQC 2 &amp; 4 : Some political sensitivities given the reduction in Children Centre delivery – however, off set by increase in Family Hub delivery</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	See above			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
Member or Officer decision	Most are Officer BUT Member decision re Children's Centre and Asset sale			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	N
In what:				
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations				

## Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative.

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Savings proposal 1 (FQC1): Positive Impact– Changes in business support responsibilities across Children’s Social Care and Families, Quality and Commissioning are ongoing, which will ensure a consistent level of business support across the division. Saving efficiencies within FQC due to changes to ways of working will not impact service users negatively.

Savings proposal 2 (FQC 2): Neutral Impact – FQC are in receipt of a range of grants. Service users will experience no change in service delivery resulting in the maximisation of grant fundings and the reduced need for General Fund.

Savings proposal 3 (FQC 3): Neutral Impact – Discussions are at an early stage regarding plans for the disposal/sale of the site. Whilst no decision has been made yet, plans to relocate the small service, currently based on site, will ensure delivery from another location and therefore will have no negative impact on service users.

Savings proposal 4 (FQC 4): Positive Impact – plans to redesign service delivery from Children and Family Centres are currently underway. These changes will create a seamless and consistent offer of support that will further prevent inequality of access to service provision. The overall impact for service users will be positive with anticipated increase in access and more targeted provision to ensure we reach and engage more families from communities not currently accessing existing provision.

Savings proposal 5 (FQC 5): Neutral Impact – The division will continue to maintain existing vacancies. Service users will not be directly impacted as there will be no changes to service delivery.

### **Staff**

Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative.

Savings proposal 1 . (FQC1): Positive Impact – Changes in business support responsibilities across Children’s Social Care and Families, Quality and Commissioning are ongoing, which will ensure a consistent level of business support across the division, create efficiencies and identify gaps and/or duplication in ways of working. Efficiencies within FQC business support function due to changes to ways of working will not impact staff negatively and there are no redundancies expected.

Savings proposal 2 (FQC 2): Neutral Impact – FQC are in receipt of a range of grants. Staff will experience no change in service delivery or ways of working resulting in the maximisation of grant fundings and the reduced need for General Fund.

Savings proposal 3 (FQC 3): Neutral Impact – Discussions are at an early stage regarding plans for the disposal/sale of the site. Whilst no decision has been made yet, plans to relocate the small service, currently based on site, will ensure delivery from another location and therefore will have no negative impact on staff.

Savings proposal 4 (FQC 4): Neutral Impact – plans to redesign service delivery from Children and Family Centres are currently underway. These changes will create a seamless and consistent offer of support that will further prevent inequality of access to service provision. The redesign will have no direct impact on council staff.

Savings proposal 5 (FQC 5): Neutral Impact – The division will continue to maintain existing vacancies. Service users will not be directly impacted as there will be no changes to service delivery.

**Appendix 1 - Member decisions**

<b>Other Council Services</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Disability</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Ethnicity</b>		X For some CYP in care being able to remain in their community, not placed elsewhere in the country that have less cultural/racial diversity.		
<b>Gender</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			Y (See notes above)	

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

### Place

<b>Directorate</b>	Place
<b>Director</b>	Patrick Dubeck
<b>Service area</b>	Inclusive Regeneration
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Cllr Brenda Dacres
<b>Reference</b>	PLA04 – Garage Portfolio Rental Charges Review
<b>Saving title</b>	Garage Portfolio Rental Charges Review
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>There are approximately 134 Council garage sites in the borough, comprising 182 garage blocks. There are approximately 2,379 individual garages. Approximately 1,801 of the garages are let to Council housing tenants and 578 are let to non-Council social housing tenants. The current waiting list for garages is over in excess of 2000 applicants. The portfolio currently has a high void rate mainly due to the condition of some of the stock.</p> <p>Taken together, the garage portfolio is projected to generate income to the general fund of approximately £1.4M in 2023/24.</p> <p>The current charging regime for garages is such that, a housing tenant with LB Lewisham pays a basic rate for a garage (subject to any specific discounts agreed) and a non-housing tenant pays the basic price with the addition of 20% VAT. Blue Badge holders receive a 50% deduction on the weekly rent although this is entirely discretionary.</p> <p>Garages are not a core social dwelling provision and therefore can be charged at a higher level. The Council's current approach to garage rent setting has been to increase rents annually based on inflation using the retail price index (RPI). In 2023/24, rents were increased by 10% (a rate, lower than the rate of inflation at the time).</p> <p>Even with this increase, the current highest rent charged this year (2023/24) is £27.39 per week (approximately £110 p/m) and the lowest is £4.67 per week (less than £20 p/m). However, some garages are charged at less than the lowest rate per week. These are discounted rates (50% of the full charge) for tenants with blue badges.</p> <p>As a comparator, garage rent levels in neighbouring boroughs are for the 2020/21 financial year were charged at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Southwark</u> - £22.40 p/w (Council tenants / leaseholders / resident freeholders who qualify). £17.40 p/w for 70+ year olds / those with mobility allowance. £39.20 p/w (private flat rate);</li> <li>• <u>Islington</u> - Charges are based on emissions. £10.65 p/w for A rated up to £23.43 p/w for D rated for Council</li> </ul>

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

	<p>tenants. Charges are based on emissions for non-Council tenants. £23.94 p/w for A rated up to £52.56 p/w for D rated for everyone else.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Camden</u> - Depends on the postcode address £25p/w - £50 p/w.</li> </ul> <p>It is clear from the above that garage rents in Lewisham is far less than other neighbouring or inner London boroughs.</p> <p>Historically, garage rents have been increased by RPI. Last year, it was agreed that the rents for 2023/24 be increased at 10% which was lower than the RPI of 14% at the time the proposal was agreed. This year, it proposed to revert to the historical method of using RPI which is currently 8.9% for the 2024/25 financial year. An increase of 8.9% would mean an average rise of £1.63 per week on the cost of renting a garage from the Council and will generate an estimated gross income of approximately £190k (£150k with Blue Badge and other discounts) This means with the Blue Badge Discount applied and noting already agreed income target from last year, the net increase for 2024/25 financial year will be £90k.</p> <p>It is also proposing a comprehensive review of the garage portfolio over the coming year. The review will provide a greater understanding of the condition of the garages and an assessment of whether there is a need for investment which will ensure the Council derives the maximum it can from their use. It will also help ensure voids are kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Further, the review will allow for an assessment of whether the Council could consider location-based charging for garages which will reflect general housing rental levels across the borough. There will also be some consideration given to reviewing their use in some location to determine whether other more beneficial uses can be generated from them.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	£0	2024/25 £k	£90
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N		If 'yes' identify the service impacted.		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		90%		
Impact of making the saving	There is no direct impact on Council services and staff.			
Possible risk mitigation	<b>Proposed rent increase not approved:</b> The Council's approach over at least the past 5-years (except last year), has been to increase rent in line with RPI. Last year the Council departed from that approach by increasing garage rent			

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

	by 10% (which was below RPI). This proposal is seeking a reversion to the RPI model.			
	<b>Estimated Income not being achieved:</b> The profiled income has been set out to reflect the fact that there is already £70k increase previously agreed for 2024/25 so the net added for 2024/5 is £90k. Also, the proposed review and investment in the portfolio will help reduce voids thereby increasing lets and income and adopting a location-based rent setting beyond the norm for future years will help increase income overall.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Member			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	N/A
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	Y	<b>Audience(s)</b>	N/A
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	N/A
	<b>In what:</b>	N/A		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None. However, it is expected that there will be a call on internal legal resources to negotiate the lettings.			

## Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact

[policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
The proposed increase of garage rents by 8.9% in 2024/25 is likely to have a negative impact on the elderly, disabled and low-income households. Overall, the proposed increase will add an average of £1.63 per week on the cost of renting a garage unit from the Council. To mitigate the impact on the elderly and disabled, the Council offers that group a £50% discount on their garage rent.
<b>Staff</b>
N/A

**Appendix 1 - Member decisions**

<b>Other Council Services</b>				
N/A				
<b>Partners</b>				
N/A				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>			Low Negative	
<b>Disability</b>			Low Negative	
<b>Ethnicity</b>				Neutral
<b>Gender</b>				Neutral
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				Neutral
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				Neutral
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				Neutral
<b>Religion and belief</b>				Neutral
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				Neutral
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>			Low Negative	
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Place			
<b>Director</b>	Zahur Khan			
<b>Service area</b>	Commercial Operations and Development			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Environment and Climate Action- Cllr Krupski			
<b>Reference</b>	PLA03 – Fly-Tipping Fees and Charges			
<b>Saving title</b>	Fees and Charges (Increased penalties for fly tipping and littering)			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>In July 2023, the Environmental Offences (Fixed Penalties) Amendment 2023 increased the upper and lower limits for fixed penalty notices issued for fly tipping and littering offences. Lower limit for littering increased from £90 to £150, upper limit from £150 to £500. Lower limit for fly tipping increased from £250 to £400, upper limit from £400 to £1000.</p> <p>It is proposed to for the council to adopt these higher limits to support policies to reduce flytipping across the borough.</p> <p>The increases reflect the seriousness of the impact of environmental crime on local people and neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The decision to increase the fixed penalty must be taken before the increased amounts can be used.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	N			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	60%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Tackling the root cause of littering/fly tipping by issuing penalties that reflect the seriousness of the crime, thus encouraging less littering/fly tipping.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>Increased non-payment of fixed penalty notices during the cost-of-living crisis could be mitigated by offering a payment plan.</p> <p>The council can prosecute for the original offence if a FPN is not accepted or not paid.</p> <p>A positive communication campaign will be developed/delivered with key messages encouraging responsible waste management and warning of the penalties for environmental crime.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Member			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	0
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>	0		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Mayor and Cabinet decision to set increased limits			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	<p>The Environmental Offences (Fixed Penalties) Amendment 2023 increased the upper &amp; lower limits for fixed penalty notices for fly tipping and littering.</p> <p>Environmental Protection Act 1990 S33 Fly tipping</p> <p>Environmental Protection Act 1990 S87 littering</p>			



## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Equalities Screening for Increased penalties for fly tipping and litter fixed penalty notices

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
<p>Satisfactory progress has been made in promoting Cleaner Lewisham and the council has invested money and resources to tackle the anti-social/illegal behaviour of those engaged with fly tipping and littering.</p> <p>The enviro-crime enforcement team take a balanced, consistent, proportionate, and fair approach when dealing with those caught littering/fly tipping.</p> <p>The increased fines for littering and fly tipping reflect the seriousness of the impact of environmental crime on local people and neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Income achieved from fixed penalty notices must go back into the service/ used for initiatives to tackle fly tipping.</p> <p>Fly tipping/littering is not acceptable behaviour and there is unlikely to be support for people who receive FPN for offences of this type.</p> <p>There may be an Increase in the non-payment of fixed penalty notices during the cost-of-living crisis, this can be mitigated by the council prosecuting for the original offence if an FPN is not accepted or not paid.</p> <p>A positive communication campaign will be developed/delivered with key messages encouraging responsible waste management and warning of the penalties for environmental crime.</p>				
<b>Staff</b>				
<p>The service will enable targeted enforcement action to areas of concern, resulting in cleaner streets and positive action against those engaged in littering/fly tipping.</p> <p>The officers are trained and act in accordance with environmental protection guidance and council policy.</p> <p>The enviro-crime enforcement team already issue fixed penalty notices for littering and fly tipping and other environmental offences.</p> <p>The officers will receive refresher training on how to engage with people and de-escalate conflict when issuing the increased amount fixed penalty notices.</p>				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None				
<b>Partners</b>				
None				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? <u>Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</u></b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X

**Appendix 1 - Member decisions**

<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No. Officers already deliver fixed penalty notices for littering and fly tipping in accordance with guidance and council policy.	

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Place			
<b>Director</b>	Zahur Khan			
<b>Service area</b>	Street Environment Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Environment and Climate Action- Cllr Krupsk			
<b>Reference</b>	PLA07 – Seasonal Street Cleansing			
<b>Saving title</b>	Seasonal street cleansing regime			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>To introduce a seasonal based street cleansing regime on residential streets across the borough to reduce the cost during the winter months when demand is lower. During the winter months after the leaf fall season (Dec-Mar) there is less pedestrian footfall and reduced amounts of litter to be swept up and collected from residential roads. Instead of relying on a scheduled all-year round cleansing regime of sweeping residential roads, the service will monitor streets and direct cleansing staff to areas on a needs basis to ensure a clean street environment.</p> <p>This pro-active approach will reduce the number of agency staff needed daily during the winter period.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	N			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	90%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>Less visible presence of street cleaning operatives in residential areas with a reduced amount of street cleaning activity during the winter period. Winter months and reduced daylight hours means less pedestrian footfall, and subsequent amounts of litter. Streets would be litter picked instead of swept. Litter bin emptying and primary/secondary retail areas would not be affected by the changes.</p> <p>No direct HR implications for LBL employees as staff affected would be agency only.</p> <p>If change is agreed and effective then this would be a future saving as winter rota could reflect changed methodology to cleansing.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>The service will direct staff to areas of cleansing need. Litter picking is an effective alternative to sweeping during adverse weather conditions. Complaints and ad-hoc spillages would be given priority attention.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Member			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	N/A			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Environmental Protection Act 1990 – local authorities must keep public areas clean. Litter picking is an effective alternative to pavement sweeping during adverse weather conditions.			

Equalities Screening for Seasonal Street Cleansing Regime

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
<p>During the winter months after the leaf fall season (Dec-Mar) there is less pedestrian footfall and consequently reduced amounts of litter to be swept up and collected from residential roads. Changes will result in a more efficient value for money service and directed services to deal with areas on a need to clean basis only.</p> <p>Less visible presence of street cleansing staff on residential roads.</p> <p>Litter picking of road may take longer than residents expected timeframe – residents are aware of when the roads are swept currently and may notice the change in frequency.</p>				
<b>Staff</b>				
<p>Instead of relying on a scheduled all-year round cleansing regime of residential roads, the area street cleansing managers will constantly monitor their streets and direct cleansing staff to areas on a needs basis to ensure a clean street environment.</p> <p>No impact to staff - staff will receive more direction and specific task allocation from supervisors.</p> <p>Anticipated reduction in staffing to be offset in less agency expenditure.</p> <p>Reduction in agency staff during winter season.</p>				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None				
<b>Partners</b>				
None				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No. The service will monitor streets and direct cleansing staff to areas on a needs basis to ensure a clean street environment.	

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Place			
<b>Director</b>	Zahur Khan			
<b>Service area</b>	Commercial Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Cllr Krupski			
<b>Reference</b>	PLA05 – Garden Waste Additional Income			
<b>Saving title</b>	Garden Waste			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	The service has undergone a recent restructure and has implemented new processes and procedures. The impact has not only improved customer service but generated additional sales which has resulted in improved income.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	95%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>Low impact as this is a service already provided to residents and is a paid for service. There may be resistance from some residents who have been used to receiving a free service prior to the recent restructure which put in place more robust record keeping and administration procedures to chase customers for payment for services rendered.</p> <p>The service is confident of making the saving as it has received the requests for service from residents and forecast income.</p> <p>Going forward into 24/25 there are risks associated with this saving if the customer growth cannot be maintained.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>There are risks if residents cancel their contract resulting in the council refunding the difference, though this is considered a low risk.</p> <p>Residents may not take up this service next year so there is a risk on achieving additional income on an ongoing basis.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>				
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>	No additional investment required as new procedures and resources already in place.		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	The service relies on street environmental service emptying the bins.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>				

Equalities Screening for Garden Waste Service

## Appendix 1 - Member decisions

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
<p>Garden waste service – this is an annual subscription for the collection of residents garden waste. The service is charged at £93.50 per annum. Approximately 12,000 households subscribed in financial year 2023/24. This service is available but not mandatory, with alternative and appropriate disposal routes available to residents.</p> <p>The proposal for fees and charges going forward is not to implement a price increase, but to focus on increased subscriptions to deliver increased revenue or savings for the council. As such there are no further equalities impacts.</p>				
<b>Staff</b>				
No proposed changes				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No proposed changes				
<b>Partners</b>				
No proposed changes				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X

**Appendix 1 - Member decisions**

<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>	No additional assessment as services is proposed as same as last year
--------------------------------	---



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive			
<b>Director</b>	Helen Clarke			
<b>Service area</b>	Communications			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
<b>Reference</b>	CEX1 - Lewisham Life Magazine			
<b>Saving title</b>				
	Lewisham Life			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Reduce frequency of Lewisham Life magazine from four times a year to two times a year.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	1,919	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	1,219	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	35	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	69
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>Lewisham Life is produced inhouse by the Council's Communications team and printed and distributed to 150,000 homes across the borough. A 2022 survey revealed it to be the most read and trusted publication in the borough. It is published four times a year, in line with Local Government Publicity Guidance.</p> <p>Rising costs in printing and labour mean the cost of printing and distribution are steadily increasing year-on-year, while advertising revenue for an infrequent, printed publication has decreased. Over time this trend is likely to continue.</p> <p>Lewisham Life is a source of Council news and information for many residents – particularly those who do not have access to digital channels, or chose not to engage with the Council via social media/digital communications.</p> <p>The local news market has reduced drastically over the last decade, with limited resources and no local newspaper delivered across the borough.</p> <p>As such, any reduction will increase the gap in the market for local news and information (including some of our statutory roles such as warning and informing and information about consultations/engagement). This could also lead to services needing to produce service-specific physical comms.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>A strategic content plan will allow to get the most out of our two issues a year and align with the Council's priorities. We will seek advertising and support from partners to either increase the size of the publication and/or resume quarterly publication.</p> <p>We are currently developing proposals to increase the reach of news and information from the Council and LSP members, both via digital and physical channels.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer but members to be briefed.			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Other services may need to fund alternatives to inform residents about services/changes/consultations etc.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	N/A			

## Equalities Screening Template

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
<p>Lewisham Life is produced inhouse by the Council's Communications team and printed and distributed to 150,000 homes across the borough. A 2022 survey revealed it to be the most read and trusted publication in the borough. It is published four times a year, in line with the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity.</p> <p>Rising costs in printing and labour mean the cost of printing and distribution are steadily increasing year-on-year, while advertising revenue for an infrequent printed publication has decreased. Over time this trend is likely to continue.</p> <p>Lewisham Life is a source of Council news and information for many residents – particularly those who do not have access to digital channels, or chose not to engage with the Council via social media/digital communications.</p> <p>The local news market has reduced drastically over the last decade, with limited resources and no local newspaper delivered across the borough.</p> <p>As such, any reduction will increase the gap in the market for local news and information (including some of our statutory roles such as warning and informing and information about consultations/engagement). This could also lead to services needing to produce service-specific physical comms.</p> <p>We will try to gain sponsorship to enable us to resume quarterly publication in the near future, but in the meantime we will take steps to mitigate the potential impact of the change in service. A strategic content plan will allow to get the most out of our two issues a year and align with the Council's priorities.</p>

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<p>We are currently developing proposals to increase the reach of news and information from the Council and LSP members, both via digital and physical channels.</p> <p>It is worth noting that over 95% of Lewisham residents have access to the Internet, so we will also work to increase subscribers to our weekly e-newsletter.</p>				
<b>Staff</b>				
<p>No impact – Lewisham Life is produced inhouse by the Council's Communications Team. Staff capacity created by this change will be reallocated to other communications activity.</p>				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
<p>Other services may need to fund alternative communications to inform residents about services/changes/consultations etc.</p>				
<b>Partners</b>				
<p>Partners frequently use Lewisham Life to promote events or campaigns. We will liaise with them to ensure we can find alternative ways to support their work, and engage them in trying to find sponsorship to enable us to increase the frequency of publication back up to four times a year.</p>				
<p><b>Are there any specific equalities implications?</b> <u>Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</u></p>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
<b>Age</b>		Research shows that while over 95% of Lewisham residents have internet access, however those who do not tend to be older - this may limit their access to alternative sources of news and information.		
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>		Research shows that residents in lower social and economic grades (C2DE) and/or social housing are <u>slightly less likely to have access</u> to the internet – this may limit their access to alternative sources of news and information.		
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive			
<b>Director</b>	Helen Clarke			
<b>Service area</b>	Communications and Engagement (Executive Support)			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
<b>Reference</b>	CEX2 - Executive Support Team Post Removals			
<b>Saving title</b>	Executive Support Structure			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The Executive Support Team will be reduced by two posts, achieved by not filling two vacancies which are currently held within the service.</p> <p>This will be a permanent saving, with the changes made to the base salary budget of the team.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	1,919	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	700	<b>Net £k</b>	£0
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	35 (plus potential underspend of further £50k)	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	97
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	90%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	The saving will reduce the level of administrative support which is provided to Directors within the Council, it will also increase the workload of the Executive Support service.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>A more fluid provision of administrative support, with staff covering across multiple Directorates instead of providing support to one.</p> <p>An acknowledgement of the different levels of administrative support required by different Directors across the Council. This will allow the service to reduce support in areas where capacity is not being fully utilised, and increase the provision of support to areas where the service is being reduced, but the demand is still high.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	-
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	-
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N-	<b>Cost £k</b>	-
	<b>In what:</b>	-		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	No			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Specific legal or statutory considerations	None
--	------

### Equalities Screening Template

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
<p>This change relates to a reduction of two vacant posts which are currently held within the Council's Executive Support Team.</p> <p>This change will have a minimal impact on service users. The team that is affected does not provide a service that regularly interacts with Lewisham residents, and therefore changes to it likely will not be felt by residents.</p> <p>The team does provide a small casework function, but this is carried out primarily by the team's managers, and the proposed change will impact the capacity of officers. It is therefore felt that there will be no impact on service users from implementation.</p>
<b>Staff</b>
<p>This change will impact staff within the Executive Support Team, as well as the Council's Directors. The Executive Support team primarily provides an administrative function to the Council's senior officers, and therefore a reduction in its capacity will reduce the work that they are able to complete. It is possible that some of the burden that has previously been carried by this team will now need to be covered from within services, rather than being provided corporately by the Council.</p> <p>Additionally, Officers within the Executive Support Team will now need to provide administrative support to an increased number of directors relative to their size as a team. This will increase the workload of both officers and managers within the team. Although it is felt that the team do have capacity to absorb an increased workload, this change will be closely monitored to ensure that it does not have a significant negative impact on workload.</p>
<b>Other Council Services</b>
<p>This change will have a minimal impact on the other Council services. As has been referenced above, it is possible that a reduced corporate administrative function will mean that some services find an increased administrative workload is placed on them. However, it is felt that this will not be significant and more efficient ways of working, including utilising technology designed to support administrative work, will help to minimise this impact.</p>
<b>Partners</b>
<p>This change will not impact the Council's partners.</p>

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
This proposed change focuses only of roles which have been held vacant for an extended period of time. As no significant impact has been felt for the duration that the roles have already been vacant, it is assumed that formalising the change will not have a significant impact on the Council or on service users.				
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive's			
Director	Sherene Russell-Alexander			
Service area	People and Organisation Development			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	CEX10 – People & Org Development Vacant Posts			
<b>Saving title</b>				
People and Organisation Development Savings Proposal				
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	All savings proposed are ongoing and achieved by holding vacant positions.			
	<b>General Fund</b> For Financial Year 2023/24 People and OD is projected to be underspent by £200,000 which represents a <b>7% saving on the Net Budget</b> . This is achieved mostly by holding vacancies while making some small savings in other areas.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	£2,925 (General Fund)	<b>Net £k</b>	£2,719 (General Fund)
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	N/A	<b>Net £k</b>	N/A
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	£200k (General Fund 7%)	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	Target Savings: 6% of General Fund = £169k
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>		No		
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>		100%		
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Higher workload for the team. Service activities to be prioritised carefully to ensure we have capacity to match delivery. As it stands there is a continually demand, with little regard for actual ability to deliver.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Careful consideration of what is added (negotiated to be removed) to the workplan - clear mapping of capacity and resources			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	Y	<b>Number of staff</b>	Potential 2 (2024/25)
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	No			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Compliance with employment legislation for redundancy and consultation with trade unions.			



## Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
No impact on service users for both 2023/24 and 2024/25				
<b>Staff</b>				
No impact on staff for 2023/24 as savings achieved by holding vacancies open.				
For 2024/25 a small restructure within People and OD is envisaged to achieve savings target. However, the details are yet to be determined. Once we are clear on the exact nature of the changes and the impact on individual posts and people, a full EAA for that people change will be undertaken.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No impact envisaged for both 2023/24 and 2024/25				
<b>Partners</b>				
No impact envisaged for both 2023/24 and 2024/25				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Disability</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Gender</b>				<b>X</b>

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Gender reassignment</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Religion and belief</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>	No. Not required at this stage as referenced above. Once the details of the changes are known, we will undertake a further screening exercise			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	Chief Executive's			
	Jeremy Chambers			
	Electoral Services			
	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
	CEX03 – Electoral Services Election Equipment Expenditure			
	Election equipment expenditure move from Electoral Registration budget to Election budget			
	<p>One-off</p> <p>We received approval from EMT earlier this year to purchase some vital new election equipment – 10 scanners for postal vote verification. The cost of the equipment, scanning software and licenses will come to around £8k. Currently this expenditure sits in our Electoral Registration budget (E44117), but it would be more appropriate to move it to the Election budget (E44118), which comes out of the corporate fund. Not an actual saving for the council, but it will represent a reduction and correction for the Electoral Registration budget.</p>			
	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
	<b>Gross £</b>	468	<b>Net £k</b>	460
	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>		Yes – to the Election budget. E44118		
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>		100%		
	<p>This will provide a correct position for the Electoral Registration budget. But it will simply pass on the cost to the Election budget, which pulls from the corporate fund (I am told).</p> <p>The election budget also covers any unscheduled polls, such as the Deptford by-election which is coming on 9 November.</p>			
	NA			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
	Officer			
	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	NA
	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	NA
	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	NA
	<b>In what:</b>			

# Equalities Analysis Assessment

## Electoral Services Savings Proposals

### 1. Election equipment expenditure move from Electoral Registration budget to Election budget.

#### Summary of the proposal

This is a one off saving. In effect it is simply a movement of expenditure from a regular service budget to the corporate fund.

Election equipment has been purchased from the electoral registration budget for approximately £8k. We are required to make 10% savings on this budget. The election budget works differently to the electoral services budget, with election expenses being unpredictable (especially for unscheduled polls). This proposals simply moves the cost for election equipment from the electoral services budget to the election budget. In addition, for each parliamentary or GLA election we are able to reclaim 10% of the cost of this equipment, which will be recorded within the election budget.

## Equalities Screening Template

Impact & Outcomes				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
There is no impact on service users.				
<b>Staff</b>				
There is no impact on staff.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
The 2 budgets for electoral services will be more accurate.				
<b>Partners</b>				
There is no impact on Council partners.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				x
<b>Religion and belief</b>				x
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				x
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive's			
<b>Director</b>	Jeremy Chambers			
<b>Service area</b>	Electoral Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	CEX04 – Electoral Services Annual Canvass			
<b>Saving title</b>	Annual Canvass – remove non-statutory freepost reply envelope and scanning service			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>From 2024-25 onwards</p> <p>The law requires us to send a canvass form with pre-paid response envelope to every 'route 2' property at least once. We have to send reminder forms to non-responding properties, but the requirement for a pre-paid reply envelope no longer applies. The first part of this proposal is to remove the pre-paid reply envelope from the reminder forms. Saving of £1k</p> <p>The second part of the proposal involves the scanning of the returned forms. Currently the forms are returned to a contractor who opens, scans and destroys the forms for us. This costs around £1k (including VAT). We propose scanning the forms ourselves instead. This work will be absorbed in normal officer work time. Saving of £1k</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	468	<b>Net £k</b>	466
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	N			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	80%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>The initial form must still carry a reply envelope. Most of the postal responses we receive come from that first form, so for most residents there will be no change to the service.</p> <p>There is an impact on the residents that receive the reminder forms. 90% of responses come from our online response service, which is cheaper than the postage cost, so this will likely mean more people using that method.</p> <p>There may be an impact on those who are unable to use the internet, and who do not receive, or lose/ignore the initial form with the reply envelope.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Those residents who are affected and unable to respond to the forms posted to them will receive a visit from a canvasser. This is a legal requirement and work we already carry out. So there is adequate mitigation already built in to the service, and already accounted for in our budget.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	NA
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	NA
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	NA
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				

Specific legal or statutory considerations	Statutory requirement for the resident to receive at least 1 canvass form with a reply envelope.
--	--

# Equalities Analysis Assessment

## Electoral Services Savings Proposals

### 2. Annual Canvass – remove non-statutory freepost reply envelope and scanning service

#### Summary of the proposal

From 2024-25 onwards

The law requires us to send a canvass form with pre-paid response envelope to every 'route 2' property at least once. We have to send reminder forms to non-responding properties, but the requirement for a pre-paid reply envelope no longer applies. The first part of this proposal is to remove the pre-paid reply envelope from the reminder forms.

Saving of £1k

The second part of the proposal involves the scanning of the returned forms. Currently the forms are returned to a contractor who opens, scans and destroys the forms for us. This costs around £1k (including VAT). We propose scanning the forms ourselves instead. This work will be absorbed in normal officer work time.

Saving of £1k

Impact & Outcomes
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
<p>The absence of a reply envelope for reminder forms could have a negative impact on a small number of people who prefer to respond by post, rather than the other methods (phone, online, by hand).</p> <p>Note that all properties will still receive a reply envelope with the initial canvass form delivered to them. In the last 2 years, 60% of forms received by post have been returned using the reply envelope in the initial form. However, of the 25,000 responses we receive each year, only 3,000 (12%) are returned by post. The vast majority are completed online.</p> <p>The online response service has improved and the number of online responses has increased every year. Lewisham now receives a higher percentage of online responses than any other London authority, and we believe we can raise that even higher by increasing awareness of the speed and ease of the digital route.</p> <p>The change to the scanning of the forms will have zero impact on service users.</p>
<b>Staff</b>
<p>The removal of the envelope will have a minimal impact on staff. It's possible it may lead to a small increase in enquiries from residents who are not able to use the online or telephone response methods.</p>

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

The change to the scanning will have a bigger impact. Staff will have to increase the amount of time they spend scanning the forms.  
 However, we know that scanning the forms internally will improve the speed and quality of our service. We will be able to scan the forms each morning, rather than waiting for the contractor to scan and upload them each afternoon. This will help the staff with the planning of their day, and give us a greater ability to audit the effectiveness of our scanning (by checking batches to identify any missed items).

**Other Council Services**

The postroom will see a large increase in the number of items to process during the canvass period. However, it is not considered this will be beyond their capacity, as the number of items will not be as great as they were in 2019, and the staffing has remained the same.

**Partners**

Our print supplier will not need to print so many reply envelopes, nor insert envelopes for our additional runs. This will save time.  
 The reduction in envelope printing will help with our environmental policy.

**Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.**

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X	
Disability			X	
Ethnicity			X	X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality			X	
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			Yes (with Corporate Policy input)	

**1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template**

<b>Author</b>	Jamie Baker	<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Execs
---------------	-------------	--------------------	-------------



**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

Date	11/1/24	Service	Electoral Services	
<p><b>1. The activity or decision that this assessment is being undertaken for</b></p>				
<p><i>Annual Canvass – remove non-statutory freepost reply envelope and scanning service</i>                      From 2024-25 onwards                      The law requires us to send a canvass form with pre-paid response envelope to every 'route 2' property at least once. We have to send reminder forms to non-responding properties, but the requirement for a pre-paid reply envelope no longer applies. The first part of this proposal is to remove the pre-paid reply envelope from the reminder forms.                      Saving of £1k                      The second part of the proposal involves the scanning of the returned forms. Currently the forms are returned to a contractor who opens, scans and destroys the forms for us. This costs around £1k (including VAT). We propose scanning the forms ourselves instead. This work will be absorbed in normal officer work time.                      Saving of £1k</p>				
<p><b>2. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</b></p>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Household type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status	
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		

### **3. The evidence to support the analysis**

Annual canvass response statistics for the last 3 years

The statistics from previous canvasses show us the number of responses to the canvass from the initial form and reminder forms.

ONS data

This gives us information on the number and types of people living in Lewisham. We cannot match the 2 datasets to determine exactly which categories of people are more likely to use reply envelopes, but we can make reasonable assumptions on the likelihood of some people having a preference for responding by post.

### **4. The analysis**

The canvass response rate has increased every year. The number of responses by post, using the free reply envelope, has decreased every year, with the number of online responses increasing significantly.

The total response rate for canvass route 2 properties is 65%. 40% of properties respond to the initial canvass form. We send a further 2 reminders and send canvassers who make at least 2 visits to each non-responding household. The total response rate from the 2 reminder forms and the door-knocking accounts for the remaining 15% of the properties to respond.

This evidence tells us:

- The introduction of the online response service has improved the response rate, reduced cost, and improved accessibility
- The reply envelope results in a decent number of responses with the initial canvass form, but suffers from diminishing returns in the subsequent reminder forms
- There are many reasons why residents do not respond to the canvass, the presence of a reply form has not made an impact on reducing the number of non-responders
- Although we cannot match non-responding properties against ONS data, we can make reasonable assumptions on the categories of people less likely to respond to the canvass
- We can also make some reasonable assumptions on the categories of people who are more likely to prefer to respond by post, using a freepost reply envelope

Scanning

For the scanning element of the proposal, the evidence shows that there will be approximately 4,000 canvass forms to scan each year. This represents a total of around 15 hours work. This is spread across a 4 month period, and can be spread across 4 members of staff. Therefore, we consider the impact on staff to be minimal, with the extra work easily absorbed into current working schedules.

## **5. Impact summary**

### **Age**

Potential for positive and negative impacts

#### **Older people**

Older people have traditionally been less likely to use digital solutions for public services, such as responding to the annual canvass. The absence of a freepost reply envelope may impact this group negatively due to their preference to complete and return the physical form.

However, recent studies show that the 70+ age group are now far more digitally proficient and confident, and in some spending more time online than other age groups. We also know that this group are more likely to respond to the initial canvass form which will carry a reply envelope.

Finally, we also know that older people move home less often, so are more likely to fall under route 1 of the canvass and be automatically verified, with no requirement to respond.

#### **Younger people**

Younger people are less likely to register to vote, and less likely to respond to the annual canvass form. The presence of a reply envelope is not thought to be a significant factor in their ability or propensity to complete the form or register to vote. Instead, it is the language on the form and awareness of the requirement to register that represent bigger barriers, in addition to an increased likelihood to feel disengaged from politics and therefore disinclined to be involved.

### **Language Spoken**

Potential for negative impacts

People who have low levels of English, or cannot read English will struggle to complete and return the canvass form. The form itself is easier to understand and complete for someone in this category compared to the online form. The presence of existing names with nationality and layout of the form make it more obvious what the resident needs to do. Because of this, the reply form is more useful for this group as they are more likely to want to respond by post.

### **Disability**

Both positive and negative impacts

This group is quite varied and the ability to respond with a freepost envelope will affect disabled people differently.

Many disabled people with mobility impairments will prefer to respond online as there is no requirement for them to travel to a postbox.

Some disabled people will struggle to complete the form themselves – paper or online versions – and will require someone to help them, such as a carer. Carers will usually prefer to complete the paper form and return it via post, rather than the online system which would require them to log on to the website with their personal device at their clients home.

### **Household type**

Negative impact

People living in flat shares and HMOs are less likely to want to complete the canvass form for the entire property. That is because they often don't know their housemates well, and are not willing to take responsibility for the household. In

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

these cases the paper form is often the best way for them to respond – each member of the household adding their own details, with the final person returning the form. However, the response rate from these properties has been low for a number of years, and we are trying other methods to contact these households to gather the list of residents.

### **Socio-Economic status**

Potential for negative impact

The poorest residents in Lewisham may not have access to online services at home, and therefore are more likely to require the freepost reply envelope.

Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:

- **To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities.**

Minor impact. The absence of a reply envelope from reminder forms will slightly reduce the likelihood of some residents to complete and return the form

- **To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality.**

No impact.

- **To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases.**

No impact.

- **To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population.**

Positive impact. The absence of the reply envelope with the reminder forms will encourage more people to return their form online. More online responses will improve the efficiency of the service and reduce the cost for residents

- **To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens**

Positive impact

Completing their registration online will give them access to more information that can encourage electoral participation.

### **6. Mitigation**

Our mitigations already exist and can be built upon further.

- The initial canvass form will still have a freepost reply envelope
- Residents are able to call us directly and complete the form over the phone
- Forms can also be returned by an additional recorded message phoneline, online, via email, and via text message
- Forms are sent to 75% of registered voters via email, with a significant response each year
- 40 canvassers visit all non-responding households to help them complete the form
- HMOs and student properties are dealt with separately, with data being requested, and often supplied, by a responsible person (HOM licence holder, landlord, university and wardens). This removes the requirement for some households to respond
- Improved data matching processes to identify where people are still resident (found on other council databases) removing their requirement to return the form

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

- Translation services information appearing on the forms enabling people who do not understand English to contact us and get help to complete the form
- Anybody that asks for a reply envelope, or a canvass form, will receive one in the post (forms we post out directly will always contain a reply envelope)

### **7. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts**

*Service users will be able to contact the council to complain or get more information about the canvass. The best point of contact will be electoral services – phone, email or visiting our office.*

*The main impact of this policy is to further encourage responses using the online response service, saving the council money which can be better spent on other important council services.*

**Signature of Director**

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive's			
<b>Director</b>	Jeremy Chambers			
<b>Service area</b>	Electoral Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	CEX05 – Electoral Services Voter ID Letters			
<b>Saving title</b>	Voter ID letters – send via email only, scrap the direct letters to households			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>One-off</p> <p>We have received a DLUHC grant to fund the new burdens introduced by the Elections Act. Part of the grant is for “elector engagement”, though they have not provided a breakdown, nor a requirement for us to provide any detailed accounts.</p> <p>Our current proposal is to spend £25k on letters to properties where there are no people registered to vote who we are able to contact via email – roughly 50k properties. Our revised proposal is to continue with the email communications only, with no letters going in the post.</p> <p>The grant will instead be used to cover other Elections Act new burdens costs, including the staffing cost for processing Voter ID applications, training polling staff, purchasing accessibility equipment, processing online postal vote applications and overseas voter applications etc.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	468	<b>Net £k</b>	441
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	N			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	90%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>Some residents will not receive any direct or indirect communication about Voter ID to their household until poll cards are sent for the election. This may mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some residents are unaware of the requirement to provide photo ID in polling stations</li> <li>• Voters turned away at polling stations due to not having ID</li> <li>• Reputational damage for Lewisham if we have an above average number of people turned away from polling stations due to a lack of suitable ID</li> </ul>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale comms campaign by the electoral commission, GLA, and political parties. Previous campaigns by these groups in the 2023 local elections have proven to be very effective</li> <li>• Large scale Lewisham comms campaign. We already propose to spend £5k on posters at key locations, and on various ads, plus a lot of social media activity. There is a lot of best practise we can follow to make this cost effective</li> <li>• 66% of voters have an email address and will receive multiple reminders about the requirement for ID</li> <li>• All electoral correspondence already includes notices about Voter ID</li> <li>• Poll cards will be in envelopes with info about Voter ID in large font on the front and back, and with more information on the poll card itself, with a full list of the ID, plus a leaflet with even more information. This type of communication is thought to be most effective as it will be a timely call to action, rather than an advanced warning of something for people to think about (which they tend to mostly ignore or forget)</li> </ul>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	NA
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	NA
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	NA
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	The only legal requirement to notify voters about Voter ID is via the poll card. Everything else is not statutory.			

# Equalities Analysis Assessment

## Electoral Services Savings Proposals

### 3. Voter ID letters – send via email only, scrap the direct letters to households

#### Summary of the proposal

One-off

We have received a DLUHC grant to fund the new burdens introduced by the Elections Act. Part of the grant is for “elector engagement”, though they have not provided a breakdown, nor a requirement for us to provide any detailed accounts. Our current proposal is to spend £25k on letters to properties where there are no people registered to vote who we are able to contact via email – roughly 50k properties. Our revised proposal is to continue with the email communications only, with no letters going in the post.

The grant will instead be used to cover other Elections Act new burdens costs, including the staffing cost for processing Voter ID applications, training polling staff, purchasing accessibility equipment, processing online postal vote applications and overseas voter applications etc.

#### Impact & Outcomes

##### What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

##### Service Users

Residents will no longer receive a letter solely about voter ID.

But the rest of the changes in the Elections Act will continue, properly funded, on schedule, and to the highest quality. This includes processing of the new VAC, postal, proxy and overseas applications via the new portal, and improved accessibility equipment in polling stations.

It is believed this change of approach will have a minimal impact on Lewisham resident’s awareness of the requirement and ability to vote. This is because our other activities will have significant reach and will ensure that the majority of people

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

who wish to vote will be aware of the requirement in good time before the election, and there will be support to people who attend polling stations on polling day without the correct ID.				
<b>Staff</b>				
No impact				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No impact				
<b>Partners</b>				
No impact				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X	
Disability			X	
Ethnicity			X	X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment			X	
Marriage and civil partnerships			X	
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality			X	
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			Yes (with Corporate Policy input)	

## 1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

<b>Author</b>	<b>Jamie Baker</b>	<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Chief Execs</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>11/1/24</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Electoral Services</b>



**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<p><b>1. The activity or decision that this assessment is being undertaken for</b></p> <p><i>Voter ID letters – send via email only, scrap the direct letters to households</i></p> <p><i>We have received a DLUHC grant to fund the new burdens introduced by the Elections Act. Part of the grant is for “elector engagement”, though they have not provided a breakdown, nor a requirement for us to provide any detailed accounts. Our current proposal is to spend £25k on letters to properties where there are no people registered to vote who we are able to contact via email – roughly 50k properties. Our revised proposal is to continue with the email communications only, with no letters going in the post.</i></p> <p><i>The grant will instead be used to cover other Elections Act new burdens costs, including the staffing cost for processing Voter ID applications, training polling staff, purchasing accessibility equipment, processing online postal vote applications and overseas voter applications etc.</i></p>				
<p><b>2. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</b></p>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Household type	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		
<p><b>3. The evidence to support the analysis</b></p> <p>The government’s DPIA and survey which was conducted before tabling the Elections Act 2022 which introduced Voter ID. Subsequent research since the first elections with Voter ID which occurred in May 2023.</p>				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

The GLA report into voter ID in London which provides data on awareness of the requirement for ID, and the number of people who claim not to have an acceptable form of ID.

