

Scrutiny Committees			
Report Title	Strategic Financial Review update and Savings Proposals for 2014/15 and 2015/16		
Key Decision	No	Item No.	5
Ward	All Wards		
Contributors	Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration		
Class	Part 1	Date:	29 November – 16 December 2013

1. Summary

- 1.1 On 10 July and 13 November 2013, Mayor & Cabinet received a report and update on the financial projections for the Council. The report sets out the need to adapt and enhance the approach to identifying savings to meet the anticipated scale of change required ahead of being built into formal annual budget assumptions.
- 1.2 Officers estimate that further savings of £16m will be required in 2014/15, in addition to £16m¹ agreed for 2014/15 in last year's budget. Overall, it is estimated that £85m of savings will be required between 2014/15 and 2017/18 over and above savings already agreed. No figures for funding for local government are available beyond 2015/16, so savings have been based on an assessment of the likely impact of reductions in the overall government spending envelope.
- 1.3 In July 2013, Mayor and Cabinet agreed the need to reconfigure, re-design and fundamentally re-purpose services to fit the available resources whilst preserving the best of what Lewisham has done to date. In November 2013, Mayor & Cabinet agreed the approach to presenting savings and the areas for thematic and cross-cutting reviews. This process will require political and managerial leadership to be re-focused on the transformational changes needed to deliver these substantial savings, weighing their financial impact against their consequences for service delivery and in terms of community impact.
- 1.4 This report presents the first tranche of the required £85m of savings for scrutiny grouped by thematic and cross-cutting area.

2. Purpose of report

- 2.1 To seek comment from Scrutiny on the proposed savings to inform the Mayor & Cabinet meeting on the 18 December when these savings will be put forward for decisions to be taken.

¹ Savings of £17m were previously agreed for 2014/15 in the 2013/14 Budget. A review by officers has identified circa £0.7m of these savings are no longer achievable. Details of these are set out at Appendix A.

3. Recommendations

3.1 Members are asked to:

3.1.1 Note the updated strategic financial position set out in section 6.

3.1.2 Provide comment on the draft savings proposals ahead of Mayor & Cabinet on the 18 December 2013.

4. Policy Context

4.1 Presenting financial information in a clear and understandable format contributes directly to the Council's tenth corporate priority: inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity. In the round, budget processes (including the need to identify savings) are designed to support all of the Council's corporate priorities by linking policy objectives, including the community strategy, to the available resources.

5. Background

5.1 Everything that the Council spends money on is intended to achieve agreed policy and community goals and hence to deliver value and benefits for the borough. The Council has a strong reputation for delivering innovative and valuable services at low costs, often with significantly lower overheads than other boroughs.

5.2 The Council delivered savings of £82m between May 2010 and 2013/14. Further savings of £16m have been agreed for 2014/15 and £1m for 2015/16. Despite this significant achievement, officers currently estimate that further savings of £85m will need to be delivered between now and 2017/18 in order to ensure that the Council's services remain affordable into the medium-term.

5.3 In July 2013, Mayor & Cabinet agreed that further savings on this scale could not solely be delivered through managerial efficiencies or service innovation to preserve outcomes at lower costs. There would of course be a continued focus on these and other disciplines to improve value for money, but hard choices would have to be confronted over the coming years about which services will need to be scaled back dramatically or even cut altogether.

5.4 Since July, work has been carried out on how the options for making the savings could be delivered by looking at the opportunities on a thematic basis. In advance of detailed work being carried out on each of the thematic areas, options for delivering savings required for 2014/15 have been identified and these are presented here.

6. Updated strategic financial position

6.1 Prior to the Spending Round 2013 (SR13) announcement on 26 June, the Council estimated that it needed to find savings of £75m over the period 2014/15 to 2017/18 in addition to savings for 2014/15 and 2015/16 agreed as part of the 2013/14 budget process.

6.2 The SR13 announced a headline real terms reduction of 10% in funding for local government in 2015/16. However, subsequent analysis by the Local Government

Association has revealed that the amount available for general distribution to councils will reduce by 14.6% in real terms because a significant element of the funding available in 2015/16 has been set aside by government for specific purposes. As a result, officers now estimate that additional savings of £10m will be required in the Council's budget in 2015/16, taking total projected savings up to 2017/18 to £85m.

- 6.3 To put this in context, these savings (of £16m already agreed and £85m to be identified) will fall on the General Fund which has a net revenue budget in 2013/14 of £285m.
- 6.4 Uncertainty with funding in subsequent years means the estimate of the budget gap in future years is likely to vary up and down as more information becomes available. Even after the local government finance settlement is announced in December 2013, we will only have some certainty for 2014/15 and 2015/16 and anticipate needing to make projections for savings from 2016/17 onwards.
- 6.5 The absence of detailed information should not prevent the Council from planning its approach now. Further savings required by 2017/18 are so substantial that they could only be delivered by considering significant options to reconfigure, re-design and fundamentally re-purpose services to fit the available resources, whilst preserving the best of what Lewisham has done to date.

