

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

	Communities, Partnership and Leisure			
Director	James Lee			
Service area	Bereavement Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Communities, Refugees - Cllr Campbell			
Reference	COM 11a Bereavement services			
Saving title				
In-year overspend savings proposal				
Description of saving (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.				
Division budget	Gross £k	29,249	Net £k	14,144
Service area budget	Gross £k	2,521	Net £k	-288
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	100	2024/25 £k	100
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? N		No		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		100%		
Impact of making the saving	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.			
Possible risk mitigation	An unexpected drop in Lewisham deaths.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Member			
Redundancies	N	None		
Public consultation	N	None required		
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	N	None	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	None			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	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.				
Staff				
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				
Other Council Services				
No impact				
Partners				
No impact				
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?			No	

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Children & Young People

Directorate	CYPS - FQC				
Director	Sara Rahman (Pinaki Ghoshal – Executive Director)				
Service area	FQC				
Cabinet Portfolio	Children & Young People- Cllr Barnham				
Reference	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				
Cut title	<p>1. <u>Reduction in Business Support to FQC.</u> Following changes in responsibilities across both Children’s Social Care and Families Quality & 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 & 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>				
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total
	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
	TOTAL	500	1000	0	£1500
	*Denotes one off savings				

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
Risks:				
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 & 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			
Other considerations:				
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

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
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

Other Council Services				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X No specific impact
Disability				X No specific impact
Ethnicity		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.		
Gender				X No specific impact
Gender reassignment				X No specific impact
Marriage and civil partnerships				X No specific impact
Pregnancy and maternity				X No specific impact
Religion and belief				X No specific impact
Sexual orientation				X No specific impact
Socio-economic inequality				X No specific impact
Is a full EAA required?			Y (See notes above)	

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Place

Directorate	Place
Director	Patrick Dubeck
Service area	Inclusive Regeneration
Cabinet Portfolio	Cllr Brenda Dacres
Reference	PLA04 – Garage Portfolio Rental Charges Review
Saving title	Garage Portfolio Rental Charges Review
Description of saving (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"> • <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); • <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

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"> • <u>Camden</u> - Depends on the postcode address £25p/w - £50 p/w. <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	Proposed rent increase not approved: 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.			
	Estimated Income not being achieved: 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.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Member			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	N/A
Public consultation	Y/N	Y	Audience(s)	N/A
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	N/A
	In what:	N/A		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations	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

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
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.
Staff
N/A

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Other Council Services				
N/A				
Partners				
N/A				
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			Low Negative	
Disability			Low Negative	
Ethnicity				Neutral
Gender				Neutral
Gender reassignment				Neutral
Marriage and civil partnerships				Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity				Neutral
Religion and belief				Neutral
Sexual orientation				Neutral
Socio-economic inequality			Low Negative	
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Directorate	Place			
Director	Zahur Khan			
Service area	Commercial Operations and Development			
Cabinet Portfolio	Environment and Climate Action- Cllr Krupski			
Reference	PLA03 – Fly-Tipping Fees and Charges			
Saving title	Fees and Charges (Increased penalties for fly tipping and littering)			
Description of saving (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>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k		2024/25 £k	50
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	N			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	60%			
Impact of making the saving	Tackling the root cause of littering/fly tipping by issuing penalties that reflect the seriousness of the crime, thus encouraging less littering/fly tipping.			
Possible risk mitigation	<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>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Member			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	0
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:	0		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Mayor and Cabinet decision to set increased limits			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	<p>The Environmental Offences (Fixed Penalties) Amendment 2023 increased the upper & 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

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
<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>				
Staff				
<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>				
Other Council Services				
None				
Partners				
None				
Are there any specific equalities implications? <u>Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</u>				
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 1 - Member decisions

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. Officers already deliver fixed penalty notices for littering and fly tipping in accordance with guidance and council policy.			

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Directorate	Place			
Director	Zahur Khan			
Service area	Street Environment Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Environment and Climate Action- Cllr Krupsk			
Reference	PLA07 – Seasonal Street Cleansing			
Saving title	Seasonal street cleansing regime			
Description of saving (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>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	40	2024/25 £k	40
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	N			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	90%			
Impact of making the saving	<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>			
Possible risk mitigation	<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>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Member			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	0
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N/A			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	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

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
<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>				
Staff				
<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>				
Other Council Services				
None				
Partners				
None				
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

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			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

Directorate	Place			
Director	Zahur Khan			
Service area	Commercial Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Cllr Krupski			
Reference	PLA05 – Garden Waste Additional Income			
Saving title	Garden Waste			
Description of saving (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.			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	100	2024/25 £k	
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	95%			
Impact of making the saving	<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>			
Possible risk mitigation	<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>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision				
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:	No additional investment required as new procedures and resources already in place.		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	The service relies on street environmental service emptying the bins.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations				

Equalities Screening for Garden Waste Service

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
<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>				
Staff				
No proposed changes				
Other Council Services				
No proposed changes				
Partners				
No proposed changes				
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

Appendix 1 - Member decisions

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