### ONS data

This gives us information on the number and types of people living in Lewisham.

GLA analysis has highlighted the following groups to be most impacted by the requirement to show ID in polling stations:

Young Londoners (18–25-year-olds)

Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic and migrant Londoners, including EU Londoners

Deaf and disabled Londoners

Older Londoners (60+ years)

LGBTQ+ Londoners, with a focus on trans and non-binary Londoners

Low-income Londoners

Social and private renting Londoners

Electoral Commission and the Electoral Reform Society completed a review of the May 2023 elections. They have found no evidence that direct letters to residents to raise awareness of ID had a significant impact. The number of voters who failed to present ID, and the turnout, did not vary significantly between authorities that sent out direct letters and those that didn't. Other communications activity had a greater potential impact, mostly posters, social media activity, and the electoral commission's own advertising campaign.

Other data sets, such as the government's own survey, has given an indication of the categories of people who are less likely to hold an acceptable form of ID, and those who are less likely to want to vote because of the requirement (regardless of whether they have an acceptable form of ID)

### 4. Impact summary

For the most part there is a small negative impact for the following groups. A direct letter could benefit these people as they are less likely to be aware of the requirement to show ID, and/or less likely to have an acceptable form of ID.

However, we are confident the mitigations listed in item 5 present a more effective way of communicating to these groups, and would present better value for money.

#### Age

18-25 year olds are less likely than average to be aware of the requirement to show ID. However, they are more likely than average to have an acceptable form of ID.

#### Language Spoken

People who do not speak English are less likely to be aware of the requirement for ID. They are less likely to be reached by the more indirect methods of communication via social media, and national media.

#### Gender Identity

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

People who have changed gender are less likely to have an acceptable form of ID with a photo that matches their current appearance. Various campaigns are being aimed at this group to improve awareness.

### **Disability**

Certain disabled groups are less likely to be aware of the requirement and less likely to have an acceptable form of ID. Deaf people in particular. Communication campaigns led by the GLA have been ongoing for some time to reach this group.

### **Household type**

Direct letters to residents in shared homes, hostels, student halls of residence and HMOs can be ineffective – with mail often not reaching the intended target. People living in private rented accommodation are less likely to be registered to vote.

### **Income**

Low income residents are less likely to be aware of the requirement to show ID. Those out of work and who do not travel abroad are less likely to have an acceptable form of ID

### **Marriage and Civil Partnership**

Many of these people, particularly women, will have ID with a name that does not match their name on the register. These people will need to amend the register, amend their ID, or provide alternative evidence when voting at the polling station. Information on the poll card and emails from electoral services provides more detail for what these people should do, as does the various communication campaigns.

### **Refugee/migrant/asylum seeker**

This group are amongst the least likely to register to vote, and least likely to have an acceptable form of ID. The GLA have led a campaign to target this group via various charities and community groups.

### **Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:**

- **To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities.**

Minor impact. Our other proactive measures to encourage Voter ID awareness should minimise the number of people who are unaware by polling day. But there will be a small group of people where a direct letter may be the best approach.

- **To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality.**

No impact.

- **To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases.**

No impact.

- **To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population.**

Positive impact. The ability to spend the grant elsewhere, and using other sources to encourage awareness, will provide value for money for our residents.

- **To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens**

No impact.

### **5. Mitigation**

Residents will receive communications and information about Voter ID through many sources. Research from the May 2023 elections has shown the following activities that Lewisham will be taking will have a strong and positive impact.

- New A4 poll card in a reply envelope, with the statutory wording about Voter ID displayed prominently on the front and reverse of the poll card
- Outer envelope which the poll card will be in will carry messaging about Voter ID on the front and back
- Note that most voters will receive at least 3 poll cards this year for the different elections. All poll cards will use the same template envelope, with repeated messages helping to improve recognition and awareness
- Poll cards are also sent by email to all polling station voters twice during each election. 75% of voters have an email address and will receive the email version of the poll card with prominent Voter ID information
- Poll cards via the post and the email versions are sent at least 1 month before polling day which gives these voters all the info they need in good time before the election, enabling them to take action if they do not have an acceptable form of ID
- Voter ID messaging on all standard letters sent to electors, and in responses to all emails
- Large scale poster campaign for each election. Evidence shows these are incredibly effective
- Direct communication to community groups via our engagement team
- Messages in the annual council tax statement, bulletins and Lewisham Life
- Social media campaign

In addition, communications about Voter ID will come from many external sources. Research has shown these can be very effective for certain target groups

- National and local media coverage
- Political party campaigning – leaflets, canvassing, media
- GLA's campaign. With a focus on direct activity at target groups
- Electoral Commission campaign – on TV, radio and social media

**The Voter Authority Certificate (VAC)**

This is an important part of the mitigation strategy. All voters are able to apply for a VAC. It is completely free. They can apply using a paper form, the online portal, or in person at the electoral services office. The deadline to apply is 6 days before polling day. This gives the ability and opportunity to obtain a valid form of photo ID completely free. Our communications will encourage awareness of the VAC so that anybody who wants/needs one will know how to do so and the deadline.

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<p>Polling day</p> <p>There will be posters outside and inside every polling station to remind people of the requirement to show ID. Any voter who doesn't have an acceptable form of ID will receive a leaflet providing all the relevant information and encouraged to return to the station with an acceptable form of ID before the close of poll (10pm). Voters will be encouraged to speak to the electoral services officer by phone, email or in person to request advice on what they can do.</p>	
<p><b>6. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts</b></p> <p><i>Service users will be able to contact the council to complain or get more information about Voter ID. The best point of contact will be electoral services – phone, email or visiting our office.</i></p> <p><i>The main impact of this policy is that some residents will not receive a direct communication about Voter ID until they receive the poll card around 1 month before polling day. The government's new burdens grant will be spent covering the additional costs of introducing Voter ID, along with the other changes within the Elections Act 2022.</i></p>	
<p><b>Signature of Director</b></p>	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive's			
<b>Director</b>	Jeremy Chambers			
<b>Service area</b>	Electoral Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>				
<b>Saving title</b>	Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.</p> <p>The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:  £10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)  £40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	468	<b>Net £k</b>	468
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	Not really. But it would create a dent in the budget for the CCR, but with a corresponding reduction in workload.			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	90%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electoral services already take <u>all</u> electoral calls during an election period</li> <li>• The CCR only take calls during months where there is no election</li> <li>• The impact will be on residents making electoral registration enquiries</li> <li>• For the vast majority of the time, the call volume will be easily manageable for the electoral services team of 4 officers</li> <li>• The impact on those 4 officers may mean less time to spend on other tasks</li> <li>• At certain times the residents may find it harder to reach us on the phone</li> <li>• But the speed, accuracy and quality of the response will be improved due to the expertise of the electoral officers compared to the CCR who are not electoral specialists</li> </ul>			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is likely that enquiries will be 'pushed' to online routes, which may not be accessible for all, though the phone lines will not be cut and will still be available for those who need them</li> <li>Potential for a negative impact on the CCR service, who will have a reduced income of £10k in 23-24 and £41k in 24-25 and thereafter</li> <li>This may mean the service needs to reduce their workforce, but could also allow for developments in other areas of the service due to freeing up officer time</li> </ul>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Push' residents to online routes for resolving their queries</li> <li>Remove the phone number from the largest mailouts, retaining it on forms only when there is a more likely requirement for the resident to contact us (eg. No phone number on addition or removal notices, but definitely keep the phone number on poll cards)</li> <li>Encourage email and postal responses</li> <li>Add forms to the website for the most common queries to enable self-service and a quick and convenient way for residents to reach us</li> <li>In the past, the electoral team is expanded at election time to manage our calls. We can begin this earlier if the call volumes necessitates and if the demands on officer time becomes too great</li> </ul>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	NA
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	NA
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	NA
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	A phone number is a requirement for many of the prescribed electoral registration and election forms. We do not propose removing the phone number from any of these forms. We will review the legislation and submit a proposal to EMT, with an EIA, before removing the phone number from any communications, or introducing any other 'push' methods.			

# Equalities Analysis Assessment

## Electoral Services Savings Proposals

## 4. Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house

### Summary of the proposal

#### One-off and Ongoing

Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.

However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.

The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.

This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:

£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)

£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>					
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>					
<b>Service Users</b>					
When contacting electoral services by phone, residents will now speak directly to the electoral services staff, rather than staff in the Customer Services Centre. There are 2 impacts, 1 positive and 1 negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive – service users will speak directly to expert electoral officers and will receive an excellent and improved response</li> <li>• Negative – on very rare occasions it is possible that service users will have to wait longer for their call to be answered</li> </ul>					
<b>Staff</b>					
Electoral Services staff will now have to answer telephone calls more often. This can disrupt the flow of their work, and can lead to an increase in work. On the other hand, speaking directly to residents on a regular basis will improve the team's knowledge of our service users, and our ability to respond to their needs.					
<b>Other Council Services</b>					
No impact					
<b>Partners</b>					
No impact					
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>					
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## 1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

<b>Author</b>	<b>Jamie Baker</b>	<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Chief Execs</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>11/1/24</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Electoral Services</b>
<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.</p> <p>The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:</p> <p>£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)</p> <p>£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>			
<p><b>1. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</b></p>			

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<input type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Household type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status	
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		

**2. The evidence to support the analysis**

We have data to show the number of calls received by the CSC for electoral services over the past 5 years. The data shows that the electoral services team should be able to handle the number of calls with a similar or higher response rate (i.e. with fewer calls going unanswered).

The CSC call handlers have in the past been trained by the electoral services team. The electoral services team have more knowledge, experience and qualifications concerning our service area, and will naturally be more able to respond to enquiries. With the addition of some customer response training, the electoral services team should be well prepared to answer calls from all kinds of residents.

Note that the electoral services telephone lines are transferred back to the electoral services team during election periods, which is when the highest volume of calls are received. The CSC does not answer electoral calls during this period. The reason for this was to improve the speed and quality of response to residents contacting the service at the most important period (election time!).

**3. Impact summary**

This change is not considered to cause a negative impact on any category of resident or service user. The movement of the phone lines back to the electoral services team will ensure that resident phone calls are answered by the staff with the most expertise, knowledge and electoral register access. Enquiries will be answered correctly and promptly, with appropriate follow-up questions asked to provide further benefit.

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

There is the potential for an impact on the electoral services staff, which will reduce over time as the staff develop procedures and undertake training to be better able to continue their regular work with the occasional interruption of a phone call.

Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:

- **To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities.**

No impact.

- **To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality.**

No impact.

- **To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases.**

No impact.

- **To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population.**

Positive impact. The improved knowledge and electoral register access for people answering the phones will improve the quality of the service the residents receive.

- **To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens**

No impact.

#### 4. Mitigation

Electoral Services staff will receive the following training:

- Call handling
- Difficult conversations
- Complaints
- Equality and diversity
- The operating system – especially in transferring calls to other services, and how to operate the language line service
- Prioritising work and juggling tasks

More staff will be added to the service at peak times, namely for elections and the canvass. And we can operate a rota system to improve our response times and ability to undertake other tasks (such as meeting residents in person who report to reception).

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

**5. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts**

*The service user journey will improve as they will speak directly with the electoral services staff rather than a customer engagement officer. The impact on electoral services itself could be challenging at times but we have sufficient mitigations and opportunities to lead to an improvement in the service.*

**Signature of  
Director**

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive's			
<b>Director</b>	Jeremy Chambers			
<b>Service area</b>	Electoral Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	CEX06 – Electoral Services Electoral Phones In-House			
<b>Saving title</b>	Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.</p> <p>The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:  £10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)  £40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	468411	<b>Net £k</b>	468411
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	Not really. But it would create a dent in the budget for the CCR, but with a corresponding reduction in workload.			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	90%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electoral services already take <u>all</u> electoral calls during an election period</li> <li>• The CCR only take calls during months where there is no election</li> <li>• The impact will be on residents making electoral registration enquiries</li> <li>• For the vast majority of the time, the call volume will be easily manageable for the electoral services team of 4 officers</li> <li>• The impact on those 4 officers may mean less time to spend on other tasks</li> <li>• At certain times the residents may find it harder to reach us on the phone</li> <li>• But the speed, accuracy and quality of the response will be improved due to the expertise of the electoral officers compared to the CCR who are not electoral specialists</li> <li>• It is likely that enquiries will be 'pushed' to online routes, which may not be accessible for all, though the phone lines will not be cut and will still be available for those who need them</li> </ul>			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for a negative impact on the CCR service, who will have a reduced income of £10k in 23-24 and £41k in 24-25 and thereafter</li> <li>This may mean the service needs to reduce their workforce, but could also allow for developments in other areas of the service due to freeing up officer time</li> </ul>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Push' residents to online routes for resolving their queries</li> <li>Remove the phone number from the largest mailouts, retaining it on forms only when there is a more likely requirement for the resident to contact us (eg. No phone number on addition or removal notices, but definitely keep the phone number on poll cards)</li> <li>Encourage email and postal responses</li> <li>Add forms to the website for the most common queries to enable self-service and a quick and convenient way for residents to reach us</li> <li>In the past, the electoral team is expanded at election time to manage our calls. We can begin this earlier if the call volumes necessitates and if the demands on officer time becomes too great</li> </ul>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	NA
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	NA
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	NA
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	A phone number is a requirement for many of the prescribed electoral registration and election forms. We do not propose removing the phone number from any of these forms. We will review the legislation and submit a proposal to EMT, with an EIA, before removing the phone number from any communications, or introducing any other 'push' methods.			

# Equalities Analysis Assessment

## Electoral Services Savings Proposals

### 4. Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house

#### Summary of the proposal

One-off and Ongoing

Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.

The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.

This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:

£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)

£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
When contacting electoral services by phone, residents will now speak directly to the electoral services staff, rather than staff in the Customer Services Centre. There are 2 impacts, 1 positive and 1 negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive – service users will speak directly to expert electoral officers and will receive an excellent and improved response</li> <li>• Negative – on very rare occasions it is possible that service users will have to wait longer for their call to be answered</li> </ul>				
<b>Staff</b>				
Electoral Services staff will now have to answer telephone calls more often. This can disrupt the flow of their work, and can lead to an increase in work. On the other hand, speaking directly to residents on a regular basis will improve the team's knowledge of our service users, and our ability to respond to their needs.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No impact				
<b>Partners</b>				
No impact				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## 1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

<b>Author</b>	<b>Jamie Baker</b>		<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Chief Execs</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>11/1/24</b>		<b>Service</b>	<b>Electoral Services</b>	
<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents. The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:</p> <p>£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)</p> <p>£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>					
<b>1. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</b>					
<input type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Household type		
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care		



**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2. The evidence to support the analysis</b></p> <p>We have data to show the number of calls received by the CSC for electoral services over the past 5 years. The data shows that the electoral services team should be able to handle the number of calls with a similar or higher response rate (i.e. with fewer calls going unanswered).</p> <p>The CSC call handlers have in the past been trained by the electoral services team. The electoral services team have more knowledge, experience and qualifications concerning our service area, and will naturally be more able to respond to enquiries. With the addition of some customer response training, the electoral services team should be well prepared to answer calls from all kinds of residents. Note that the electoral services telephone lines are transferred back to the electoral services team during election periods, which is when the highest volume of calls are received. The CSC does not answer electoral calls during this period. The reason for this was to improve the speed and quality of response to residents contacting the service at the most important period (election time!).</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3. Impact summary</b></p> <p>This change is not considered to cause a negative impact on any category of resident or service user. The movement of the phone lines back to the electoral services team will ensure that resident phone calls are answered by the staff with the most expertise, knowledge and electoral register access. Enquiries will be answered correctly and promptly, with appropriate follow-up questions asked to provide further benefit.</p> <p>There is the potential for an impact on the electoral services staff, which will reduce over time as the staff develop procedures and undertake training to be better able to continue their regular work with the occasional interruption of a phone call.</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities.</b></li> </ul> <p>No impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality.</b></li> </ul> <p>No impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases.</b></li> </ul> <p>No impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population.</b></li> </ul> <p>Positive impact. The improved knowledge and electoral register access for people answering the phones will improve the quality of the service the residents receive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens</b></li> </ul> <p>No impact.</p>			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

### 4. Mitigation

Electoral Services staff will receive the following training:

- Call handling
- Difficult conversations
- Complaints
- Equality and diversity
- The operating system – especially in transferring calls to other services, and how to operate the language line service
- Prioritising work and juggling tasks

More staff will be added to the service at peak times, namely for elections and the canvass. And we can operate a rota system to improve our response times and ability to undertake other tasks (such as meeting residents in person who report to reception).

### 5. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts

*The service user journey will improve as they will speak directly with the electoral services staff rather than a customer engagement officer. The impact on electoral services itself could be challenging at times but we have sufficient mitigations and opportunities to lead to an improvement in the service.*

**Signature of Director**

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive			
<b>Director</b>	Jeremy Chambers			
<b>Service area</b>	Information Security and Governance			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	CEX07 – Information Security and Governance (GF)			
<b>Saving title</b>	Information Security and Governance GF Savings			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>NB: For all savings please confirm whether one-off or ongoing? All 2024/25 savings should be ongoing, and any 2023/24 once off savings must have a permanent replacement in 2024/25.</p> <p>2023 / 2024 GF Savings: None</p> <p>2024/2025 GF Savings: Savings of £36000 by reducing the supplies and services budget by £30000 and the Comms and Computing budget by £6000. This will be ongoing.</p> <p>NB: These GF savings are made against the current service budget and do not take into account the budget for the Access to Records team which is transferring from CYP.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	744	<b>Net £k</b>	594
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	0	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	36
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	GF: Savings have come from non-salary budget and should not see impact to service delivery.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	The DPO function transferring from Lewisham Homes will transfer to the Council's DPO. Non-salary savings were made based on comparative spend of previous years.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer decision			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	0
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	N/A
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	-
	<b>In what:</b>	N/A		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	N/A			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	The DPO function of Lewisham Homes transferring to the Council will be absorbed by the Council's DPO.
---	---

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to service users.				
<b>Staff</b>				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to staff.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to Council services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to partners.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive			
<b>Director</b>	Jeremy Chambers			
<b>Service area</b>	Mayor's Office			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Mayor			
<b>Reference</b>	CEX08 – Mayor's Office Salary & Non-Salary			
<b>Saving title</b>	Mayor's Office			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	The office will achieve underspend of c.£12k from salaries in 23/24 and is proposing cut of 6% in its 24/25 non-salary expenditure for 24/25 (£870).			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Minor impact on office expenditure but this can be managed			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Look to hold any vacancies as unfilled for short periods of time (where capacity allows) in order to create additional headroom in the budget.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	<b>NA</b>
	<b>In what:</b>	NA		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	NA			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	NA			

### Impact & Outcomes

**What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?**

**Service Users**

None.