7. The Lewisham Future Programme

- 7.1 As Lewisham and its residents experience change on an unprecedented scale, the Council needs to offer high level strategic leadership in response to that change. It must balance the need to sustain local neighbourhoods that are clean and where people feel safe; protect the vulnerable with complex needs; promote, facilitate and provide opportunities for all; develop and maintain the public realm and infrastructure; and support local communities and the organisations that help deliver this and develop the social capital on which Lewisham is built.
- 7.2 Lewisham takes a prudent and forward thinking approach to its budget and recognises that the further savings required in 2014/15 of £16m, (in addition to the £16m previously agreed)² need to be developed and delivered in the context of the projections of further savings required through 2015/16 to 2017/18.
- 7.3 The Lewisham Future Programme is the response to the direction of the Mayor to carry out a fundamental review of services. This Programme focuses on the areas of greatest spend, recognising that in the fourth consecutive year of significant spending reductions even greater innovation, focus on the customer, and cross-cutting thinking will be required to deliver savings whilst attempting to minimise the impacts on residents and customers of Lewisham.
- 7.4 The Lewisham Future Programme will be led by a Board chaired by the Chief Executive. The Board (LFPB) will develop options for the Mayor & Council to consider. It will drive the changes once they have been consulted upon and agreed. It will only work well if the governance is right and tight. Actions and accountabilities to Mayor & Cabinet and the Council's relevant select committees is crucial. While

² See footnote 1.

the LFPB will be led by senior management, it will need to engage and involve as many staff, trade unions, suppliers and service users as possible.

- 7.5 While attention will focus on large budgets, no part of the Council's activity can be excluded from the approach set out in the Lewisham Futures Programme. The Council's own directly managed services as well as those delivered by partner organisations and the third sector will all be included. Those areas which cannot be examined over the next few months will be looked at later.
- 7.6 Savings in *central support services* have been one focus of the budget strategy in 2010-13. Further savings will be sought in this area, but this requires a cross-cutting review of the options for centralising core functions to identify the potential to further reduce costs.
- 7.7 The Council will review its *asset base* with the aim of fully utilising its key assets, disposal of other assets, and developing a strategic approach to community assets. This approach should deliver savings in 2014/15, but will also be part of a longer term delivery strategy over a number of years.
- 7.8 External policy changes, and the SR13 announcements on the transfer of NHS funding into an Integration Fund, make it important to review the *future shape of adult social care*, and the potential of integration with health partners. Health and social care is already well integrated in Lewisham, but the development of options on how adult social care and health services may further align has the potential not only to deliver savings over 2015-18, but also improve outcomes for residents.
- 7.9 Lewisham has invested in a range of *preventative and early intervention services* designed to improve outcomes, and reduce the demand on our acute services. As public health has returned to local authorities this year, it is appropriate that the Council reviews how the public health funding can be used together with existing Council funding to create new and innovative approaches that deliver savings. The effectiveness of existing early intervention services will be reviewed to ensure that we invest in the programmes that are shown to be effective.
- 7.10 Where the Council is providing paid-for services, a *review of income and full cost recovery* is necessary. Ensuring that the Council is delivering value for money is the key driver of the budget strategy. This will include exploring how regulation and enforcement might reduce costs imposed on the council, and ensuring that the council achieves full cost recovery in its transactional or paid-for services.
- 7.11 The Council has used opportunities for *joint commissioning and procurement across boroughs* as a way of reducing costs. This has delivered savings already, and the Council will focus attention on how joint procurement, commissioning and the sharing of services with other Boroughs might reduce costs in Lewisham.
- 7.12 These areas of activity have been brought together in a set of thematic and cross-cutting reviews. Officers are currently preparing initial scoping papers which will identify the opportunities for change under each of the headings, the actions required to achieve the change and timescales for delivering outcomes from the reviews. Initial financial targets for savings over the next four years have been set against each of the reviews and the scoping exercise will identify the realism of these targets and the timescales over which they can be delivered. Each of the reviews will report into a relevant select committee at initial planning stage, at key

stages during implementation, and post-completion. All key decisions during delivery of the reviews will go to Mayor and Cabinet for approval.