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Staff</b>				
None.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None.				
<b>Partners</b>				
None.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				No impact.
<b>Disability</b>				No impact.
<b>Ethnicity</b>				No impact.
<b>Gender</b>				No impact.
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				No impact.
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				No impact.
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				No impact.
<b>Religion and belief</b>				No impact.
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				No impact.
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				No impact.
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No.	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive's (Legal and Corporate Governance)
<b>Director</b>	Jeremy Chambers
<b>Service area</b>	Scrutiny and Policy
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk
<b>Reference</b>	CEX09 – Corporate Policy Team Staffing Reduction
<b>Saving title</b>	Staffing reduction – Corporate Policy
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p><b>Deletion of one Senior Policy and Strategy Officer (SPSO) P06 role from 2023/24 onwards.</b></p> <p>This will require the reshaping of the policy team (part of the wider scrutiny and policy team), with a move away from direct support to directorates and a re-focusing on core, central workstreams. The policy team is currently configured to 'shadow' directorates. The proposed reduction in the number of posts in the team combined with an additional directorate (Housing) being created means this is no longer feasible. Instead, it is proposed that the two remaining P06 posts focus on a core suite of corporate policy functions.</p> <p>Currently, equalities work and consultation &amp; engagement work forms a large part of the team's workload, which will need to change.</p> <p><b>Equalities</b> – the saving proposal relies upon equalities work being carried out by a new equalities advisor. This has been agreed and is in train.</p> <p><b>Consultation and engagement</b> – some citizen space work will need to be moved to another team. Completely transferring responsibility for day-to-day consultation and engagement activity to another team would assist in the streamlining and reshaping of the team to take on a central co-ordinating role. Such a transfer may also result in responsibility for the function and responsibility for everyday activity sitting in the same team, which would be desirable.</p> <p>Key elements of a re-shaped policy team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPSOs will no longer be assigned to specific directorates. Directorates will continue to get dedicated policy support from assigned Executive Support Officers (ESOs). A recent policy mapping exercise showed that, in addition to this, some directorate level policy resource also exists. Specialist support in relation to equalities will be provided by the proposed equalities advisor post.</li> <li>• If required, the two SPSOs will continue to support consultation and engagement, although this will impact on their ability to deliver the key products listed below.</li> <li>• The two SPSOs will deliver a range of "key products" for the council including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Overall policy co-ordination</b> – Regularly meeting with, and linking up, directorate policy leads, the ESOs, performance officers, the specialist equalities post, consultation and engagement officers (if responsibility is transferred) to ensure policy alignment and consistency across the council.</li> <li>• <b>Corporate Strategy</b> – Assisting in the production of service level delivery plans in relation to key service plan outcomes and KPIs; and tracking delivery of the corporate strategy, in partnership with the Performance team, with an annual report to EMT.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Oversight of the corporate portfolio of policies and strategies</b> – Keeping track of policy and strategy delivery across the council and working with directorates and the equalities advisor, to ensure all EAA requirements and consultation/engagement requirements are met; and making connections so that policies and strategies don't happen in directorate silos (and cross-directorate input is sought where appropriate).</li> <li>• <b>Develop and maintain strategy / policy / action plan templates and guidance</b> – Providing guidance and ensuring that policies and strategies look and feel similar; and are aligned with each other and the corporate strategy.</li> <li>• <b>EMT Horizon scanning / Policy briefings</b> - Analysing national, regional and/or local policy; making connections between regional and national developments, and Lewisham; and presenting this to Directors via the EMT horizon scan and other briefings as required.</li> <li>• <b>Network management</b> – Representing the council on the Cooperative Council Innovation Network; the London Policy network; and other related networks and forums.</li> <li>• <b>Policy projects</b> – Participating in policy style projects such as support in writing bids, subject to capacity.</li> <li>• <b>Back Up resource to specialist posts</b> -Maintaining a working knowledge of equalities and consultation &amp; engagement including citizen space (if responsibility for consultation and engagement transfers to another service) to cover for the specialist posts as required and avoid single person dependency.</li> <li>• <b>Mentoring</b> – Helping to embed policy skills and capabilities within the ESO function to allow them to take on additional policy and strategy related work, via mentoring.</li> </ul>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	571	<b>Net £k</b>	571
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	6,297	<b>Net £k</b>	5,831
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y</b>		All directorates to absorb a degree of policy work		
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>		100%		
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>There will be some reduction in direct, generalist policy support for Directorates. This will need to be partly absorbed by the directorates and partly absorbed by ESOs.</p> <p>Strategic responsibility for consultation and engagement currently lies with the Director of Communications and Engagement, but a large amount of day to day support is provided by the policy team who advise on consultation and engagement and load surveys onto the council's survey platform: citizen space. This includes statutory surveys. Although a streamlined policy team of two posts could continue to carry out this activity, it would limit the core central activity they can carry out and, at times, would mean they have little capacity to carry out work other than consultation and engagement.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p><i>Equalities</i> - Directorates will have access to a new Equalities Advisor once recruited.</p> <p><i>Consultation and engagement</i> - Although a streamlined policy team of two posts could continue to carry out this activity, if this was transferred, it would mean that strategic responsibility and operational delivery for</p>			



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<p>consultation and engagement could be brought together and the policy team could have a clearer new focus.</p> <p><i>Other Policy support</i> -The council has a range of specialist and generalist posts, across different teams and directorates, which contribute to, and support, policy. Whilst it is proposed that 'pure policy' support is provided by the two remaining SPSOs, generalist support will continue to be provided by ESOs and cabinet support officers; and service transformation support by business analysts. Specialist support will be provided by the performance team, partnership officers, directorate specific policy officers and the new equalities post.</p> <p>Work has already taken place to embed policy skills and capabilities within the ESO function to allow them to take on additional policy and strategy related work.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	The proposal relies on the new Equalities Advisor post being filled and ideally, consultation and engagement being transferred out of the service.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	The council has statutory responsibilities in relation to equalities and consultation.			

## Equalities Screening Assessment

### Impact & Outcomes

#### What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

##### Service Users

The users of this service are internal. There will be some reduction in direct, generalist policy support for Directorates. This will need to be partly absorbed by the directorates and partly absorbed by ESOs. A new specialist equalities advisor post has been agreed and this post will absorb the majority of the equalities work being carried out by the team.

##### Staff

The post being deleted is vacant. The service provided by the remaining officers will be re-shaped to avoid an impact on workload. The appointment of a specialist equalities post will have a positive impact of the equalities policy support that directorates receive.

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Other Council Services</b>				
As above. There will be some reduction in direct, generalist policy support for Directorates. This will be partly absorbed by the directorates, ESO and specialist equalities advisor post (which will absorb the majority of the equalities work being carried out by the team).				
<b>Partners</b>				
The Policy team will continue to work with council partners, representing the council on the Cooperative Council Innovation Network; the London Policy network; and other related networks and forums.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>			X Positive	
<b>Disability</b>			X Positive	
<b>Ethnicity</b>			X Positive	
<b>Gender</b>			X Positive	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>			X Positive	
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>			X Positive	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>			X Positive	
<b>Religion and belief</b>			X Positive	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>			X Positive	
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>			X Positive	
(The transfer of most equalities support from a generalist central policy team to a specialist equalities advisor post will have an overall positive impact on equalities – the appointment of a specialist equalities advisor was a recommendation of the recent independent review of the Council's approach to equalities)				
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Services			
<b>Director</b>	Joan Hutton/ Kenneth Gregory			
<b>Service area</b>	Adult Social Care/ Joint Commissioning			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
<b>Reference</b>	COM01 – Homecare Efficiencies ASC01_24_25			
<b>Saving title</b>	Homecare Efficiencies			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The new Maximising wellbeing at home (MWAH) contract that went live on 1<sup>st</sup> September 23, has a yearly efficiency factor built into the contract specification that will achieve the 400K savings proposed</p> <p>This is based on efficiencies submitted by successful bidders and as part of MWAH contract. These efficiencies will form of capitated budget for the relevant /target years.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	125,513	<b>Net £k</b>	62,921
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	21,095	<b>Net £k</b>	20,680
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>400,000</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>No</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	80%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Confirmation that Contract specification has been applied and reduced spend on homecare for same amount of hours. Doing more with less with each pound spent. Only increases will be demographic based and other work around front door eg Newton enablement should keep this within reasonable control			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Continual monitoring of the contracts and data provided by the providers regarding detail of service hours delivered.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer decision			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>	N/A		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	No			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	No			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Services			
Director	Joan Hutton			
Service area	Adult Social Care			
Cabinet Portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
Reference	COM02 – ASC Transitions ASC02_24_25			
<b>Saving title</b>	Transitions			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The analysis of costs associated with young people with SEND who transition to ASC indicates an increase of both demand and cost per care and support plan. It is forecast that the demand in 24-25 is now 32 young people who are going to become 18 during the year. Of the 32 young adults identified, it is unlikely that all of them will need ASC, but from the information we have been given appears at least 26 will need Adult Social Care Services.</p> <p>Initially based on earlier CYP data, we understood the Transition numbers to be 16, this informed the corporate growth funding of 1.5m in total including the transition of 0.8m. The latest data suggests that there is now 800k gap from the initial estimate.</p> <p>This proposal is in anticipation of increase share of social care grant in 24-25 either from existing pot or from any increases from government funding received by LBL. The total expected funding from the grant should be in the region of 1.4m in order to be able to deliver the savings below. Hence this requires agreement with EMT/Corporate colleagues</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	125,513	<b>Net £k</b>	62,921
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	30,893 <i>*This is LD Budget (Transitions cuts across various care types)</i>	<b>Net £k</b>	29,750 <i>*Adjusted for CHC only. (Other income is not allocated per service area) 46,502 Res and Nursing only</i>
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>600,000</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>No</b>	None			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	80%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	This will reduce the underlying £4-6m pressure in the ASC budgets that is forecast for 24-25			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>This risk is also being managed via improving the Transition system by greater joined up working with CYP so that Transition cases are identified early to allow proactive work in sourcing more suitable and affordable packages in line with ASC client portfolio. The current reality is that upon transfer the average weekly costs of CYP cases are much higher than typical ASC package</p> <p>Also ASC will ensure that those young persons with more complex needs are assessed early for CHC eligibility. This will reduce the cost to the Council</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer decision			

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	This saving proposal is contingent on corporate agreement on ASC share of social care grant in 24-25.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Services			
<b>Director</b>	Joan Hutton			
<b>Service area</b>	Adult Social Care			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
<b>Reference</b>	COM03 – ASC Care Home Reviews ASC03_24_25			
<b>Saving title</b>	Care Home Reviews			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>ASC aims to support residents of the borough with care and support needs to remain at home living as independently as possible. For citizens who have more complex needs, a care home setting is often the safest and appropriate way to meet their needs. Nationally there has been an increase in the complexity of people who require this type of support, particularly for people with advanced dementia and other complex presentations.</p> <p>Adult social care has a duty to review all services users annually who have care and support plans in place.</p> <p>There is a total of 25 Residential and Nursing home placements that have 1:1 and 2:1 support.</p> <p>The review process will work closely with the placement providers to ensure residents are well supported and that their needs continue to be met. There will be an opportunity to manage some of the presentations that have required the additional support by adding capacity to the specialist clinical care home support team.</p> <p>This saving will require collaborative multi-disciplinary work arrangements that support providers to manage more complex residents effectively and safely and may result in an increase in requests for full CHC or joint funding with health.</p> <p>The implications of the recent Fair Cost of Care exercise that took place in 2022 and the significant rise in costs in providing care has been considered within the data informing this proposal inflation.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	125,513	<b>Net £k</b>	62,921
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	46,502 Res and Nursing only	<b>Net £k</b>	30,984 *CHC and Client contributions
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>			<b>300,000</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>		No		
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>		65%		
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>The result of implementing this support to providers should be a positive experience for the residence in terms of how their care and support is delivered. There may be an increase to Health budgets, it could mean that more costs are transferred to Health as more cases reach criteria for CHC full funded, or Health Joint funding.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>Joint Commissioning will ensure that inflation increases are negotiated and remain within budget. They are also working with local providers to block purchase some beds rather than be totally reliant on a spot purchasing model.</p>			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	There will be additional training and support to Care home staff from specialist clinicians that will allow the reduction to 1-1 Support.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Y	<b>Cost £k</b>	70k
	<b>In what:</b>	To increase capacity within the Care home support team with a focus on support for people with complex dementia and behavioural presentations that require specialist support.		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	None			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Care Act and CHC Fund policy			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Services			
<b>Director</b>	Joan Hutton			
<b>Service area</b>	Adult Social Care			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
<b>Reference</b>	COM06 – ASC Staffing Reorganisation			
<b>Saving title</b>	Staffing reorganisation across Adult Social Care			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>A reorganisation proposal of staffing across Adult Social Care assessment teams is in Draft form.</p> <p>The intention of this proposal is to strengthen our approach to the management of demand, multi-disciplinary working and to further embed the Principles of the Empowering Lewisham programme of improvement.</p> <p>A planned recruitment campaign will also reduce reliance on agency staff, conclude secondments and Acting up arrangements that are currently in place. Agency staff will be replaced with permanent staff, and some posts now covered by agency will be deleted.</p> <p>This will also strengthen our position regarding staff retention in preparation for our forthcoming CQC inspection.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	125,513	<b>Net £k</b>	62,921
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	21,095	<b>Net £k</b>	20,680 *S75 recharge adjusted
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>350,000</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	This will have a Positive impact on service delivery as the reorganisation will further embed the EL programme of work.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>Consultation with staff will facilitate an opportunity to manage this change in accordance with the Councils HR procedures.</p> <p>There remains a risk that recruitment process may not be successful in filling posts and that this will mean continuing reliance on agency cover. Experienced Social care workers are in high demand across London</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>In what:</b>	
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	No	
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	No	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Services			
<b>Director</b>	Joan Hutton			
<b>Service area</b>	Adult Social Care			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
<b>Reference</b>	COM06 – ASC Arranging Care Fees & Charges ASC07_24_29			
<b>Saving title</b>	Fees and Charges increases			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>This proposal is in accordance with Care Act 2014 legislation and the National Fairer Charging policy that allows LA's to Charge a fee for arranging care and support to those residents assessed to pay full costs for their care.</p> <p>The saving will be achieved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An annual increase in charging based on inflation increases.</li> <li>2. By introducing an annual fee from April 24 to all full cost paying Services users in receipt of ASC services where we have arranged and commissioned their care.</li> </ol>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	125,513	<b>Net £k</b>	62,921
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	11,498 *client contributions	<b>Net £k</b>	11,498
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>150,000</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	85%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Increased costs to Service Users. Full cost payers may choose to organise their own care; therefore, we will not get the full income for charging for this function.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>Ensuring all new Service Users have a financial assessment as soon as they become Care Act eligible.</p> <p>The fees paid to providers via the LA are often more cost effective than those privately sourced.</p> <p>The quality of care is monitored as part of contract monitoring by Joint commissioning.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer, this has already had Members decision.			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	May impact the workload of the Financial and Money Management Team.			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Care Act and Fairer Charging Guidance
---	---------------------------------------

# ASC Equalities Screening Template

Change : Home care efficiencies

The new Maximising wellbeing at home (MWAH) contract that went live on 1<sup>st</sup> September 23, has a yearly efficiency factor built into the contract specification that will achieve the £400K savings proposed

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Staff</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Partners</b>				
Partners have agreed to an efficiency factor from year 2 of their contract onwards as part of the procurement exercise and with the understanding that they are getting the full fair cost of care upfront.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Equalities Screening Template

### Change : Transitions

This proposal is in anticipation of increase share of social care grant in 24-25 either from existing pot or from any increases from government funding received by LBL. The total expected funding from the grant should be in the region of 1.4m in order to be able to deliver the savings below. Hence this requires agreement with EMT/Corporate colleagues. THIS IS RELIANT ON THE SERVICE GETTING ADDITIONAL FUNDING OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT MTFS ASSUMPTIONS

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Staff</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
Funding is expected to come from additional sources				
<b>Partners</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Equalities Screening Template

Change : Care Home Reviews

This saving will require collaborative multi-disciplinary work arrangements that support providers to manage more complex residents effectively and safely and may result in an increase in requests for full CHC or joint funding with health.

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
More complex service users across all protected characteristics will be supported in their care homes				
<b>Staff</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
<b>Partners</b>				
MDT Working				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>		positive		
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Equalities Screening Template

Change :

Section 117 recharge to ICB	This saving will be achieved by ensuring 50% of all Section 117 aftercare is recharge to the ICB in accordance with the Section 75 Agreement.
-----------------------------	---

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
<b>Service Users</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Staff</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Partners</b>				
Recharged to ICB in accordance with the S75 agreement				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Equalities Screening Template

Change :

Staffing reorganisation across Adult Social Care	The intention of this proposal is to strengthen our approach to the management of demand, multi-disciplinary working and to further embed the Principles of the Empowering Lewisham programme of improvement.
--	---

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Staff</b>				
Staff restructure focusing on agency and temporary staff				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Partners</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Equalities Screening Template

Change :

Fees and Charges increases	This proposal is in accordance with Care Act 2014 legislation and the National Fairer Charging policy that allows LA's to Charge a fee for arranging care and support to those residents assessed to pay full costs for their care.
----------------------------	---

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
Those who are assessed to pay full cost for their care will be charged a brokerage fee, in line with the National Fairer Charging Policy. Clients will therefore be selected regardless of equalities but based on their level of income/savings.				
<b>Staff</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Partners</b>				
None anticipated				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X



**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Service			
<b>Director</b>	James Lee			
<b>Service area</b>	Leisure Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
<b>Reference</b>	COM08 – Leisure Service Savings			
<b>Saving title</b>	Leisure Services Savings			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£100k –will be available from revenue generated when the Leisure Contract share of surplus mechanism kicks in 24/25 forward</li> <li>£20k – removal of professional consultancy fees, 23/24 forward</li> <li>£10k – work R&amp;M contingency at Downham Leisure Centre 23/24 forward</li> </ul>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	29,249	<b>Net £k</b>	14,144
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	Leisure currently supported by provisions
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£30</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>£130</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>The loss of the budget for the London Youth Games, mini marathon and sports talent bursaries will adversely affect young people in the borough depriving them of the opportunity to represent their borough and excel in their chosen sport perhaps effecting their long-term life chances.</p> <p>The revenue generated via the share of surplus could have been directed to cover other potential emerging pressure in the Leisure Service such as the outcome of the Downham PFI benchmarking process that is currently underway.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>The level of consultancy support has reduced since placing the Leisure Contract on a sound footing.</p> <p>LYG reputational risk of being the first London Borough to pull out of the games counter to the objectives set out within the recently adopted Physical Activity Strategy. There is a possibility that the local sports clubs and schools will step into entre the YLG AND Mini Marathon if the council removes it support. Advice could be offered to talented athletes on where they can find bursaries and sponsorship to support their development.</p> <p>PFI contractor at Downham Leisure Centre has a contractual responsibility to undertake R&amp;M on the site robust contract monitoring procedures ensure that these works are being completed removing the necessity to spend the contingency.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N/A
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A

**EAA Screening**

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
No direct impact on service users				
<b>Staff</b>				
No direct impact on staff				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No direct impact on other services				
<b>Partners</b>				
No direct Impact on Partners				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Partnerships and Leisure – Community Services			
<b>Director</b>	James Lee			
<b>Service area</b>	Community Education and Cultural Assets			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
<b>Reference</b>	COM07 – ALL GF Subsidy Reduction			
<b>Saving title</b>	Adult Learning Lewisham reduction in general fund subsidy for salary enhancements			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	One off Savings of £100K for 2023/24 and 2024/25 from the core budget contribution to the uplift on Salaries at ALL			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	29,249	<b>Net £k</b>	14,144
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	£3,943	<b>Net £k</b>	£231
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£100</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>£100</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	If 'yes' identify the service impacted. N			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	The service has an increase of funding from GLA in 23/24 of £65K due to over performance against the GLA AEB budget allocation and the service in predicting an overall underspend. The London factor uplift has been increased, which means there is more funding allocated per learner, with learner enrolments increasing and class numbers growing this means that courses will draw down more funding and therefore we can increase the cost efficiency of course delivery.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	<p>There is the potential with the London factor uplift that the service will continue to over perform within the 3% tolerance, which represents up to an additional £100K per academic year.</p> <p>The service also has a reserve from the ring-fenced funding allocation which could mitigate against the risks of underperformance or the impact of salary uplifts in 2023/24 and 2024/25.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>	N		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	The GLA AEB funding is ring fenced for the delivery of adult education only. This means that we are only able to make cuts from the general fund			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	subsidy to salary increases for 23/24 and 24/25 to support the savings programme which will align with the contractual funding agreement
--	--

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Service		
<b>Director</b>	James Lee		
<b>Service area</b>	Parks and Open Spaces		
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh		
<b>Reference</b>	COM09 – Parks Infrastructure Investment		
<b>Saving title</b>	Infrastructure Investment		
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Reduce by 30k revenue budget for parks infrastructure improvements allocated to supplement Greening Fund 2 & NCIL (GF2 & NCIL) projects and other small-scale improvements at locations that have no GF2 & NCIL projects planned.		
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£30,000</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>
<b>Risks:</b>			
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.		
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%		
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	The main impact will be less resources to invest in parks infrastructure to compliment other GF2 & NCIL works taking place across the borough as well as a loss of budget for small scale improvements at location where no GF2 & NCIL projects planned.		
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Risks a missed opportunity for additional parks investment. Mitigation will be to work within secured GF2 & NCIL allocations		
<b>Other considerations:</b>			
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer		
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>
	<b>In what:</b>		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	N/A		
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	N/A		

### Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

No direct impact on service users				
<b>Staff</b>				
No direct impact on staff				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No direct impact on other services				
<b>Partners</b>				
No direct Impact on Partners				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				x
<b>Disability</b>				x
<b>Ethnicity</b>				x
<b>Gender</b>				x
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				x
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				x
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				x
<b>Religion and belief</b>				x
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				x
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Community Service			
<b>Director</b>	Catherine Mbema			
<b>Service area</b>	Public Health			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Businesses, Jobs and Skills- Cllr Powell			
<b>Reference</b>	COM10 - Public Health NCDP			
<b>Saving title</b>	Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships (NCDP) saving (PH grant substitution).			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£90k currently allocated to public health area-based programmes, which has been used to support our Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships.</li> <li>Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships (NCDPs) bring together relevant partners in each Neighbourhood in Lewisham to identify resources within communities to maximise their potential while also highlighting gaps in service provision and working with the local voluntary sector to develop services to meet local needs.</li> </ul>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	29,914	<b>Net £k</b>	£Nil
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	90	<b>Net £k</b>	90
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>£90,000</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic the funding for Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships (NCDPs) has been repurposed to support emergency food provision/food justice work in the borough owing to the inability of the Partnerships to run during the pandemic. This financial year some of this funding has also been repurposed to support the development of Health Equity Teams in the borough for each Primary Care Network (PCN) in Lewisham, which are a more recent form of area/neighbourhood work that public health is supporting. Since the NCDPs have now not run for a number of years the impact of them not restarting will be mild, however there will be a risk to the ongoing support that can be provided to work on food justice and Health Equity Teams by making this public health (PH) grant substitution/saving.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	There is South-East London Integrated Care Board (SEL ICB) work underway to develop integrated neighbourhood teams that may provide some degree of mitigation to not having NCDPs in place. If sustained the In terms of food justice work, fixed-term funding from other areas of PH grant will provide short term mitigation for no longer being able to repurpose NCDP funding to support this work.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N/A
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A

### Equalities Screening Template

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
The service users that would have been attendees of the NCDP funded projects for the 2019/2020 period include younger residents, residents over 60 years and residents from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities. Residents that would benefit from NCDP funded projects may therefore be impacted by the proposed changes with potential mitigations for these impacts outlined in the savings proforma attached.				
<b>Staff</b>				
There are no direct equalities implications for Lewisham Council staff as a result of these changes.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There are no direct equalities implications for Lewisham Council staff as a result of these changes.				
<b>Partners</b>				
NCDPs were supported by Community Connections Lewisham so there may be some impact for this partnership initiative by the proposed changes.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Negative)	Neutral
<b>Age</b>			x	
<b>Disability</b>			x	
<b>Ethnicity</b>			x	
<b>Gender</b>			x	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				x
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				x
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>			x	



**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Religion and belief</b>			x	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				x
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>			x	
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Corporate Resources			
<b>Director</b>	Rich Clarke			
<b>Service area</b>	Assurance (Cross Service)			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR01 – Assurance Budget Adjustments			
<b>Saving title</b>	Various Assurance Budget Adjustments			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Various budget adjustments within Assurance to bring budgets in line with expected expenditure and remove historical anomalies (including some growth items). Individual recurring changes &gt;£10k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• +£33k, cease practice of recharging audit to schools</li> <li>• +£29k, additional A-FACT apprentice (2yr scheme)</li> <li>• £25k, re-tender Lewisham Homes inherited internal audit support (currently total GF/LH budget is c.£70k, anticipate new contract to be awarded at c.£45k. Estimated split of that contract would be £10k GF, £35k HRA resulting in £10k GF saving and £15k HRA saving but this is an estimate subject to recharge arrangements tbc on workload split).</li> <li>• £25k, relinquishing contingency held in H&amp;S budget for restructure</li> <li>• £20k, expected re-tender of combined building inspection contract</li> <li>• £15k, achieved saving following H&amp;S software re-procurement</li> </ul>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	5,744	<b>Net £k</b>	2,775
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	5,744	<b>Net £k</b>	2,775
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	90%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Various impacts, but all regarded as manageable.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Various mitigations, but all regarded as achievable.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer.			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Number of staff</b>	n/a
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Audience(s)</b>	n/a
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Cost £k</b>	£0
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	None.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None.			