7.13 The list of reviews and initial target savings are included in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Thematic and cross-cutting reviews with initial target savings

Thematic – total savings £64m	Cross-cutting – savings £21m
1. Smarter assessment arrangements and deeper integration of social & health care incl. public health - £22m	1. Management and corporate overheads
2. Sharing services with other Councils and bodies - £12m	2. School effectiveness services and functions
3. A Council wide “efficiency review” across all budgets - £10m	3. Crime reduction services
4. A Council wide asset rationalisation programme - £8m	4. Culture and community services
5. Grouping more corporate & business support services together - £6m	5. Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services
6. Review of income generation - £4m	6. Environmental Services
7. Combining front-line services (enforcement & regulation) - £2m	7. Public Services
	8. Planning and Economic Development
	9. Safeguarding and Early Intervention services for children and families

8 Budget process

- 8.1 An effective budget process needs to reflect the political and managerial leadership’s priorities and to facilitate an appropriate degree of review and challenge to proposals. It needs to provide a framework for financial accountability and enable clear decision making and it needs to do all of this in an efficient manner to ensure that the work in developing, reviewing and scrutinising proposals is proportionate to the objectives, rather than an end in itself.
- 8.2 The proposed approach to thematic and cross-cutting reviews set out in section 7 above will require our existing budget processes to change. The longer term and cross-cutting approach proposed will mean that savings will be delivered over longer time periods and will not fit easily into the annual budget timetable. Instead, there will be an on-going identification of opportunities to take costs out of services as the reviews are carried out. Decisions will happen at different times of the year and savings will be taken when they are identified rather than waiting to be agreed at the annual budget meeting. All savings that have been agreed – and those forecast for future years – will then be reported in the annual budget report, but many of the key decisions will already have been taken or may be taken at a later date. This means that political and managerial focus will move away from individual smaller scale savings that have typified the budget process in previous years to larger scale savings delivered through major change programmes.
- 8.3 It should be noted that 2014/15 is a transition year. The process for delivering a balanced budget for 2014/15 is as follows:
- a. Savings of £17m in 2014/15 were agreed as part of the 2013/14 budget process. Officers have now reviewed these and in most cases they are confident that they will be delivered. There are five savings proposals, listed in Appendix A, which

will not now be delivered. These total £0.742m and mean that the required new savings for 2014/15 increases to £16m.

- b. Officers have also been developing a set of further individual budget savings proposals for 2014/15 for consideration at relevant Scrutiny Committees in November and December and submission to Mayor & Cabinet on 18 December 2013. These savings proposals will go some way to bridging the revised £16m gap for 2014/15. The draft savings proposals of £5.9m for 2014/15 are summarised in Appendix B, by theme and cross-cutting review area, and in Appendix C, by service directorate. Further details of the proposals are attached at Appendix D.
- c. As outlined in the July report to Mayor & Cabinet, it is important that every budget holder in the Council feels that it is their responsibility to deliver smaller-scale savings. This will instil a greater sense of financial accountability within the organisation. These proposals, such as deleting vacant posts and other marginal, but nonetheless important efficiency measures, will be co-ordinated under an overall efficiency programme. This will help to ensure that realistic savings, currently targeted at £2.55m, are delivered without senior focus being diverted from the major change programmes required to meet the Council's demanding financial targets. This saving for 2014/15 is included in the summary at Appendix B.
- d. The initial scoping work for thematic and cross-cutting reviews will be used to identify areas where officers believe savings can be delivered in 2014/15 and for future years. This element of the process will enable savings proposals to be put up on a rolling basis as and when the work to develop them to a sufficient standard has been reached. The savings will only be allocated against individual budgets once the proposals have been reviewed by scrutiny and decisions taken by Mayor & Cabinet.

8.4 The 2014/15 budget is scheduled to be considered at Full Council on 26 February 2014. The timetable for securing scrutiny input into budget proposals for 2014/15 and the other requirements is set out at Appendix E for information.

8.5 From 2015/16 onwards, the work carried out on the thematic and cross-cutting reviews, including oversight by scrutiny and decisions of Mayor & Cabinet, will be the primary basis for identifying and delivering savings.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 This report is concerned with the approach to be adopted for the Council to address the financial challenges it faces and the processes for agreeing the budget for 2014/15. There are no direct financial implications arising from the report itself.

10. Legal Implications

10.1 The Council must set and maintain a balanced budget and must act prudently in relation to the stewardship of council taxpayers' funds.

11. Crime and disorder implications

- 11.1 None specific to this report, although future budget proposals may have crime and disorder implications. If so, they will be considered at the appropriate time.

12. Equalities Implications

- 12.1 None specific to this report, although future budget proposals may have equalities implications. If so, they will be considered at the appropriate time.

13. Environmental Implications

- 13.1 None specific to this report, although future budget proposals may have environmental implications. If so, they will be considered at the appropriate time.

14. Conclusion

- 14.1 The Council expects to need to make further savings of around £85m between now and 2017/18, although this figure is subject to significant change as financing estimates are refined. The proposals in this report will make the process for developing policies and budgets to deliver this more focused to key priorities and efficient to administer.

15. Background documents and further information

Short Title of report	Date	Location	Contact
2013/14 Budget	27 February 2013 (Council)	3 rd Floor Laurence House	Selwyn Thompson
Strategic Financial Review	10 July 2013 (M&C)	3 rd Floor Laurence House	Selwyn Thompson
Strategic Financial Review (update)	13 November 2013 (M&C)	3 rd Floor Laurence House	Selwyn Thompson

For further information on this report, please contact:

David Austin - Interim Head of Corporate Resources on 020 8314 9114

APPENDIX A

Savings agreed for 2014/15 as part of the 2013/14 Budget that are no longer deliverable

Ref	Service Area and proposal	£'000s	Reason why saving is considered as being no longer deliverable
CYP 52	Referral and Assessment – The proposal is to delete a specialist team manager role in this service who manages matters such as private fostering, young carers and missing children.	60.0	Current pressures in the service mean that this proposal is no longer deliverable.
CUS 01	Bereavement Services – Consider through the consortium (Lewisham, Lambeth, Southwark and Greenwich) a reduction in costs paid to the inner South London Coroner Court by 10%.	30.0	The coroner has questioned the current level of funding received.
CUS 03	Lee Valley Park Levy – Seek a reduction of 20% in the annual sum paid for financial year 2014/15 for Lee Valley Regional Park.	52.0	The budget is no longer part of the Customer Services Directorate.
CUS 29	Parking Services – The saving is the removal of the exit barrier system and staff at the Holbeach car park and the introduction of pay and display. The saving would be realised in the new parking contract to run from July 2013.	100.0	Action has been implemented, but the contract cost is higher than the budget
RNR 13	Planning - Introduction of locally set planning application fees.	500.0	The legislation has been delayed and may not happen, making this saving undeliverable.
	Total	742.0	

APPENDIX B

Summary of individual budget saving proposals aligned to thematic / cross-cutting review.

Lewisham Future Programme		Savings Proposed			Savings to Find	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Savings Proposals		£m	£m	£m		£m	£m	£m	£m
Totals		85.00	9.23	75.77		8.43	0.80	0.00	0.00
Target						16.00	30.00	20.00	20.00
Gap						7.57	29.20	20.00	20.00
Thematic reviews		64.00	5.45	58.55		5.45	0.00		
T1	Smarter assessment arrangements and deeper integration of social & health care; including Public Health	22.00	2.90	19.10	COM01	2.50			
					COM04	0.10			
					COM05	0.30			
T2	Sharing services with other Councils and bodies	12.00		12.00					
T3	A Council wide "efficiency review" across all budgets	10.00	2.55	7.45	Corp.	2.55			
T4	A Council wide asset rationalisation programme	8.00		8.00					
T5	Grouping more corporate & business support services together	6.00		6.00					
T6	Review of income generation	4.00		4.00					
T7	Combining front line services (enforcement & regulation)	2.00		2.00					

Cross-cutting reviews		21.00	3.78	17.22		2.98	0.80		
C1	Management and corporate overheads		0.26		RNR01	0.13			
					RNR03	0.13			
C2	School effectiveness services and functions		0.63		CYP01	0.05			
					CYP03	0.06			
					CYP04	0.06			
					CYP12	0.10	0.20		
					CYP14	0.08	0.08		
C3	Crime reduction services								
C4	Culture and community services		0.80		COM02	0.20			
					COM03	0.50			
					RNR04	0.10			
C5	Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services		0.43		CUS01	0.07			
					CUS04		0.20		
					CUS05	0.16			
C6	Environmental services		0.32		CUS02	0.05			
					CUS03	0.27			
C7	Public services		0.45		CUS06	0.20			
					CUS07	0.10	0.10		
					CUS08	0.03	0.02		
C8	Planning and economic development		0.05		RNR02	0.05			
C9	Safeguarding and Early Intervention services for children and families		0.84		CYP05	0.10	0.05		
					CYP06		0.10		
					CYP07		0.05		
					CYP08	0.05			
					CYP09	0.02			
					CYP10	0.05			
					CYP11	0.10			
					CYP13	0.10			
			CYP15	0.22					

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF NEW 2014 / 16 SAVINGS PROPOSALS – DIRECTORATE

Summary of budget saving proposals presented in service directorate order mapped to thematic / cross cutting references