## Equalities Screening Template: Assurance – Cross Service

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
None. Services are not public facing.				
<b>Staff</b>				
None. Changes are not staff related save A-FACT apprentice recruitment.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
Minimal. Largely arising through releasing contingency or effective procurement.				
<b>Partners</b>				
None.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Corporate Resources			
<b>Director</b>	Rich Clarke			
<b>Service area</b>	Insurance & Risk			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR02 – Assurance Insurance Contracts			
<b>Saving title</b>	Insurance Contract			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	We recently awarded new contracts for the Council's insurances as part of a scheduled recruitment. These contracts will commence 1/12/23 and run for five years.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	5,744	<b>Net £k</b>	2,775
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	4,454	<b>Net £k</b>	1,566
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>203</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	95%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	None. Providing sufficient coverage was a qualifying requirement for suppliers. Therefore we retain expected coverage levels. Note that c.25% of the saving will be charged to HRA as the insurance covers Council residential properties.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	N/A			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Delegated officer decision to be made by David Austin.			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Number of staff</b>	n/a
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Audience(s)</b>	n/a
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Cost £k</b>	£0
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Contract award decision pending			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Small inherent risk that award may be challenged by unsuccessful suppliers, but no challenge expected. Process completed alongside Council procurement team from start to finish and so confident on compliance.			

## Equalities Screening Template: Assurance – Insurance Contracts

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
<b>Staff</b>				
None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
<b>Partners</b>				
None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Corporate Resources			
<b>Director</b>	Rich Clarke			
<b>Service area</b>	Internal Audit			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR03 – Internal Audit Restructure			
<b>Saving title</b>	Internal Audit Restructure			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Current vacant post. Propose not replacing at all in 2023/24 and instead spreading work among existing staff (current saving proposed). For 2024/25 look to replace the post with a more junior post focussed on maintaining risk information.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	5,744	<b>Net £k</b>	2,775
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	454	<b>Net £k</b>	421
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	17	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	15
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	70%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Reduced internal audit capacity.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Hope to manage the impact via better targeted audit derived from improved risk information.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer (Head of Assurance, with appropriate permissions for amended post).			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Number of staff</b>	n/a
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Audience(s)</b>	n/a
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Cost £k</b>	£0
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Spend rest of 23/24 determining demand for risk information. Working expectation is as per this form; need for a more junior employee to help manage risk register. However, it is possible with more self-service across the Council the post may not be needed at all (in which case saving c.£50k).			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None.			

## Equalities Screening Template: Assurance – Internal Audit

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
None. IA is not a public facing service.

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Staff</b>				
Minimal. All changes proposed relate to vacant posts. Replacement post is more junior and presents opportunity to recruit early-career individual.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
None.				
<b>Partners</b>				
None.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			No	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Corporate Resources			
<b>Director</b>	Katharine Nidd			
<b>Service area</b>	Finance			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy – Cllr De Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR04 – Finance Structure Revisions			
<b>Saving title</b>	Finance Savings			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	As at P4 Finance were reporting an underspend and therefore all savings will take effect from 1 April 2024. The saving is a mixture of re-structuring historically hard to fill vacant posts (including a full review of the payroll service) and minor revisions to structures to drive efficiencies out.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	8,491	<b>Net £k</b>	6,100
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	8,491	<b>Net £k</b>	6,100
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>250</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	This will slightly reduce resilience within the finance function, and remove any capacity for making significant change or improvement without additional resource in the future.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	We are undertaking a review of recharges for those services paid by others (schools, HRA, GF), this may offset risk in Finance but may result in cost shunt.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	N/A
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	N/A
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	N/A
	<b>In what:</b>	N/A		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	None initially, as part of budget setting the review of recharges may involve discussion with other services.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None			

## 1. Equalities Screening Template



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
There should be very little impact on service users, the changes mostly relate to vacant posts which are being delivered in other ways, therefore there should be minimal noticeable change for service users within the Council.				
<b>Staff</b>				
There is a planned restructure of the Payroll service which staff have been made aware of as this has already been planned. There are a number of hard to fill vacant posts across finance which will either be deleted or reviewed/changed and which will not affect any staff directly, and there is a deletion of a single post which will impact on a staff member, however they will be assimilated into an existing equivalent role.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services, however, in making savings this slightly reduces resilience within the finance function, and removes any capacity for making significant change or improvement without additional resource in the future.				
<b>Partners</b>				
None				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Resident and Business Services			
<b>Director</b>	Maxine Gordon			
<b>Service area</b>	Facilities Management			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR10 – FM Printing & Stationery			
<b>Saving title</b>	FM Other Costs			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	FM Printing FM Stationery			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	5,008,288	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	177,767	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	80%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Invu Printing Costs finished during Covid and annual stationery costs are static and lower than budget.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>				
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>				

EIA

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

There is no impact to service users because this printing hasn't been used since 2020. Stationery costs have also been below budget this year hence the proposed saving.				
<b>Staff</b>				
No anticipated impact to staff.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No anticipated impact to council services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
No anticipated impact to partners.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Resident and Business Services			
<b>Director</b>	Maxine Gordon			
<b>Service area</b>	Facilities Management			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR05 – FM Energy Post Removal			
<b>Saving title</b>	FM Energy			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Reduction of one admin post			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	1,124,309	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	265,775	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	80%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Technical solution to be implemented which will process school utility invoices. The member of staff is a CYP officer and we make a £25k contribution to their salary.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>				
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	1
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>				

EIA

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
Invoice validation will be a positive change for service users because it will better improve our management of energy payments.

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Staff</b>				
One person is affected but this person is employed by the schools and is currently 0.7 (2 days a week).				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
Schools will have the option of providing her with more work or making her role redundant.				
<b>Partners</b>				
There are no partners involved in this proposed change.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>		x		
<b>Disability</b>			x	
<b>Ethnicity</b>		x		
<b>Gender</b>		x		
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				x
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				x
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				x
<b>Religion and belief</b>				x
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				x
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Resident and Business Services			
<b>Director</b>	Maxine Gordon			
<b>Service area</b>	Facilities Management			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR11 – FM Receptionist Posts			
<b>Saving title</b>				
FM Soft Services				
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	2 x Receptionist roles.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	922,701	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	841,434	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	80%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	We are in October and these roles have not been recruited to as yet for 23/24. We will be recruiting to these roles in 24/25.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>				
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>				
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	0
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>				

### EIA – FOH Receptionists

#### Impact & Outcomes

#### What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

#### Service Users

These posts have been vacant for over a year with no impact on service users. Cover has been arranged and the team are supported by security staff who

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

signpost enquiries in the first instance. The majority of visitors come in relation to housing and they currently have their own staff in the reception area				
<b>Staff</b>				
There are currently no negative impacts identified. Before the end of 23/24 a new Operations Manager will join the team and they will be able to better manage resources.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is no negative impact on any other services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
There is no negative impact on any partners.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Resources			
<b>Director</b>	IT & Digital			
<b>Service area</b>	Shared Technology Services (STS)			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR06 – IT & Digital STS			
<b>Saving title</b>				
Shared Technology Services (STS) savings				
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	JUMPSEC Limited	Cyber Security Review	Jumpsec Ltd for Cyber Security Review – This is the company that the London Borough of Lewisham use to scan and report on potential cyber threats to the council's IT network.	£33,000
	Computacenter (UK) Ltd	Mobile Iron Renewal	London Borough of Brent & London Borough of Lewisham to renew the contract for MobileIron which is the software used to secure corporate devices such as mobile phones.	£38,509
	One off		Relocation of Lewisham Homes Equipment from Greenwich to Brent Datacentre	£7,467
	One off		Relocation of Equipment from Maidstone to the Croydon Datacentre	£7,486
	Plus £88,000 proposed reduction from move to new O2 annual contract from Vodafone All 2024/25 savings should be ongoing reduction to the Shared Technology Services (STS) budget.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>11,112,891</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>4,210,956</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>174</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	A reduced cost to Lewisham Council for services and contracts provided by Shared Technology Services (STS).			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Not applicable			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer decision			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	
<b>(value of saving)</b>	<b>In what:</b>			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

shown above should be net of this investment)		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	None	
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None	

### 1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
There will be no impact on service users as these savings are mainly gained from contractual cost reductions and equipment relocations within the data centres. This would all occur "behind the scenes". Service will continue seamlessly.
<b>Staff</b>
The only impact on staff will be those who use devices with council SIM cards (mobile phones, tablets, laptops etc.) who will need to change the sim cards to the new O2 ones. This is being co-ordinated, managed and communicated in a way that will cause minimum disruption to staff.
<b>Other Council Services</b>
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services.
<b>Partners</b>
None

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Resources		
<b>Director</b>	IT & Digital		
<b>Service area</b>	ICT		
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk		
<b>Reference</b>	COR08 – IT & Digital Vacant Posts		
<b>Saving title</b>			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Staffing ‘In year’ saving by not recruiting to a number posts within the IT and Digital solution, plans are in place to recruit next year to bolster the service to meet demand		
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	1118	<b>Net £k</b>
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b> <b>0</b>
<b>Risks:</b>			
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No.		
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	30%		
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Posts remain vacant so delays in some work around transformation, data, IT design, and Cyber Security we remain reliant on Shared Technology Services (STS) and Director of IT & Digital.		
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Cyber Security we remain reliant on Shared Technology Services (STS) and Director of IT & Digital.		
<b>Other considerations:</b>			
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer decision		
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>
	<b>In what:</b>		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	none		

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Specific legal or statutory considerations	none
--	------

### 1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
<b>Service Users</b>				
Whilst these changes may delay some work around IT Design and Cyber Security, we remain supported by Shared Technology Services (STS) who are currently supporting the bulk of these activities.				
<b>Staff</b>				
No perceived impact on staff as the posts have always been vacant so for staff, the status quo remains.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
We are reliant more on STS until these posts are filled.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>				N

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Resources			
<b>Director</b>	IT & Digital			
<b>Service area</b>	Programme Management Office (PMO)			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR09 – IT & Digital PMO			
<b>Saving title</b>	Programme Management Office (PMO) savings			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	The Programme Management Office (PMO) will not recruit to a vacant Business Analyst and Project Officer role, making a saving of £60,820.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>11,112</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>665</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	The Programme Management Office (PMO) will only have one Business Analyst role in the team. This will limit the ability to work with numerous service areas across the council and support other service improvements and savings proposals.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	To recruit temporary agency staff via Matrix, the council's agreed agency worker provider.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer decision			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>	N/A		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	None			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

### 1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
There will be a slight impact on service users whereby the Programme Management Office (PMO) will have less capacity for Business Analysis which will limit it's ability to work with numerous service areas across the council and support other service improvements and savings proposals.				
<b>Staff</b>				
There may be an impact on other staff in the Programme Management Office (PMO) with the need to share some of the Business Analyst function amongst the other team members.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
None				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X



**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Resources			
<b>Director</b>	IT & Digital			
<b>Service area</b>	Digital Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
<b>Reference</b>	COR07 – IT & Digital Applications			
<b>Saving title</b>	Digital savings			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Support for the Microsoft Dynamics Customer Relationship Management (CRM) application which supports various services and new Housing Management system transfer from Xpedition Ltd to the in-house team, a saving of 24,835. As we have built up the capability and size of the Digital team, these capabilities can be managed in house. To be achieved from 24/25.</p> <p>Lewisham will cease to use East Peninsular Trading for recruitment and talent acquisition, a saving of 20,000. To be achieved from 23/24.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>11,112,891</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>148,509</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Will no longer use talent acquisition so it may be more difficult to recruit.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	To fill vacant posts with permanent staff where possible or to use Matrix, the council's approved agency worker provider if necessary.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer decision			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	None			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	None			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

### 1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
No impact on service users as there should be a seamless transition from the support for MS Dynamics provided by Xpedition Ltd to the in-house team.				
<b>Staff</b>				
No impact on staff as they will still go through the same contact team.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is no envisaged impact on any other council services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
None				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>				N

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	CYPS - CSC				
Director	Pinaki Ghoshal				
Service area	Children's Social Care				
Cabinet Portfolio	Children & Young People- Cllr Barnham				
Reference	CYP1 – CSC Housing Benefit Claims CYP2 – CSC Placement Payments Efficiency CYP3 – CSC Building Residential Homes CYP4 – CSC S17 & Placements				
Cut title	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Placements: Housing Benefit claims for all Staying Put</li> <li>2. Placements: Payments efficiency for placement providers</li> <li>3. Placements: Building Lewisham children's residential homes</li> <li>4. S17 &amp; Placements: Reduced spot purchasing of youth support</li> </ol>				
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<b>Saving</b>	<b>2023/24</b>	<b>2024/25</b>	<b>2025/26</b>	<b>Total</b>
		<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
	CSC 1	0	80	0	<b>80</b>
	CSC 2	20	180	0	<b>200</b>
	CSC 3	0	390	1,170	<b>1,560</b>
	CSC 4	200	500	500	<b>1,200</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>1,150</b>	<b>1,670</b>	<b>3,040</b>	
Division budget	<b>Gross £k</b>	57,222		<b>Net £k</b>	53,619
Service area budget	<b>Gross £k</b>	57,222		<b>Net £k</b>	53,619
Cut proposed	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£220k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b> <b>2025/26 £k</b>	<b>£1.150m</b> <b>£1.670m</b>
<b>Risks:</b>					
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No				
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%				
Impact of making the cut	<p><u>CSC2</u>: Positive impact – fewer overpayments and interest charges on late payments</p> <p><u>CSC3</u>: Positive impact - less reliance on placement market, more cost control</p> <p><u>CSC4</u>: Negative impact moderate - Could risk more young people entering care, if an alternative is not in place.</p>				
Possible risk mitigation	<u>CSC4</u> : Development of adolescent service to provide alternative 'in house' service				
<b>Other considerations:</b>					
Member or Officer decision	officer				
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff		
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)		
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Y	Cost £k		TBC
In what:	S3: Capital investment for repurposing identified buildings S4: Expansion of 'in house' service as alternative to commissioned resource				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	S2: Requires changes to processes across CYP Services and Finance Payments Service S3: Business Case to be developed.
Specific legal or statutory considerations	

## Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

Impact & Outcomes
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
CYP Directorate CSC Division Savings Proposals.  Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact Saving 3 impact: Placing of children in care in an in-house Lewisham controlled provision as an alternative to commissioning placements, is likely to have a positive impact for those service users placed in the proposed units. Primarily, the provision will be local/in Borough and closer to the child's support network, family, school and community. Secondly as Lewisham will be in control of the provision, we will not be served short notice on placements (as frequently currently experienced). Both factors are likely to result in greater stability and continuity of care for some of our most vulnerable young people in care.
<b>Staff</b>
Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact Saving 3 impact : Developing in house children's home provision will require staffing, depending on the model implemented and whether staffing will be permanent employees or a sub-contracted, internal staff may be suitable for an attracted to new posts, which may have an impact on existing staffing levels in the Children's Directorate.
<b>Other Council Services</b>
Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

Saving 3 – too early at this stage to establish. As part of the Business Case and Programme Management of this proposal a fuller EAA will be completed where this will be explored in detail.				
<b>Partners</b>				
Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact Saving 3 – too early at this stage to establish. As part of the Business Case and Programme Management of this proposal a fuller EAA will be completed where this will be explored in detail.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Disability</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Ethnicity</b>		X For some CYP in care being able to remain in their community, not placed elsewhere in the country that have less cultural/racial diversity.		
<b>Gender</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X No specific impact
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			Y (See notes above)	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	CYP																															
<b>Director</b>	Angela Scattergood																															
<b>Service area</b>	Education – Access, Inclusion and Participation																															
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Cllr Barnham																															
<b>Reference</b>	CYP5 – Primary Phase Commissioning Costs – Management Action CY6 – Participation Team – Management Action																															
<b>Cut title</b>	<p><b>Edu 4. Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management action</b></p> <p><b>Edu 5. Contribution from the Participation Team – Management action</b></p> <p><b>Edu 12. Lewisham Challenge – Management action</b></p> <p><b>Edu 14a. Outreach Inclusion Service – Management action</b></p>																															
<b>Description of cut</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Saving</b></th> <th><b>2023/24</b></th> <th><b>2024/25</b></th> <th><b>Total</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th><b>£'000</b></th> <th><b>£'000</b></th> <th><b>£'000</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Edu 4</td> <td>70</td> <td>30</td> <td><b>100</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 5</td> <td>10</td> <td>0</td> <td><b>10</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 12</td> <td>0</td> <td>40</td> <td><b>40</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 14A</td> <td>70</td> <td>0</td> <td><b>70</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>150</b></td> <td><b>70</b></td> <td><b>220</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Edu 4. Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management action</b> We intend to commission fewer Primary Alternative Provision places from September 2023. This reduction will be five places at £20K so in an academic year £100K saving to the HNB. An in year saving of £70,000 in the 2022-23 budget and a total of £100K in 2024-25. This saving can be achieved as we have not seen the number of commissioned places go above 20 for some time, so there is no reduction in the offer to children.</p> <p><b>Edu 5. Contribution from the Participation Team – Management action</b> We can offer a £10K from the Participation Team as an in-year saving from for European Social Fund (ESF) grant for post-16 tracking work.</p> <p><b>Edu 12. Lewisham Challenge – Management action</b> Is a programme to raise aspirations amongst young people across all of the Lewisham sixth forms and colleges and to inform their decisions about HE and career opportunities. This is a programme unique to Lewisham but a non-statutory function. The target group is 16-18 and is well supported by external organisations (Higher Education, practitioners and employers). The programme is long standing in Lewisham and is coordinated by an external consultant.</p> <p>The proposal is to remove Council this funding for this coordination which is currently through the General Fund and for the Lewisham post-16 providers (sixth forms and colleges) to fund the programme moving forward. Recent legislation, including the Skills Post-16 Education Act 2022 and the Education (Careers Guidance in Schools) Act 2022 has placed further responsibility for careers guidance with schools and providers (rather than the LA). This has already been discussed with the providers who are confident in the programme and want to ensure its continuity; schools,</p>				<b>Saving</b>	<b>2023/24</b>	<b>2024/25</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	Edu 4	70	30	<b>100</b>	Edu 5	10	0	<b>10</b>	Edu 12	0	40	<b>40</b>	Edu 14A	70	0	<b>70</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>Saving</b>	<b>2023/24</b>	<b>2024/25</b>	<b>Total</b>																													
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>																													
Edu 4	70	30	<b>100</b>																													
Edu 5	10	0	<b>10</b>																													
Edu 12	0	40	<b>40</b>																													
Edu 14A	70	0	<b>70</b>																													
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>220</b>																													



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	Higher Education providers and Goldsmiths University have committed to funding.			
	<p><b>Edu 14a. Outreach Inclusion Service – Management action</b></p> <p>There are three elements to this overall savings proposal of £70k.</p> <p>a. We no longer base the Outreach Inclusion Service at New Woodlands School and staff are not based at Laurence House and work remotely. The rental of £18K is no longer required as an expenditure from the budget.</p> <p>b. Finance support has previously brokered with the New Woodlands School at an annual cost of £6K. This ceased from 31<sup>st</sup> July 2023. The Outreach Manager and internal Business Support are managing the finances and will continue to do so moving forward.</p> <p>With changes to the management of the offer a vacant post is now being deleted from the establishment.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	£170,538	<b>Net £k</b>	£15,176
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	£8,563	<b>Net £k</b>	£197
<b>Cut proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£150k</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>£70k</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	All- 100%			
<b>Impact of making the cut</b>	Need to continue to monitor demand for alternative provision places.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Review in September 2024 when management of the provision will move to Grinling Gibbons School.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>N</b>		<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>N</b>		<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>N</b>		<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	n/a			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	n/a			
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
<p><b>Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action</b></p> <p>No impact on services users. Based on three years of analysis less places are required to need. This will be sufficient to support the primary aged children in Lewisham schools.</p> <p><b>Contribution from the Participation Team</b></p> <p>N/A as it is external / additional funding we can contribute. However this is a one-off saving contribution.</p> <p><b>Lewisham Challenge</b></p>				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

If we are unable to maintain external funding from key stakeholders we would need to consider the future of the programme.