DIRECTORATE	2014/2015 Proposals £'000s	2015/2016 Proposals £'000s	Total £'000s
CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE	971.0	475.0	1,446.0
COMMUNITY SERVICES	3,600.0	0.0	3,600.0
CUSTOMER SERVICES	879.0	325.0	1,204.0
RESOURCES & REGENERATION	408.0	0.0	408.0
Total 2014 / 16 NEW REVENUE SAVINGS PROPOSED	5,858.0	800.0	6,658.0

2014 / 16 NEW REVENUE BUDGET SAVINGS PROPOSALS

Summary of 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Children and Young People Directorate

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
CYP01	PERFORMANCE	CYP Performance Service provides statutory data collections, data analysis, performance reporting to the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board (CYPSPB), Lewisham Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB), DMT, Directorate Services, with particular emphasis on Children's Social Care and School Improvement. The implementation of the replacement corporate software for monitoring and reporting performance should result in fewer administrative processes to produce the monthly and annual performance data reports. This is expected to result in a saving of one post with an estimated value of £50k.	50.0		50.0	C 2
CYP03	EARLY YEARS	The Early Years Improvement Team provides advice, support and training for practitioners working with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage in the maintained and non-maintained sector. It is proposed to make a saving on £58k through a review of work. Local authorities are required to make arrangements to secure that early childhood services in their area are provided in an integrated way that facilitates access to services and maximises the benefits to children, parents and prospective parents. Early years providers providing early years for which they are registered under the Childcare Act 2006 (or would be required to register but for being exempted) are required to ensure compliance with the "Early Years Foundation Stage". The proposed review of work in this area will have to ensure that sufficient advice, support and training will be available to ensure early years providers comply with their requirements to deliver the "Early Years Foundation Stage".	58.0		58.0	C 2

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
CYP04	LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN EDUCATION TEAM	The Looked After Children Education Team oversees the education of Looked After Children, including providing tuition to support their learning, support in transition from primary to secondary school, and peer mentoring. The team also ensure that destinations data is collected to monitor pathways and ensure the right support is provided to individuals. Most of the funding is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant (£200k) although there is a contribution of £62k to the service from the General Fund. In future all costs will be contained within the Dedicated Schools Grant.	62.0		62.0	C 2
CYP05	BUSINESS SUPPORT, PLACEMENTS & PROCUREMENT	Business Support within Children's Social Care providers administrative support for all the services in the division. These are Referral & Assessment; Family Social Work; Looked After Children; Adoption; Leaving Care; Fostering; Placements & Procurement; Quality Assurance; and Children with Complex Needs. As well as the Business Support teams based in the front line services, there are currently 2 specialist teams providing centralised functions in compliance with separation of duties under Financial Regulations. This contributes to safeguarding functions by freeing up and supporting Social Workers to concentrate on direct work with vulnerable children and families. A review of business support across the Children's Social Care Division is being undertaken to examine the opportunities for reshaping current activities and identifying opportunities for sharing resources with other support teams in the Council such as Finance and Adult Social Care. These are in addition to the savings in the previous two years of £575k.	100.0	50	150.0	C 9
CYP06	LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN, LEAVING CARE & ADOPTION SERVICE	The leaving care team currently works with children looked after from the age of sixteen. We propose to make savings and improve the performance of the service by changing the way the service functions. Currently there are three Looked after Children's Teams that work with looked after children from roughly the age of 5 to 16 at which point they transfer to one of three Leaving Care Teams who provide support as the young person leaves care and onwards until they are 21 (or 25 if they are in full time education). Feedback from the Children in Care Council is that they would prefer not to have the change of worker at the age of 16. We are therefore proposing to have Looked after Children Teams that will take young people through to 25 where required. We can achieve this with 5 teams and delete one team manager post. The staff from that team will be spread out amongst the remaining teams.	0.0	100.0	100.0	C 9