### Outreach Inclusion Service

With one less member of staff supporting children in schools it may have an impact on reducing exclusions for Lewisham CYP. However, this work is part of the overall inclusion strategy and initiatives such as Mental Health Support Teams in Schools are being rolled out to more schools across the borough which is likely to offset any impact.

### Staff

#### Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action

N/A no impact on staffing.

#### Contribution from the Participation Team

N/A no impact on staffing.

#### Lewisham Challenge

N/A no impact on staffing.

#### 4. Outreach Inclusion Service

N/A no impact on staffing

### Other Council Services

#### Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action

N/A no impact on other Council services.

#### Contribution from the Participation Team

N/A no impact on other Council services.

#### Lewisham Challenge

N/A no impact on other Council services.

#### Outreach Inclusion Service

No impact on other Council services

### Partners

#### Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action

N/A

#### Contribution from the Participation Team

N/A

#### Lewisham Challenge

N/A

#### Outreach Inclusion Service

New Woodlands School were notified of these changes in Spring 2023, which were implemented in Summer 2023.

### Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>				<b>N</b>

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	CYP		
Director	Angela Scattergood (Pinaki Ghoshal – Executive Director)		
Service area	Education Services - Integrated SEND Services for Children & Young People		
Cabinet Portfolio	Cllr Barnham		
Reference	CYP17 – SEND Travel Assistance CYP18 – Integrated SEND Service		
Cut title	Edu 8 Savings DBV Programme Implementation Grant Edu14 SEN Transport Mitigation work		
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Integrated SEND Service (£100k) – Grant Maximisation (one off) SEN Travel Assistance £150k		
Division budget	Gross £k	£170,538	Net £k
Service area budget	Gross £k	£86,435	Net £k
Savings proposed	2023/24 £k		250k
<b>Risks:</b>			
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%		
Impact of making the cut	<p><b>Edu 8. DBV Programme -Grant Implementation-Mitigation work</b></p> <p>The LA is currently in wave 3 of the Delivering Better Value (DBV) programme and is highly likely to succeed with its bid/grant application for £1million to support continued mitigation work in reducing special educational needs and disabilities SEND spend from April 2024 onwards. The grant application is currently going through the assurer process from Newton Europe and Department for Education (DfE) and feedback so far has been positive.</p> <p>The LA has already demonstrated a strong track record in delivering mitigations such as creating additional local SEND places in special schools and resource bases as well as working with partners, such as local colleges on moderating high needs funding levels for individual learners with Education Health Care Plans (EHCPs).</p> <p>This work related to the DBV programme has required and continues to require protected project management and leadership time as well as capacity in the wider statutory SEND Service to undertake and deliver the ongoing mitigation work.</p> <p>We suggest therefore that 8-10%, e.g. £80k-£100k of the grant when successful, is used in supporting the internal continued staffing cost for wider project management related to high needs mitigation work. Additionally, £32k has already been awarded by the DBV programme for data collection work; this could be added to the overall substitution. We would propose a £132k substitution to the posts funded by the general fund, including Head of Service for SEND post, SEND Data Monitoring Officer, CYP Finance Strategic Lead as a one-off saving.</p> <p><b>Edu14. SEN Travel Assistance for eligible learners: increase of personal travel assistance budgets by 5-8%.</b></p>		

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<p>Currently we have 1,038 children and young people (CYP) who are eligible to be receiving SEND travel assistance, but only 62 of these CYP are accepting/receiving/are provided with a Direct Payment or Personal Travel Assistance Budget to meet their travel assistance needs to school/college and back home. The average unit cost of a Personal Travel Assistance Budget (PTAB) is £2,326.06 per learner per annum, compared to an average unit cost of £9,500 for a learner provided with SEN transport. A cost difference of £7,173.94 per learner per annum.</p> <p>A PTAB Offer or Direct Payments offer can be completely flexible and does not need to be only for a set mileage and a set mileage cost. A PTAB offer would also give families more choice and control. In order to encourage more families to take up the offer of a PTAB, we want to ensure we can make a generous offer to individual families, who are eligible to receive SEND travel assistance for their child, which encourages and enables more choice and control for the family whilst also saving the Council significant amounts of money longer term (as a PTAB is always more cost efficient than providing direct 'transport'). Additionally, it would encourage a long overdue culture change related to expectations of a 'door to door' service and a more comprehensive approach to supporting independence for CYP where this is an appropriate and desirable outcome. A PTAB would be significantly cheaper than the Council needing to commission direct travel assistance in form of taxi or LPS. The parents/carers could commission their own support, may this be a neighbour or retired grandparent taking the eligible child to school, a family booking an Uber for the child and siblings, a family paying for breakfast and/or after school club which allows a parent to also manage multiple school runs better for all siblings.</p> <p>We are proposing that a PTAB can be offered of up to 50% of the value of the average unit cost and this could provide a saving of at least £4,750 per learner accepting this offer.  5% of learners would be 51 C&amp;YP x£4,750= £242,250 pa  8% of learners would be 83 C&amp;YP x£4,750= £394,250 pa</p> <p>We have identified particular groups of learners whom we would want to approach in the first instance, such as our post 16 learners in local provisions in and out of borough. We also want to focus on young people going through a statutory phase transfer, moving on to secondary school.</p>		
Possible risk mitigation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capacity in the Integrated SEND Service- to be monitored</li> <li>2. Limited acceptance of families taking up the offer of a PTABs/Direct Payment options- Comms plan, support for individual families</li> </ol>		
Other considerations:			
Member or Officer decision	Officer		
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	N			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	N			
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
Lewisham C&YP with SEND and their families will be provided with more choice and control. Families not wishing to take up the PTAB will be entitled to their standard transport offer. This PTAB does not impact on eligibility criteria.				
<b>Staff</b>				
Increase in administrative work to ensure PTABS are set up and paid regularly.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
Reduction in need for Lewisham Passenger Services will need to be monitored.				
<b>Partners</b>				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications?</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	
<b>Age</b>				
<b>Disability</b>				
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
<b>Gender</b>				
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				
<b>Religion and belief</b>				
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>		A positive impact could be that more families have more choice and control and the funds to make their own travel arrangements for their children.		

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Children & Young People																																							
<b>Director</b>	Angela Scattergood																																							
<b>Service area</b>	Education services																																							
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Cllr Barnham																																							
<b>Reference</b>	Edu 6,7,10,11 CYP18 – Grant Funding to Support Lewisham Learning CYP19 – Early Years Block Grant Maximisation CYP20 – Lewisham Virtual School Efficiencies (Edu 11- DUPLICATE)																																							
<b>Cut title</b>	Edu6 - Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.  Edu7 – Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation  Edu10- Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School  Edu11 - Overspend reduction measure – Time off for trade union activities (TOFTUA) and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) charges																																							
<b>Description of cut</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Saving</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Edu 6</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 7</td> <td>0</td> <td>35</td> <td>100</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 10</td> <td>61</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 11</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>91</b></td> <td><b>35</b></td> <td><b>100</b></td> <td><b>226</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Edu 6 - Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.</b> Saving relates to cost reduction £15k Since the beginning of the academic year the Lewisham Learning Project Manager post has been vacant. In parallel with this Lewisham has been successful in securing a grant from the Violence Reduction Unit for work supporting primary schools. This funding includes an allocation to provide administrative support for the project. The intention is therefore to recruit to a full-time post, but however part fund this through the grant allocation. It is estimated that this will save £15k within the current financial year.</p> <p><b>Edu 7. Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation</b> The Early Years Block enables LA to holdback 5% of the total 3 and 4 year old funding. This proposal suggests that a total of £135k is put forward as a grant maximisation saving. This would be phased £35k in 2024/25 and further £100k in 2025/26.</p> <p>The Government has agreed to an extension of the Early Years entitlement offer including free childcare for children from the age of 9 months. The implementation of the new offer will take time to embed, for this reason the saving is phased in as stated. To support this extension additional grant funding has also been made available to the LA. As the</p>					Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	Edu 6	15	0	0	15	Edu 7	0	35	100	135	Edu 10	61	0	0	61	Edu 11	15	0	0	15	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>226</b>
Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total																																				
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000																																				
Edu 6	15	0	0	15																																				
Edu 7	0	35	100	135																																				
Edu 10	61	0	0	61																																				
Edu 11	15	0	0	15																																				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>226</b>																																				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<p>number of children attending pre-school provision increase as more families access free provision, the income the LA will also increase.</p> <p><b>Edu 10. Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School</b>  This saving relates to review and of contracts and service level agreements across the activities of the Virtual School to ensure best use of funding. There will be no reduction to direct statutory support for children which is mainly funded through ring-fenced Pupil Premium funding. The Pupil Premium has specific grant conditions which we cannot deviate from.  The service funding of £2,043k for 23/24:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>DSG - High Needs</td> <td style="text-align: right;">948,119</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pupil Premium - CLA</td> <td style="text-align: right;">867,790</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">100,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Virtual School Extended Duties</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Extension of the Role of Virtual School Heads</td> <td style="text-align: right;">47,972</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pupil Premium Plus (PP+) post-16</td> <td style="text-align: right;">78,200</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Edu 11 - Overspend reduction measure, TOFTUA and DBS) Saving relates to cost reduction £15k.</b>  This saving relates to a Lewisham schools forum decision (October 2023, as part of its de-delegation arrangements) to a full reimbursement model for schools for trade union cover, ensuring that there is equity across schools in funding this activity and in reimbursement for those schools who have elected local union representatives, for their actual costs. Under the current arrangements, the Local Authority and specific schools (i.e. those with elected reps.) and are subsidising TOFTUA arrangements across the borough. It based on a historic formula, rather than activity and the full cost of covering these members of staff.  Lewisham Council and schools forum remains committed to supporting the role that local trade unions play in maintaining good employee relations, communication and representing individual employees. This proposal does not make any changes to level of activity.  The budget in question relates mainly to the teacher trade unions, including NEU, which also welcomes all school-based staff. Facilities time for the main recognised support staff unions (UNISON, GMB, UNITE) is funded by the corporate Council.  In addition, future charging to schools to use the DBS service will include the reimbursement of administrative the costs.</p>					DSG - High Needs	948,119	Pupil Premium - CLA	867,790		100,000	Virtual School Extended Duties		Extension of the Role of Virtual School Heads	47,972	Pupil Premium Plus (PP+) post-16	78,200
DSG - High Needs	948,119															
Pupil Premium - CLA	867,790															
	100,000															
Virtual School Extended Duties																
Extension of the Role of Virtual School Heads	47,972															
Pupil Premium Plus (PP+) post-16	78,200															
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>£170,538k</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	<b>£15,176k</b>												
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	<b>£4,319k</b>	<b>Net £k</b>	<b>£197k</b>												
<b>Savings proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£91k</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b> <b>2025/26 £k</b>	<b>£35k</b> <b>£100k</b>												
<b>Risks:</b>																
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	<b>No</b>															
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	6 - 100% 7 – 70% 10 - 95% 11- 100%															
<b>Impact of making the cut</b>	<b>6 - No impact given the additional grant funding</b>															



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	7 - One key risk is that as the new entitlement offer is being rolled out, there is a possibility that the 5% holdback that LA's are allowed to centrally managed could be reduced to 3%- DfE communication will be monitored 10 – The Virtual School service is demand led and a statutory requirement on LA's 11 – Education service will no longer subsidise shortfall in costs.		
Possible risk mitigation	6 - N/A 7 - It is unclear exactly what the government's intentions are here. A reduction in the percentage funding that we hold back may however be offset by a large increase in the number of children receiving free early years childcare. 10 - There will be no reduction in direct statutory support to children 11 – N/A		
<b>Other considerations:</b>			
Member or Officer decision	Officer Schools Forum where relevant		
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k N
	In what:		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N		
Specific legal or statutory considerations	6 – N 7 – Grant conditions will be met. 10 - LA are required to provide Virtual School services as part of their statutory requirements. Grant conditions will be met. 11 - N		
<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>			
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>			
<b>Service Users</b>			
<b>Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.</b> There is no anticipated impact on service users. The support to schools and delivery of services will not be affected.			
<b>Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation</b> There will be no impact on service users.			
<b>Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School</b> There will be no reduction in direct statutory support to children			
<b>Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges</b> None			
<b>Staff</b>			
<b>Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.</b>			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

There is no anticipated impact on staff. The recruitment process will be in line with Lewisham guidance and the post will be advertised externally.

### Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation

There will be no impact on staff.

### Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School

None envisaged

### Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges

None

## Other Council Services

### Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.

There is no anticipated impact on other council services.

### Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation

There is no impact on other council services.

### Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School

None envisaged

### Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges

None

## Partners

### Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.

There is no anticipated impact on partners.

### Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation

There is no impact on partners.

### Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School

None envisaged

### Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges

Arrangements for school funding of the activity has been agreed by schools forum

**Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.**

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				<b>x</b>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				<b>x</b>
<b>Religion and belief</b>				<b>x</b>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				<b>x</b>
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				<b>x</b>
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			NO	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	CYPS – Education
<b>Director</b>	Angela Scattergood (Pinaki Ghoshal – Executive Director)
<b>Service area</b>	Education
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Children & Young People- Cllr Barnham
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Cut title</b>	1. <u>Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges</u>
<b>Description of cut</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Saving relates to cost reduction £15k</p> <p>Lewisham Council strongly supports the principle of collective bargaining and recognises the role that local trade unions can play in maintaining good employee relations, assisting communication between the authority and its workforce, as well as representing individual employees.</p> <p>Schools Forum has supported the process of ‘de-delegation’ for a number of years now in relation to Lewisham maintained schools. The Forum has recognised the value of having a consistent group of experienced trade union representatives to work with on a borough wide basis. The budget in question relates mainly to the teacher trade unions. However, the inception of the National Education Union (NEU) means that this large union welcomes members from all school based staff. Facilities time for the main recognised support staff unions (UNISON, GMB, UNITE) is funded by the corporate Council. Previously the TOFTUA support was allocated on the basis of an historic formula.</p> <p>The unions elect their representatives democratically. This can present a challenge for schools when they find a member of their staff has been elected and may be required to have time off for a regular day/days per week. In addition the current reimbursement arrangements within the policy do not cover the full cost of absent members of staff.</p> <p>The consequences, although unintended are that specific schools and the Local Authority were subsidising TOFTUA arrangements.</p> <p>At its meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2023, Schools forum supported the full reimbursement model for trade union cover as part of its de-delegation arrangements.</p> <p>This means, that the previous shortfall in funding is no longer the case. Relative to 2022/23, the Education service will no longer subsidise this cost.</p> <p>The service also provides a DBS service. future costs will include the reimbursement of Administrative costs.</p>

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Savings proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b> <b>2025/26 £k</b>	
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the cut</b>				
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>				
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>				
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	<b>N</b>
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Children & Young People			
<b>Director</b>	Angela Scattergood			
<b>Service area</b>	Education Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Cllr Barnham			
<b>Reference</b>	CYP9 – Short Breaks Review			
<b>Cut title</b>	Edu 9. Savings from Short Breaks Review- Targeted & Specialist Short Breaks including CHC cases.			
<b>Description of cut</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p><b>Targeted Short Breaks:</b> We are currently reviewing the criteria for targeted short breaks as they currently focus on diagnosis and Disability Living Allowance which give a generic need but does not factor elements such as severity of need and other support available to the child.</p> <p><b>Specialist Short Breaks:</b> Over time the spot purchasing of support has increased, especially related to carer support and domiciliary care. We are proposing to review commissioning arrangements, reduce the level of support spot-purchased (which is typically more expensive than using an agreed contract) and will also explore the opportunity of increasing our in-house offer if we can evidence better value for money.</p> <p><b>Contributions to Continuing Health Care (CHC awarded by Health) Packages:</b> We are currently contributing over £1million per annum for children who are eligible to receive continuing health care packages via the ICB. We are proposing a review of these historical agreements as well as a policy review as we are of the view that it should not be that social care has to subsidise care packages for children with often acute nursing needs.</p> <p>The estimate of the savings achieved is £150k. This may increase once further work has been done in this area.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	£170,538	<b>Net £k</b>	£15,176
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	£86,435	<b>Net £k</b>	£14,172
<b>Savings proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b> <b>2025/26 £k</b>	<b>£150k</b> <b>£0</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	70%			
<b>Impact of making the cut</b>	<p>Reluctance of ICB/CHC to cover costs of care packages for health reasons.</p> <p>Changes to Targeted Short Breaks may lead to some children receiving increased packages of support and others receiving less. Families in the latter group are unlikely to welcome such a reduction.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	In relation to changes in criteria for targeted support we will need to communicate openly with families about the changes proposed and why. Some initial exploration has identified discrepancies in the levels			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	of support that children receive. We will ensure effective consultation and communication with families. In relation to the ICB health contribution this will need to involve on-going negotiation with our Health partners			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	Y/N	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Y	<b>Cost £k</b>	N
	<b>In what:</b>	Not known at present – development of increased in-house provision is likely to involve some investment if this is deemed to be the best way forward. This would be met through reduced spend on contracted provision.		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	N			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	N			
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
Some CYP and their families may receive a reduced level of service, whilst others may receive more and/or additional children and young people may become eligible for targeted short breaks. A full assessment of impact will be carried out as part of the review.				
<b>Staff</b>				
No impact on staff.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
No impact				
<b>Partners</b>				
ICB- negotiations at senior level to agree way forward				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications?</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>		Potential negative or positive impact on some C&YP with SEND in service level changes- will be assessed as part of EAA of the review		
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>			Potential negative or positive impact on some C&YP with SEND in service level changes- will be assessed as part of EAA of the review	
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			Y (will be undertaken as part of review)	



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	Children & Young People										
	Sara Rahman										
	Families, Quality & Commissioning										
	Cllr Barnham										
	CYP11 - FQC Reduction in Business Support CYP12 – FQC Grant Maximisation CYP13 – FQC Sale of Capital Asset CYP14 – FQC Children’s Centre Revenue CYP15 – FQC Staffing Costs Reduction										
	<p>1. <u>Reduction in Business Support to FQC.</u> Following changes in responsibilities across both Children’s Social Care and Families Quality &amp; Commissioning changes in business support (still largely delivered by staff within CSC are required. It is expected that this can lead to efficiencies given changes in ways of working and staffing restructures more widely within FQC. In addition grant funding will be used for some of the administrative support where appropriate).</p> <p>2. <u>Grant maximisation (inc Family Hubs).</u> Increasingly FQC have been in receipt of a range of different grants, including the Family Hub grants and Enhance grant from the DfE. Other smaller grants from the VRU have also been gained. Some use of grant funding for some activity previously funded through the General Fund is possible.</p> <p>3. <u>Sale of a capital asset.</u> The directorate has continued responsibility for a building in Honor Oak (Honor Oak Depot), which historically was used to support Children’s Centre delivery. This site has not been delivery a Children’s Centre offer for some time and is currently used for accommodating a small service which could be delivered elsewhere. The building is within the Honor Oak estate (and Opposite the Honor Oak Youth Centre which is about to become a Family Hub, supported by additional capital investment. The site is valued at £850k and is no longer required. Given its location it would be suitable to be redeveloped for social housing (HRA funding) or temporary accommodation. Further discussions will be required with colleagues across the Council to consider how the site might best be used to support residents. No decision about this has yet been made.</p> <p>4. <u>Children’s Centre Revenue saving.</u> With the changes to service delivery (from Children’s Centres to Family Hubs) and improved multi-agency working, there is expected to be a permanent saving to Children’s Centre running costs. As the Family Hubs programme develops there will be some overlaps with the current Children’s Centre delivery with opportunities for efficiencies. In the longer term, new Family Hubs in sites that are not previously Children’s Centres (2 or 3 depending on a final decision for Kaleidoscope) will provide an opportunity to ensure more integrated service delivery in hubs, supported by a lower level of support in spokes leading to less activity in Children’s Centres that are not Family Hubs.</p> <p>5. <u>Reduction in staffing costs</u> The division has already been managing with a number of vacant posts following previous restructures. It is projected that this will deliver an additional saving of £350k over and above previous projections.</p>										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Saving</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total					
Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total							

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	FQC 1	0	100	0	£100
	FQC 2	150	0	0	£150
	FQC 3*	0	850	0	£850
	FQC 4	0	50	0	£50
	FQC 5*	350	0	0	£350
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>£1500</b>
	<b>*Denotes one off savings</b>				
	<b>Gross £k</b>		15,141	<b>Net £k</b>	8,328
	<b>Gross £k</b>		15,141	<b>Net £k</b>	8,328
	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>£500k</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>£1m</b>
				<b>2025/26 £k</b>	<b>£0</b>
<b>Risks:</b>					
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>		No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>		70%			
	<p><b>FQC 1:</b> Potential impact on business support capacity – low risk</p> <p><b>FQC 3:</b> This assumes the sale of a capital asset as a one off cost saving to the General Fund. As noted above this will require further work to support delivery of the saving.</p> <p><b>FQC 2 &amp; 4:</b> Careful management is required here as we move away from the previous Children's Centre delivery model to the new Family Hub model. This is intended to improve outcome for children and families as it involves greater multi-agency working and a 'one stop shop' for families seeking support.</p>				
	See above				
<b>Other considerations:</b>					
	Most are Officer BUT Member decision re capital assets				
	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>		
	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>		
	<b>Y/N</b>	Y	<b>Cost £k</b>	N	
	<b>In what:</b>	Investment already identified to support the Family Hub programme – approximately £4.5M over three years, grant funded			

## Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact [policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:policy@lewisham.gov.uk)

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
<p>Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 1 (FQC1):</u> Positive Impact– Changes in business support responsibilities across Children’s Social Care and Families, Quality and Commissioning are ongoing, which will ensure a consistent level of business support across the division. Saving efficiencies within FQC due to changes to ways of working will not impact service users negatively.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 2 (FQC 2):</u> Neutral Impact – FQC are in receipt of a range of grants. Service users will experience no change in service delivery resulting in the maximisation of grant fundings and the reduced need for General Fund.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 3 (FQC 3):</u> Neutral Impact – Discussions are at an early stage regarding plans for the disposal/sale of the site. Whilst no decision has been made yet, plans to relocate the small service, currently based on site, will ensure delivery from another location and therefore will have no negative impact on service users.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 4 (FQC 4):</u> Positive Impact – plans to redesign service delivery from Children and Family Centres are currently underway. These changes will create a seamless and consistent offer of support that will further prevent inequality of access to service provision. The overall impact for service users will be positive with anticipated increase in access and more targeted provision to ensure we reach and engage more families from communities not currently accessing existing provision.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 5 (FQC 5):</u> Neutral Impact – The division will continue to maintain existing vacancies. Service users will not be directly impacted as there will be no changes to service delivery.</p>
<b>Staff</b>
<p>Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 1 . (FQC1):</u> Positive Impact – Changes in business support responsibilities across Children’s Social Care and Families, Quality and Commissioning are ongoing, which will ensure a consistent level of business support across the division, create efficiencies and identify gaps and/or duplication in ways of working. Efficiencies within FQC business support function due to changes to ways of working will not impact staff negatively and there are no redundancies expected.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 2 (FQC 2):</u> Neutral Impact – FQC are in receipt of a range of grants. Staff will experience no change in service delivery or ways of working resulting in the maximisation of grant fundings and the reduced need for General Fund.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 3 (FQC 3):</u> Neutral Impact – Discussions are at an early stage regarding plans for the disposal/sale of the site. Whilst no decision has been made yet, plans to relocate the small service, currently based on site, will ensure delivery from another location and therefore will have no negative impact on staff.</p>

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Savings proposal 4 (FQC 4): Neutral Impact – plans to redesign service delivery from Children and Family Centres are currently underway. These changes will create a seamless and consistent offer of support that will further prevent inequality of access to service provision. The redesign will have no direct impact on council staff.

Savings proposal 5 (FQC 5): Neutral Impact – The division will continue to maintain existing vacancies. Service users will not be directly impacted as there will be no changes to service delivery.

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Housing Services			
<b>Director</b>	Fen Beckman			
<b>Service area</b>	Private Sector Licensing and Home Improvements			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
<b>Reference</b>	HSG1 – Capitalise Posts to DSG			
<b>Saving title</b>	Capitalise posts to Disabled Facilities Grant			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The Housing Improvements and Assistance team work to support homeowners to adapt their homes to meet their changing needs through the distribution of loans and facilitating the construction/building works to enable them to continue to live independently. These loans include the Disabled Facilities Grant, (DFG), and other capital grants such as the Empty Homes Grant.</p> <p>In addition to the team manager, there are four surveyors, three of who work on DFG projects, an Empty Homes Officer, two Health and Housing Officers and two Programme Coordinators who provide administration support to the surveyors and disburse the grants. All except two posts have been capitalised to their relevant capital grants. Recent analysis of activity has highlighted that the team manager (PO6) spends at least 50% of her time on DFG work and the second coordinator, (SO1), also spends at least 75% of their time on DFG projects.</p> <p>This proposal is to therefore to capitalise 50% of the Team Manager salary and 75% of the Coordinator salary to the DFG. This equates to;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team Manager (50% of PO6) - £35,901</li> <li>• Programme Coordinator (75% of SO1) - £37,408</li> <li>• Total to be capitalised = 73,309</li> </ul>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	54,015,896	<b>Net £k</b>	3,883,337
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	1,817,952	<b>Net £k</b>	-148,483
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£73</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	0
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	N			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	There will be no impact to service being delivered to our clients. This saving can be made in 2023/24.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Not Applicable			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	Not Applicable
	<b>In what:</b>	Not Applicable		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>				
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Not applicable			

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
<b>Service Users</b>				
There is no impact to service users				
<b>Staff</b>				
There is no impact to staff as this proposals just changes the funding stream from which the post is paid.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is no impact to other Council services				
<b>Partners</b>				
There is no impact to our partner organisations				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Housing Services			
<b>Director</b>	Fen Beckman			
<b>Service area</b>	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
<b>Reference</b>	HSG2 – Capitalisation of Housing Casework Officer to HRA			
<b>Saving title</b>	Capitalise salary of the Housing Casework Officer to the HRA			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	This proposal is to capitalise the salary cost of the Housing Casework Officer post which is currently in the Housing Needs and Refugee Services/Housing Strategy Division establishment but will be moving to the new Directorate Casework Team in the Residents Engagement and Services Division from 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2023. The post will be incorporated into the former Lewisham House Customer Relations Team and the remit for the role will extend to include housing management casework.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	54,015,896	<b>Net £k</b>	8,383,337
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	51,577,572	<b>Net £k</b>	9,276,448
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	There will be no impact to service users as this is essentially a change in the funding stream for the post.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	Not Applicable			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Number of staff</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	Not Applicable	<b>Audience(s)</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	Not Applicable	<b>Cost £k</b>	Not Applicable
	<b>In what:</b>	Not Applicable		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Not Applicable			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Not Applicable			

<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>
<b>Service Users</b>
There is no impact to service users
<b>Staff</b>
There is no impact to staff as this proposals just changes the funding stream from which the post is paid.

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is no impact to other Council services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
There is no impact to our partner organisations.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Housing Services			
<b>Director</b>	Fen Beckman			
<b>Service area</b>	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
<b>Reference</b>	HSG3 – TA Reduction Project			
<b>Saving title</b>	Increase savings from the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Project			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>This would be an additional savings target to further reduce spend on temporary accommodation, building on the actions already being taken through the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan. The focus will be on procuring temporary accommodation that is an alternative to hotels/nightly paid accommodation that leads to a reduction in the limitation recharge, extracting more savings from the existing workstreams and identifying any new areas of activity.</p> <p>The TA Reduction Project is currently due to deliver £1m over the next three years, with £200k in 23/24, £300k in 24/25 and £500k in 25/26. This proposal is to increase the savings target for 2024/25 to £500k, which is an additional £200k.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	54,015,896	<b>Net £k</b>	8,383,337
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>	51,577,572	<b>Net £k</b>	9,276,448
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	Work is already underway to achieve the existing savings and from this work we believe there is potential to achieve more.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>				
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Number of staff</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Audience(s)</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	N	<b>Cost £k</b>	Not Applicable
	<b>In what:</b>	Not applicable		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Some of the additional savings to be realised is dependent on acquisition programme delivering new properties for TA.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Homelessness duties apply – cannot refuse TA where there is a statutory obligation to provide it. However, there is some flexibility in location and type of accommodation.			

**What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?**

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Service Users</b>				
This proposal is not expected to impact on service users as the savings will be achieved from implementing more efficient processes within the temporary accommodation service.				
<b>Staff</b>				
This proposal is not expected to impact directly on staff.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is no impact to other Council services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
There is no impact to our partner organisations.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Housing Services			
Director	Fen Beckman			
Service area	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
Reference	HSG4 – Reduction of Property Negotiator Posts			
<b>Saving title</b>				
Reduction of two Property Negotiator posts				
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)				
<p>The Accommodation Supply establishment has four Property Negotiator posts all funded from the General Fund. This proposal is to reduce the General Fund allocation by the equivalent of two posts in 2024/25. Unless alternative funding, (eg Home Office), is secured this will lead to a reduction of two posts in the team.</p> <p>The Accommodation Supply team is responsible for procuring accommodation to meet the needs of services across the Council; this includes temporary accommodation as well as accommodation for discharge of duty into the PRS. The team includes the Accommodation Supply Manager, one Technical Surveyor who works primarily on repairs and maintenance of Private Sector Leased (PSL) properties due to be handed back to landlords as well as working with landlords and their agents to ensure that the standard of leased accommodation is high. The team also includes four Property Negotiators who are primarily responsible for sourcing accommodation to ensure that the numbers of people in TA reduces, and supply of accommodation meets the demands on the Housing Needs service and other Council services.</p> <p>There are just under 2800 households in temporary accommodation on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2023 and the homelessness service continues to face increasing demand for support from residents in housing need. There is however a significant shortage of properties in the private rented sector for our officers to procure for use as TA or to discharge our homelessness duties.</p> <p>This shortage has been a result of landlords exiting the rental market due to a number of changes to the tax system which has increased the amount of tax payable on both the purchase of a buy-to-let property and its rental income, this has then been compounded by the rapid rise in interest rates earlier this year ultimately reducing viability for landlords. The result has been a significant reduction in properties available for officers to procure. During the first six months of this year, we procured a total 154 properties for all our housing duties including prevention, discharge of duty, rough sleepers, refugee resettlement and ex-offender accommodation etc. In 21/22 we had procured 245 in the same period, this is about 40% reduction in activity. Below are the total number of <u>new</u> properties (PMAs and PSLs) procured for temporary accommodation by the team between April and September of the following years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21/22 - 60</li> <li>• 22/23 - 47</li> <li>• 23/24 –27</li> </ul> <p>The reduction of two Property Negotiator posts is a reflection of the very challenging environment that the service is operating in and as there are no properties for staff to procure this proposal seeks to reduce the team by half.</p>				
Division budget	Gross £	54,015,896	Net £	8,383,337M
Service area budget	Gross £	51,577,572	Net £	9,276,448
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	113
<b>Risks:</b>				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N		No		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		100%		
Impact of making the saving	The impact of making this saving is a reduction in the number of officers searching for properties for our families in housing need and a reduction in the overall capacity of the service to work with existing landlords and clients.			
Possible risk mitigation	The Accommodation Supply team will continue to retain two Property Negotiator posts. The remaining officers will work to secure the few properties that come onto the market as well as to negotiate with our existing landlords to keep our families in their properties and reduce the number of properties due to be handed back.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	Yes (Possibly)	Number of staff	2
Public consultation	Y/N	No	Audience(s)	Not Applicable
	Y/N	No	Cost £k	Not Applicable

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>In what:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Not Applicable	
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	This proposal would need to be implemented using the Council's Management of Change policy. There is no savings in 23/24 due to change management processes and timescales.	

<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
There is low impact to service users, ie our homeless households, as the number of new PRS properties that the team have been procuring has been very few and significantly below original targets set out in the Accommodation Supply Strategy. The remaining officers in the team will continue to access available supply of property in the market for our homeless households.				
<b>Staff</b>				
There will be an impact to staff as two posts are proposed to be deleted from the staffing establishment. Any vacancies that exist at the time of implementation will be included as part of the process. This will be done through the Council's Change Management process.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is no impact to other Council services				
<b>Partners</b>				
There is no impact to our partner organisations				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>				N

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Housing Services			
<b>Director</b>	Fen Beckman			
<b>Service area</b>	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
<b>Reference</b>	HSG5 – Cease Contribution to Capital Letters			
<b>Saving title</b>	Stop contribution to Capital Letters for Property Negotiator role			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Lewisham is a member borough of Capital Letters, a pan London organisation working with ten London councils and private landlords to find homes for our homeless families in the private rented sector. Member boroughs currently have the option of either seconding staff to Capital Letters or paying the salary cost of officers who are then employed by Capital Letters. Lewisham has chosen to pay the cost equivalent to the salary of one Property Negotiator which is £50,000.</p> <p>However, there is an unprecedented housing and homelessness crisis nationally and particularly in London, compounded by the cost-of-living crisis. Property listings have reduced by 41% since lifting the pandemic restrictions with only 2.3% of properties at LHA levels (down from 19% in 2020/21) and 25 applicants for each property listed. This has increased average rents by 23% in London, making them ever more inaccessible to those on low income or benefits. As a result, all London Boroughs are struggling to find sufficient good quality properties – whether PRS or PSL – to house those for whom they owe a duty, and costs of TA are escalating (£60m per month collectively).</p> <p>Capital Letters have not been able to acquire substantial numbers of affordable PRS properties for boroughs to use for discharge of duty. Capital Letters were offering 400 PRS properties a month to members but this year the projection is 300 for the entire 2023/24 year. It is therefore not sustainable to continue to pay for Negotiator roles when they are not able to deliver the outcomes, (properties), Boroughs need.</p> <p>This proposal is to stop paying Capital Letters the equivalent of an officer post and to make different arrangements with Capital Letters in return for access to any properties that they procure. Capital Letters have had discussions with Member Boroughs on alternatives to staff secondment.</p>			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	54,015,896	<b>Net £</b>	8,383,337xx
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £</b>	51,577,572	<b>Net £</b>	9,276,448
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>		<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	100%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	The impact of making this saving is a reduction in the number of officers searching for properties for our families in housing need and a reduction in the overall capacity of the service to work with existing landlords and clients.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	We will retain a couple of Negotiator posts in-house to work on renewal of tenancies and to work with landlords to access what supply there is still available.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	Not Applicable to LBL	<b>Number of staff</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Audience(s)</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	No	<b>Cost £k</b>	Not Applicable
	<b>In what:</b>	Not Applicable		
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	Not Applicable			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	Not Applicable			

Impact & Outcomes

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
<b>Service Users</b>				
There is very low impact to service users, ie our homeless households, as the number of new PRS properties that we have received have been very few and significantly below original targets. It should also be noted that the Council still has a Procurement team who are bringing in properties.				
<b>Staff</b>				
There is no direct impact to staff working in the Council as the funding was given to Capital Letters as a contribution to their staffing budgets and they employed the Property Negotiators.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
The Capital Letters Property Negotiator role was supposed to bring in PRS properties to use for our homeless households. These properties would be additional to what the in-house Property Negotiators procure. There is very low impact to the Procurement Team in the TA Service as the Capital Letters Property Negotiator role was not giving value for money with very low numbers of properties being secured.				
<b>Partners</b>				
There is no impact to our partner organisations				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Place																																																						
<b>Director</b>	Patrick Dubeck																																																						
<b>Service area</b>	Inclusive Regeneration																																																						
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Housing Development and Planning- Cllr Dacres																																																						
<b>Reference</b>	PLA01 – Council Offices Rationalisation																																																						
<b>Saving title</b>																																																							
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The Council’s Catford office estate is made up of five buildings - Laurence House, Civic Suite, 9 Holbeach Road, Town Hall Chambers and Eros House. The table below summarises the current running cost for the complex:</p> <p><u>Catford Complex Running Cost 2022/23</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Rent</th> <th>Rates</th> <th>Utilities</th> <th>FM Costs</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Decarbonisation Cost</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Laurence House</td> <td>£0</td> <td>£601,160</td> <td>£507,678</td> <td>£762,110</td> <td><b>£1,870,948</b></td> <td>£2,083,160</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town Hall Chambers</td> <td>£0</td> <td>£69,938</td> <td>£13,192</td> <td>£51,555</td> <td><b>£134,685</b></td> <td>£1,100,006</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Civic Suite</td> <td>£0</td> <td>£105,336</td> <td>£329,247</td> <td>£96,006</td> <td><b>£530,589</b></td> <td>£228,371</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eros House</td> <td>£282,100</td> <td>£47,880</td> <td>£39,918</td> <td>£63,477</td> <td><b>£433,375</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Holbeach House</td> <td>£75,000</td> <td>£50,274</td> <td>£28,606</td> <td>£51,616</td> <td><b>£205,496</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>£357,100</b></td> <td><b>£874,588</b></td> <td><b>£918,641</b></td> <td><b>£1,024,764</b></td> <td><b>£3,175,093</b></td> <td><b>£3,411,537</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As part of a wider and ongoing asset review, officers have been reviewing possibilities for office consolidation to realise savings or generate income. This builds on work already undertaken over previous years to rationalise the estate and resulted in the conversion of the Old Town Hall into a Public Sector Hub with a current net income of circa £400k a year.</p> <p>Laurence House is the Council’s core office building and pre-Covid was the office base for around 1700 staff plus the CCG. Since Covid and with new and more agile ways of working, office utilisation in the traditional sense, has declined significantly and even with the new Housing Directorate occupying space in the building, occupation levels are still below capacity and significantly lower than pre Covid usage. This provides an opportunity for further consolidation into Laurence House. In the short-term as identified in the adopted Catford Town Centre framework, it is intended that Laurence House will remain the Council’s primary office location.</p>							Rent	Rates	Utilities	FM Costs	Total	Decarbonisation Cost	Laurence House	£0	£601,160	£507,678	£762,110	<b>£1,870,948</b>	£2,083,160	Town Hall Chambers	£0	£69,938	£13,192	£51,555	<b>£134,685</b>	£1,100,006	Civic Suite	£0	£105,336	£329,247	£96,006	<b>£530,589</b>	£228,371	Eros House	£282,100	£47,880	£39,918	£63,477	<b>£433,375</b>		Holbeach House	£75,000	£50,274	£28,606	£51,616	<b>£205,496</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>£357,100</b>	<b>£874,588</b>	<b>£918,641</b>	<b>£1,024,764</b>	<b>£3,175,093</b>	<b>£3,411,537</b>
	Rent	Rates	Utilities	FM Costs	Total	Decarbonisation Cost																																																	
Laurence House	£0	£601,160	£507,678	£762,110	<b>£1,870,948</b>	£2,083,160																																																	
Town Hall Chambers	£0	£69,938	£13,192	£51,555	<b>£134,685</b>	£1,100,006																																																	
Civic Suite	£0	£105,336	£329,247	£96,006	<b>£530,589</b>	£228,371																																																	
Eros House	£282,100	£47,880	£39,918	£63,477	<b>£433,375</b>																																																		
Holbeach House	£75,000	£50,274	£28,606	£51,616	<b>£205,496</b>																																																		
<b>Total</b>	<b>£357,100</b>	<b>£874,588</b>	<b>£918,641</b>	<b>£1,024,764</b>	<b>£3,175,093</b>	<b>£3,411,537</b>																																																	

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

	<p>Of the other buildings in the complex, 9 Holbeach Road and Eros House are the only other two actively used office bases for Council teams. The former, 9 Holbeach Road, is the subject of this proposal.</p> <p>The building is currently the base for about 100 staff across a number of services including Crime Reduction Service, Environmental Health and also houses the front-line Youth Offending Service.</p> <p>The building is leased from CRPL on a full repairing and insuring basis at a rent of circa £75,000, a year. The current lease term is nearing expiry but has been extended previously and the Council can do so again. Building related operating costs for the property are approximately £200,000 a year, including rent. This is separate from other service specific costs such as security costs, which are borne by services as required. As part of the current lease obligation, the Council has planned works to the building estimated at over £300k, including refurbishment of the roof.</p> <p>In line with the ongoing office rationalisation, it is proposed that the Council issues notice on its lease at Holbeach and staff and services moved to other buildings in the complex, primarily Laurence House. Many of the back-office functions currently operated from Holbeach can be moved relatively easily to the upper floors of Laurence House. However, front-line services, particularly Youth Offending Service, would require specific relocation consideration.</p> <p>The former Catford Library space in Laurence House is not currently occupied and is an option for the relocation of Holbeach Road located services. It however requires extensive refurbishment and remodelling, including an upgrade of the mechanical heating and ventilation system in order to accommodate new uses. The current estimated cost to refurbish the space is £900k and is unfunded.</p> <p>The table below provides a summary of the capital costs and the projected savings to the Place Directorate for implementing this proposal.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Projected Savings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2024/25</td> <td>£100k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025/26</td> <td>£105k</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>£205k</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This projected savings in the above table represents all the building related costs currently incurred by the FM (Corporate Resources Directorate) and the Property and Estates Team (Place Directorate). Therefore, the savings will be accrued across separate budget lines.</p>			Projected Savings		2024/25	£100k	2025/26	£105k	<b>Total</b>	<b>£205k</b>
Projected Savings											
2024/25	£100k										
2025/26	£105k										
<b>Total</b>	<b>£205k</b>										
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>								



## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	£100
<b>Risks:</b>				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	60%			
Impact of making the saving	As noted above, staff working in Holbeach will need to move to a new location currently proposed to be Laurence House. While most of the back-office functions can be relatively easily accommodated on the upper floors of Laurence House, new and separate accommodation will be required for the Youth Offending Service because of the front line and specific nature of service delivery.			
Possible risk mitigation	<p><b>Alternative Accommodation:</b> Suitable alternative accommodation cannot be found for the front-line services in Holbeach, particularly Youth Offending Service, which requires a safe, welcoming, and discreet space to be able to deliver their service.</p> <p><u>Mitigation:</u> The space in Laurence House formerly occupied by the Catford Library could be remodelled. There are other alternative sites in the Catford complex that will form part of options analysis, in consultation with the service.</p> <p><b>Empty 9 Holbeach Road:</b> The implication of this proposal is that the Council surrenders its lease on 9 Holbeach Road and hands it back to CRPL. This could result in loss of income to CRPL.</p> <p><u>Mitigation:</u> The current phasing of the Catford Framework Plan suggests that the Holbeach site is in the latter phases of delivery which means that the building could be in situ for another 10-15 years. This provides the potential for CRPL to relet the property to support its income for the portfolio. The Property and Estates team are currently aware of a number of organisations who are interested in space in Catford town centre.</p>			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
Member or Officer decision	Officer Decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	N/A
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	N/A
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be	Y/N	Y	Cost £k	c£980k
	In what:	Capital investment will be required to remodel existing Council assets to accommodate the services currently located at Holbeach Road.		