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
CYP07	CONTACT	We are required by legislation to provide contact between some parents and their children who have been removed from their care. Some of these contacts need to be supervised and most of which are ordered by the courts. The Supervised Contact is provided in a safe place due to risks that the parent may still pose to the child. There is a requirement in many instances for birth parents to have contact with their children in Local Authority care. Contact will often be in secure environments, as some parents have difficult and challenging behaviour. We currently use specialist agencies to carry out this contact, who charge for premises. It is proposed to use Council premises in the future which will mean we will save on the cost of premises hire and/or alternatively negotiate significant reduction in room hire and other costs. This is in addition to the previous savings of £200k in 2013/14 and already offered for 2014/15. The proposed saving relates to a reduction in costs of premises where the service is located. Any new competitive procurement would seek bids which could reduce this cost.	0.0	50.0	50.0	C 9
CYP08	ADOPTION SERVICE	The Adoption Support Team provide services and advice to families to assist them through the process of of adoption and as required by legislation provide contact between some parents and their children who have been removed from their care. We are currently implementing the Government reforms on adoption. The reforms included an equalisation of the assessment fee to £27k. Historically the adoption service has not targeted Lewisham families for adoption as many Lewisham LAC cannot be placed in the borough in close proximity to their birth families. The equalisation and reform grant monies mean we now have capacity to recruit surplus adopters, including Lewisham based adopters, that other Local Authorities and Adoption agencies can use. We anticipate that this will generate income for Lewisham. £50k represents two additional assessments.	50.0		50.0	C 9
CYP09	FAMILY SOCIAL WORK	Meliot Road is a family centre that provides support to vulnerable families and Court reports as part of care proceedings. It is planned to sell surplus capacity to other London boroughs. Where the Council sells surplus capacity to other London Boroughs, officers must ensure that there are appropriate contractual arrangement in place to cover such arrangements.	15.0		15.0	C 9

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
CYP10	EARLY INTERVENTION	This budget covers delivery of the Family Information Service which provides a directory that covers early years and childcare, employment and training, health, housing, safety and other issues. The database has been brought in house and the cost has therefore reduced.	45.0		45.0	C 9
CYP11	EARLY INTERVENTION	Targeted Family Support contract - the commissioned Targeted Family Support contract provides support to vulnerable families. Through better commissioning arrangements savings can be made as we have managed the current Targeted Family Support contract to deliver to a lower value than initially set aside for the contract. This saving does not reduce the number of families who will receive support from the service, but does reduce the unit costs.	100.0		100.0	C 9
CYP12	ATTENDANCE & WELFARE	Attendance and Welfare Service - Parents have a legal responsibility to ensure that their child is attending school regularly. The service works closely with families, schools and other agencies to improve school attendance. Failure to attend school regularly could result in the Council taking legal action. Magistrates can also impose a Parenting Order, requiring parents or carers to attend counselling or guidance sessions for a period of up to three months. A full re-organisation of the service was proposed in the last budget round, including de-layering of management as well as considering the caseloads of staff and the areas of work that have the greatest impact on absence. Savings of £200k have already been agreed. It will become a traded service for non-statutory elements. A further saving is now believed possible to make. The total saving is £500k or 50% of the original budget (£1,087k), taking expenditure into line with our statistical neighbours.	100.0	200.0	300.0	C 2
CYP13	YOUTH SERVICE	The Youth Service has been reorganised and provides directly and through commissioning a range of services supporting young people in the borough aged 8-19, up to 25 with LDD covering: 1:1 intensive support for young people with identified vulnerabilities, Issue based group work for specific vulnerable groups, Street based youth work and Access to positive activities through fun and vibrant places to go and things to do. With activities targeted at young people at the greatest risk of poor life outcomes. All services are aimed at achieving impact for young people of: Improved life skills· Increased involvement in education, employment or training, Staying safe and well, and	100.0		100.0	C 9

		preventing needs from escalating. It is now proposed to reduce the commissioned work for youth by a further £100k from the currently allocated £965k.				
CYP14	SERVICES TO SCHOOLS	Service Level agreements are offered by the council to schools and cover a variety of support services. Schools pay for these services from their delegated formula budgets. The services continue to trade successfully with schools and are increasing the value of services they are selling. It is proposed to increase the range of charges to schools and to ensure that all services to schools by the council are achieving the 15% overheads recovery.	75.0	75.0	150.0	C 2
CYP15	COST REDUCTIONS	The Directorate has been operating a Departmental Expenditure Panel (DEP) for two years in order to challenge the need for all proposed expenditure. The departmental expenditure panel consists of the Executive Director of Children of Young People and the Directorate's Head of Resources. It approves all expenditure that is incurred within the Directorate before it is committed unless it is an emergency or is for a social care / special educational needs placement. This has already resulted in in-year savings through stopping expenditure or budget holders deciding it is no longer appropriate to undertake expenditure in these austere times. It is proposed now to take out of the budget the savings that have been delivered in the past through this process.	216.0		216.0	C 9
Total 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Children and Young People Directorate			971.0	475.0	1,446.0	

Summary of 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Community Services Directorate