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

net of this investment)	
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A

<b>Author</b>	<b>Gavin Plaskitt</b>	<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Place</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>18.12.23</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Inclusive Regeneration</b>
<p><b>1. The activity or decision that this assessment is being undertaken for</b></p> <p>This assessment is being carried out to determine the impact of the closure of Holbeach office and the transfer of services operating from that location to Laurence House. This proposal is driven by a requirement for costs savings and an approximately £100k p.a. saving can be achieved by closing this outlying office.</p>			
<p><b>2. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</b></p>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/> Language spoken
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Household type
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:  Client unease with formality/ authority figures</p>			

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		
<p>This proposal does not involve any reduction in the services offered. Its main impact is that the physical location for staff to work and service users to access services will change. The change of location/facilities may have an impact on staff and service users with disabilities or those accessing mental health services.</p> <p>It is not obvious that the relocation will have an appreciable impact on any of the other protected characteristics or equalities factors. The services will simply transfer from one accessible location to another nearby.</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3. The evidence to support the analysis</b></p> <p>Approximately 83 staff have Holbeach office as their designated workplace:</p> <p>Crime, Enforcement and Regulation – c.35 staff          Youth Offending Service/Child &amp; Adolescent Mental Health Services c.39 staff          Environmental Health c.9 staff</p> <p>Most staff work in a flexible manner in common with colleagues across the Council.</p> <p>Face to face meetings are held between staff and clients for the purposes of managing youth offending, child and adolescent mental health and carrying out PACE interviews (under caution) by Environmental Health and Crime Enforcement and Regulation teams.</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4. The analysis</b></p> <p>There are no particular changes to the way we intend to deliver services to clients arising from the closure of the Holbeach office. The main difference is that the services will be delivered at a new location nearby, with new facilities.</p> <p>Holbeach office and Laurence House are only 250m apart in the centre of Catford and have similar levels of transport accessibility for people around the borough.</p> <p>It has been highlighted by Youth Offending Services that some of their client group experience unease with formality/ and uniformed security that are present in the main reception of Laurence House. This this will be need to be factored into the design of the new service delivery arrangements.</p> <p>New meeting and therapy rooms will allow face to face service delivery by YOS and CAMHS staff in a similar way to how services are currently provided at Holbeach</p>				

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

office. Children and young people will have a similar level of access to their case workers.

Staff from Holbeach will benefit from an improved office environment in the refurbished Laurence House. The building benefits from lifts and a range of accessibility features that are not present in their current building. This makes the building more suited to any staff with disabilities. The move will mean more hot desking for staff but the design and fit out of Laurence House with large monitors for hot desking and various collaboration spaces also contributes to a better working environment. One potential drawback requiring management is that increased hot desking can be disruptive for staff who require adapted workstations.

### 5. Impact summary

Characteristic	High (+ve or - ve)	Medium (+ve or -ve)	Low (+ve or - ve)	Neutral	Summary
Age				x	
Disability	x +ve				Staff and clients benefit from a more modern building with lifts, accessible toilets, powered doors etc.
Ethnicity				x	Ethnicity is not expected to be impacted by the project
Gender		x +ve			Reduction in concern about anti-social behaviour amongst female staff entering/leaving the Holbeach office.
Gender reassignment				x	Gender reassignment is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Marriage and civil partnerships				x	Marriage and civil partnerships is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Pregnancy and Maternity				x	is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Religion and belief		x +ve			Staff will have access to the reflection rooms in Laurence House for religious observance.
Sexual Orientation				x	Sexual orientation is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Socioeconomic inequality				x	Socioeconomic inequality is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Other factors		x -ve			Clients uneasy with formality/ and authority figures (uniformed

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

					security) associated with Laurence House main reception.
<b>6. Mitigation</b>					
<b>Disability</b>					
A staff survey will be completed to understand whether any transferring staff require an adapted workspace so that the necessary adjustments can be arranged as part of the workplan.					
<b>Other factors</b>					
It is proposed that there will be a separate reception for Youth Offending Services staffed by their own officers as it is important for their client group who sometimes feel uneasy in formal settings. By replicating the existing arrangements, we can ensure this does not create a barrier to attendance/service access.					
<b>7. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts</b>					
This project will change the location where services are delivered to a nearby location in Catford. With good communication it should be possible to transfer the services with minimum disruption to the way clients access services currently delivered from the Holbeach office.					
<b>Signature of Director</b>					

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Place
<b>Director</b>	Patrick Dubeck
<b>Service area</b>	Inclusive Regeneration
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Businesses, Jobs and Skills- Cllr Powell
<b>Reference</b>	PLA06 – One-Council Employment Support
<b>Saving title</b>	One-Council Employment Support Proposal
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Lewisham Works is the Council's directly delivered employment and skills service for residents. This service launched in May 2022, and has already supported hundreds of residents to develop their employability, access training, and secure jobs related to their career goals. This element of the Jobs and Skills Service has been funded by a combination of S106 Employment and Skills ringfenced funding, but mostly since May 2022 by a European Social Fund "Connecting Communities" Grant. This grant allowed us to claim fully for staff salaries delivering employment support.</p> <p>The original ESF grant was due to finish in September 2023. Lewisham Works were able to achieve their core grant KPIs and were one of the best performing CLF boroughs in this area, and as a result we were able to draw down 100% of our grant allocation. Due to the Council's high performance, CLF offered Lewisham and two other boroughs the opportunity to utilise pan-CLF underspends on a focussed 18-24 ESF allocation until December 2023. This was known as the ESF 'NEET push'.</p> <p>The 'NEET push' presented an opportunity for Lewisham Works to collaborate with colleagues from Adult Learning Lewisham (Community Directorate) and Baseline (CYP) – to identify and encourage target young people to engage with the project. Our services overlap in our focus for supporting Lewisham residents with employment and skills participation.</p> <p>The Council is due to receive a UK Shared Prosperity Fund allocation for 'People and Skills' in 2024/25, although we are able to bring forward invoices and claims from January 2024. We are yet to receive a funding agreement for this grant, but we expect to receive circa £900k to be spent by March 2025 on supporting economically inactive residents to train and gain employment. We expect to claim staff salaries and commissioned employment support, and we must spend by March 2025. This funding is restricted to employment and skills.</p> <p>It is proposed that one officer from each service, providing overlapping advice and guidance to residents, is funded through UKSPF. These officers would be required to record resident interactions and outcomes on a single CRM system managed by Lewisham Works, used to report our performance to CLF against our UKSPF delivery. We expect to easily achieve our UKSPF KPIs, which are very modest. This would allow us to take a more integrated approach to how we support residents, from services across the Council.</p> <p>Claiming for these officer salaries offsets their General Fund cost in local budgets, as the Baseline and Adult Learning posts are funded through General Fund at present. We are not yet aware of future UKSPF allocations, so this represents a one-off contribution.</p> <p>This represents an in-year saving of £24,190.50.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 months of salary + on-cost at SCP25 (SO1) for two members of staff</li> <li>• This represents an individual saving to CYP and Communities of £12,095.25 in-year.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<p>It is also proposed we claim the full salary of each of these SO1 officer for the 2024/25 financial year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This represents a saving of £96,762 approx. based on top of the SO1 salary scale.</li> <li>• This represents an individual budget saving of £48,381 to both CYP and Communities</li> </ul> <p>*These savings are not from Place budgets, explicitly they are offering creative solutions to provide savings elsewhere in the Council.</p>				
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>£24</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	<b>£96</b>
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	This represents a shunt from Adult Learning and Baseline salaries to UKSPF, managed by Economy, Jobs and Partnerships			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	80%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	<p>By increasing the amount of UKSPF utilised for staff salaries, we potentially reduce the available funding for commissioning local organisations to deliver complimentary services. This does not have a significant impact, because the Council is set to receive more UKSPF than first-thought, and the Council also has S106 employment and skills pots which must be spent in the next 12 months.</p> <p>Due to last minute interventions by DWP in the UKSPF funding agreement, Lewisham Council is receiving £300k more UKSPF directly than first anticipated, so this does not have an immediate negative impact on Jobs and Skills planned activity.</p>			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	N/A – utilising S106 offsets any potential risk to planned Jobs and Skills activity.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officers Decision			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	<b>£0k</b>
	<b>In what:</b>	N/A		

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	<p>This saving is contingent on Adult Learning and Baseline staff recording their resident support work on the Lewisham Works CRM.</p> <p>We will create and SLA and sufficient support to allow those staff to record progress in a compliant fashion.</p>
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	N/A

EIA Screening

<b>Impact &amp; Outcomes</b>				
<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
There is no impact expected for service users as a result of this decision. Service Users will continue to receive the same level of support from Lewisham Works, Adult Learning and Baseline.				
<b>Staff</b>				
There is a neutral impact on staff outside of the Lewisham Works funded by this grant – that they will be required to record monitoring data on the ‘Hanlon’ system used by Lewisham Works to record client progress. Otherwise, there is no impact on the employment status and day to day work of staff. The UKSPF People and Skills funding aligns with normal day-to-day duties of staff funded by this grant. The two officers outside of Lewisham Works will benefit from more joined-up working and practice across the Council.				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
There is a positive financial benefit to Adult Learning and Baseline – who will both receive grant funding to supplement Council General Fund for salaries. There are no other impacts to Council services.				
<b>Partners</b>				
There are no impacts to external partners arising from this decision.				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X



**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X
<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>			N	

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>Directorate</b>	Place			
<b>Director</b>	Zahur Khan			
<b>Service area</b>	Commercial Services			
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Environment and Climate Action- Cllr Krupski			
<b>Reference</b>	PLA02 – Commercial Waste Additional Income			
<b>Saving title</b>	Commercial Waste			
<b>Description of saving</b> (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	The service has undergone a recent restructure and has implemented new processes and procedures with new management arrangements. Changes to the service project a balancing of the budget target, and additional income. The service is confident going forward that it will improve on commercial sales which will result in consistent additional income. The figure which is been proposed is that amount the service is confident in delivering.			
<b>Division budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Service area budget</b>	<b>Gross £k</b>		<b>Net £k</b>	
<b>Saving proposed</b>	<b>2023/24 £k</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2024/25 £k</b>	
<b>Risks:</b>				
<b>Cost shunt to other service? Y/N</b>	No			
<b>Likelihood of making cut in full - %</b>	95%			
<b>Impact of making the saving</b>	No negative impact on residents or businesses. In order to ensure the service delivers the savings the use of interim arrangements with agency staff is required until key posts within the service have been filled.			
<b>Possible risk mitigation</b>	As with all commercial services the council is reliant on businesses renewing their contracts. The service is very competitive and is confident in delivering a good service to meet this saving and seek to improve on it in future years.			
<b>Other considerations:</b>				
<b>Member or Officer decision</b>	Officer			
<b>Redundancies</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Number of staff</b>	
<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Audience(s)</b>	
<b>Investment required</b> (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Cost £k</b>	
	<b>In what:</b>			
<b>Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work</b>	The service relies on street environmental service emptying the bins.			
<b>Specific legal or statutory considerations</b>	All business must have a trade waste agreement in line with duty of care.			

Commercial Waste Service Equalities Screening

**Impact & Outcomes**

## Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<b>What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?</b>				
<b>Service Users</b>				
<p>Commercial waste services users include businesses across the borough who wish to use the councils commercial waste service to meet their duty of care obligation as per Environmental Protection Act, for disposal of their waste.</p> <p>Currently the service has approximately 1500 customers, evenly split between our sack and bin service customers.</p> <p>Businesses across the borough can use any licences waste carrier and therefore those that use our service do so because they find our services to be most suitable for their business's requirements including equalities considerations.</p> <p>The changes proposed are to implement an increase of fees to the bin service in line with Consumer Price Index (CPI).</p>				
<b>Staff</b>				
<p>Staff are trained to support all individuals including those with protected characteristics to deliver an excellent service and support additional needs where required.</p>				
<b>Other Council Services</b>				
Not applicable				
<b>Partners</b>				
Not applicable				
<b>Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</b>				
<b>Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations</b>	<b>High (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Medium (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Low (Positive / Negative)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Age</b>				X
<b>Disability</b>				X
<b>Ethnicity</b>				X
<b>Gender</b>				X
<b>Gender reassignment</b>				X
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>				X

**Appendix 2 - Officers decisions**

<b>Religion and belief</b>				X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				X
<b>Socio-economic inequality</b>				X
<b>Is a full EAA required?</b>	Not required as this service is determined by businesses who have choice to use our services or other waste carriers as a business decision.			

# Report of meeting regarding Budget Savings Proposals for Children and Young People Directorate

11 am on 5 January 2024

Microsoft Teams

## In attendance

Cllr Barnham, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Cllr Sorba, Chair of the Children and Young People Select Committee

Cllr Warner, Vice-Chair of the Children and Young People Select Committee

Pinaki Ghoshal, Executive Director for Children and Young People

Benjamin Awkal, Scrutiny Manager

**The Chair and Vice Chair of CYPSC looked at all the savings proposals and paid particularly close attention Home to School Transport, Short Breaks, and the methodology for assessing the probability of delivering proposed savings.**

**The key details of the whole discussion are described below.**

## Key decisions for Members

### *Sale of capital asset*

One-off saving. Building valued at £850k by Regeneration.

At some point, the building ceased to be used as children's centre. Its location in the middle of the estate made it opportune for use as Housing Revenue Account or Temporary Accommodation housing. There was no logic to CYP having the building when the Honor Oak Youth Centre was across the road. The Chair noted he and other ward councillors were content for the building to be sold and repurposed, as it was currently providing limited social value locally, and hoped that would result in greater social value.

Delivery confidence was a professional judgement of the probability of a successful sale and not arrived at using a specific methodology.

### *Children's Centre revenue savings*

£50k is a conservative estimate reduction in revenue costs achieved by the sale of Honor Oak Depot and expected contributions from our Health Partners resulting from the move to Family Hub model.

There was a question around where a Family Hub would be located in Area 2 of the Borough. When hubs and spokes are implemented, some existing sites may become surplus to requirements. The aspiration is to increase service quality and reach, and communicate this to the public so they recognize the merit in potentially closing former delivery sites.

A Children's Centres delivery contract with the Early Years Alliance had been extended recently. A key decision will be required, likely before summer as to whether in the long term, Children's Centres will be recommissioned from outsourced providers or run in-house.

## Officer decisions

*Placements: Housing benefit claims for all Staying Put*

To ensure claiming Housing Benefit for Care Leavers remaining with foster families (Staying Put), offsetting costs to the authority. The confidence figure around what sum will be saved as a result is due to the fluctuating number of Care Leavers in Staying Put arrangements.

*Placements: payments efficiency for placement providers*

Council is now better at tracking payment commitments for placements, which would avoid costs associated with some missed/late payments in the past.

*Placements: building Council owned Children's Residential Homes*

£390k saving for Financial Year 24/25 a part-year saving to be followed by significantly larger savings in subsequent Financial Year.

Developing a business case to open in-house residential placements for Children Looked After with particularly complex and high needs. The current market conditions allow private providers to charge significantly more than equivalent Council-owned and managed provision.

At any one time, around 40-45 CLA are in residential placements. The proposal is likely to create around 10 places in and around Lewisham over a number of years to accommodate the highest-cost CLA. The Council needed to be cautious not to create too many placements and end up with expensive over-capacity. In-house placements would also reduce consequent costs of out-of-area private placements (e.g. visiting Social Worker travel time and costs).

*S17 & Placements: reduced spot purchasing of youth support*

Current spend approx. £3-5m.

Observed significant increases in placements and the complexity of CLA and children at risk of entering care had resulted in spot purchasing of support for young people.

Proposed to create in-house support offer at lower cost but equal or better quality.

EDCYP is confident the skills are available in the labour market as Council currently procuring the same services. An improved Ofsted rating of Lewisham Children's Social Care would help the Council market itself as an employer of choice. The Council was somewhat ahead of other London councils in this regard so unlikely to be competing with them to hire the requisite staff.

A similar approach had been followed at The Meliot Centre.

*Contribution from the Participation Team – Ongoing saving*

The Lewisham Challenge which helps high achieving school students prepare to apply and gain entry to the very top Universities is in the interests of Further Education and Higher Education and the Council believed it no longer needed to fund it. This had been discussed with FE and HE institutions, hence 100% confidence in delivering the saving.

*3 x Outreach Inclusion Service - Management actions*

Already delivered.

*Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action*

Primary Phase Alternative Provision is currently being delivered by a commissioned provider at Lucas Vale. The school is now expected to deliver the service moving forward and fewer spots are expected to be required as Exclusions come down.

*Contribution from the Participation Team – Ongoing saving*

Alternative funding is being used.

*Savings DBV Programme Implementation Grant and SEN Transport Mitigation work – direct payments and Personal Travel Assistance Budgets*

Personal Home to School Transport budgets are currently calculated as a mileage allowance paid to parents or carers, which mostly has not been financially attractive. The proposal is to provide more financially attractive travel allowances to parents and carers. These however will nevertheless remain considerably cheaper (apx. 50%) than the Council providing or arranging travel.

Uptake of such an offer by parents/carers is estimated to be between 5% and 8% of the children and young people who receive Home to School Transport. The lower figure of 5% has been used to estimate saving's value.

The proportion of SEND learners receiving Home to School Transport has decreased, although the absolute number has gone up because the total number of children with SEND has gone up.

*Savings DBV Programme Implementation Grant and SEN Transport Mitigation work – grant top-slice*

High level of confidence in delivery due to an expected positive Department for Education response to the Council's grant application.

*Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning*

Violence Reduction Unit grant is being applied, therefore one-off saving.

*Virtual school*

Total non-pupil spend was apx. £1m, therefore a relatively small saving and potential for further future savings.

*Early Years*

Capacity to increase saves through greater use of grant funding.

*DBS*

EDCYP was unsure of detail of saving, which he believed to already have been delivered. Perhaps the schools are providing funding to offset facilities costs of trade union activities.

*Savings from Short Breaks Review- Targeted & Specialist Short Breaks including CHC cases.*

An expansion of Short Breaks had been observed. Some service users supported by Disabilities Team.

The Council was seeking to attract more funding from our Health Partners.

The spot-purchasing/in-house provision saving relates to how bespoke support for specific individuals was being procured/provided and not to our formally commissioned arrangements, such as the Ravensbourne facilities. This operational change will not require consultation with parents and carers.

The criteria for Short Breaks were to be reviewed to better match the level of support to the level of need as there have been cases of families experiencing a mismatch. Parents and carers would be consulted in this review.

The changes were aimed at new service users rather than existing ones.

*Reduction in business support*

Business support arrangements are being reviewed following structural changes in the Directorate.

Also there is an intent to look to charge against grants for business support costs.

*Grant maximisation*

Charging against a plethora of small grants for operational costs.

Also, a £4m grant application has been submitted to the DfE "Families First for Children Pathfinder Programme (the stream ringfenced for Authorities classed as Requires Improvement at the time of the application being decided). The outcome is expected in January 2024, which, if positive, would increase the £150k saving.

*Reduction in staffing costs*

The Family, Quality and Commissioning Division had been established on the basis of figures provided at the time and has been returning a salary budget surplus.

**Luke Sorba, January 10<sup>th</sup> 2024**