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
COM01	ADULT SOCIAL CARE	This proposal builds on a number of previous savings proposals (Rounds 1 and 2) that bring together adult health and care services. The integrated adult health and care programme has been established to deliver better outcomes for residents and, through the joining up of health and care services and the removal of duplication across the whole health and care system deliver a range of efficiencies.. The integrated care programme will focus on developing teams of professionals and support services that work closely with GP practices to reduce duplication of assessment , care planning and management of care. It is anticipated that this way of working will enable a saving of 2.5 m to be made in 2014/15.	2,500.0		2,500.0	T1
COM02	CULTURE & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Both Leisure contracts include provision for free swims for under 16s and over 60s. In future, given the recognised benefits of swimming in terms of health and wellbeing, Public Health funding will be used to deliver this provision going forward as part of their physical activity programme. The commitment to free swims for under 16s and over 60s will therefore remain and work in partnership with Public Health will take place to promote the scheme and increase take up.	200.0		200.0	C 4
COM03	CULTURE & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - VCS grants	It is proposed to reduce the £6.4m grants budget by £0.5m. This saving proposal will not impact on the small grants, faith fund or existing commitments in the main grants programme. The saving will be taken from unallocated funds. Savings have become available through reduction to the required contribution to London Borough Grants Scheme and previously agreed tapered funding.	500.0		500.0	C 4

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
COM04	SUPPORTING PEOPLE	The Supporting People service received an additional amount within its budget to cover inflation costs. However the Supporting People Framework Agreement and call-off contracts under it do not provide for indexation or any inflationary increase and this additional funding can therefore be offered as a saving.	100.0		100.0	T 1
COM05	DRUGS & ALCOHOL	Savings will be delivered through improved efficiencies, following a review of the drug and alcohol treatment budget and reallocation of resources in line with priorities. The Drug and Alcohol Action Team is working closely with Public Health in this work. The Tier 4 (detox and rehab) panel has been overhauled and the Tier 4 provider framework re-commissioned. This ensures improved utilisation of rehabilitation provision and mitigates against the possible reduction in overall rehab places. In order to support people leaving rehab, an Aftercare service (TTP) has been commissioned and this ensures wraparound support is provided to residents following a period in a rehab setting. This results in sustained recovery. Local community based detox provision has also been established (also known as ambulatory detox) which is less costly than a residential rehab placement.	300.0		300.0	T 1
Total 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Community Services Directorate			3,600.0	0.0	3,600.0	

Summary of 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Customer Services Directorate

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
CUS01	HOUSING STRATEGY & PROGRAMMES	This proposal is to restructure the entire Housing Strategy and Programme team to provide a more streamlined approach by merging three teams into two new units, which will reduce management overheads, duplication and streamline processes. Of the £173k, £100k is already accounted for in the 2014/15 budget with a further £73k being a new saving achieved by a wider scale restructure of the team	73.0		73.0	C 5
CUS02	BECKENHAM PLACE PARK, BEREAVEMENT SERVICES, REFUSE & FLEET SERVICES	Cost reviews in Beckenham Place Park, Bereavement Services, Refuse & Fleet Services: £53k	53.0		53.0	C 6
CUS03	REFUSE	1.Reduction of recycling collection round and vehicle (x1). There are currently 9 rounds. Route optimisation will allow for one round to be reduced. 2.Income from bin hire charges introduced this year is exceeding original estimate. There is no indication that this will reduce in future years.	270.0		270.0	C 6
CUS04	PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING UNIT	To transfer the hostels from the HRA to the General Fund. The budget for Hostel accommodation is currently held in the HRA. In recent years hostels have been used to increase the Council's stock of temporary accommodation, along side Bed & Breakfast accommodation (B&B) and Private Sector Leases (PSL), which are charged to the General Fund. The transfer of Hostels to the General Fund would allow a consistent approach for all types of temporary accommodation. An effect of this change would be to set the rents for those in hostel accommodation on the same basis as those in PSL properties. This would have the effect of increasing income to the Council of £200k from 2015/16		200.0	200.0	C 5
CUS05	HOUSING STRATEGY & PROGRAMMES	This saving will be achieved by absorbing an element of the expected £516k management costs within the Council as a result of the fact that now a large number of the properties have been let the resource requirement to manage the scheme has reduced. The effect of these efficiencies is a reduction in the expenditure budget for the Milford Towers project of £158k in this year.	158.0		158.0	C 5

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
CUS06	SERVICE POINT	The Registration Service provides a Nationality Checking Service (NCS) which generates an income (budgeted income of £116K). The savings proposal increases the income budget by £200K to £316K. There is a significant demand for the NCS service and this is expected to continue for the next 2 years. The increase will be achieved by increasing the number of appointments available and processing more checks. The increased income assumes 60% of customers will go on to attend a Citizen Ceremony	200.0		200.0	C 7
CUS07	SERVICE POINT	The Call.Point service current delivers an out of hours emergency telephone service. This savings proposal recommends the outsourcing of the service. Previous recommendations were to outsource the service to the London wide shared service centre operated by Vangent. However, concerns were raised over performance and risk. This proposal recommends the service is put out to tender rather than using the London wide shared service centre. Soft market testing suggests that once set up £200K savings are possible. Other providers (e.g. Agilisys and Capita) both deliver for other local authorities who report they are satisfied with the services received.	100.0	100.0	200.0	C 7
CUS08	SERVICE POINT	Reorganise Service Point staff to delayer and rationalise management duties. Delete remaining 6 x Sc6 supervisor posts, but create 1 scheduling and planning officer and 2 x Sc4.	25.0	25.0	50.0	C 7
Total 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Customer Services Directorate			879.0	325.0	1,204.0	

Summary of 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Resources and Regeneration Directorate

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
RNR01	AUDIT & RISK	<p>Internal Audit – review assurance priorities and delivery mechanisms to save £75,000. Counter Fraud – reduce resourcing of Housing Benefit Investigation by £25,000 (part year) ahead of move to the Single Fraud Investigation Service under Department for Work and Pensions direction. This post is currently vacant. Health & Safety – delete the vacant post for administration support H&S post to save £30,000 and connect this team to the Business Support Services review to get administration support centrally.</p>	130.0		130.0	C 1
RNR02	PLANNING	<p>The Planning Service introduced a fee of £1000 plus VAT for the provision of pre-application advice on Major planning applications with a £40,000 income target per annum. This fee was introduced on 1 April 2011. At the time, the Service stated that it would assess the potential to extend pre-application fees to other planning application categories including householder applications.</p> <p>The provision of the pre-application advice service has now been internally reviewed by the Planning Service and also benchmarked against other comparable London Boroughs.</p> <p>A combination of an increase in fees for pre application advice on Major planning applications and a new fee for householder and other small scale scheme pre-application advice should enable an additional £50k to be achieved in fees.</p>	50.0		50.0	C 8

Ref	Service	Proposal Narrative	2014/15 £'000s	2015/16 £'000s	Total Saving £'000s	Thematic (T) / Cross- cutting (C) Reference
RNR03	POLICY & GOVERNANCE	A saving across the salaries budgets is proposed at £128k for 2014/15 through the deletion of 2.4 vacant posts	128.0		128.0	C 1
RNR04	STRATEGY	Community Budget 100K reduction: reduction in cross partner project work, Seek resources for specific projects when needed rather than baseline funding	100.0		100.0	C 4
Total 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals - Resources & Regeneration Directorate			408.0	0.0	408.0	
Total 2014 / 16 New Savings Proposals			5,858.0	800.0	6,658.0	

APPENDIX D – Detailed Budget Savings Proposals

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Resources

REF: CYP01

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 2

SERVICE: Performance

LEAD OFFICER: Alan Docksey

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Finance

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
691	37	654

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Performance Service provides statutory data collections, data analysis, performance reporting to the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board (CYPSPB), Lewisham Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB), DMT, Directorate Services, with particular emphasis on Children's Social Care and School Improvement.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

The implementation of the replacement corporate software for monitoring and reporting performance should result in fewer administrative processes to produce the monthly and annual performance data reports. This is expected to result in a saving of one post with an estimated value of £50k.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users: It is anticipated that the reduction in administrative processes will make the performance Team more efficient in its functions. This may impact on the output of the service but we will try to minimise this.

Does this proposal require a full report . (Seek advice from Legal Services)

YES

NO

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" ie. span over different Services

YES

NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15:	2015/16:	Total 2014 / 16:
50		50

Percentage of Net Budget proposed: 7.6%

Effect on HRA/DSG: / YES NO If YES, outline the effect below

HRA:

DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:

YES

NO

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)											
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory											
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable											
4			2			3			4		
Impact on Corporate Priorities:											
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:-					
<i>J -Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity</i>			<i>B - Young people's achievement and involvement</i>			A. Community Leadership and empowerment					
						B. Young people's achievement and involvement					
						C. Clean, green and liveable					
						D. Safety, security and a visible presence					
						E. Strengthening the local economy					
						F. Decent Homes for all					
						G. Protection of children					
						H. Caring for adults and the older people					
						I. Active, health citizens					
						J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity					
Impact of saving on corporate priority											
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral						
Level of Impact			Level of Impact								
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low						
What is the overall impact on equalities?											
2014/15			2015/16			2016/17					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low			
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:											
Ethnicity:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender:			High			Medium			Low		
Age:			High			Medium			Low		
Disability:			High			Medium			Low		
Religion/Belief:			High			Medium			Low		
Pregnancy/Maternity			High			Medium			Low		
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High			Medium			Low		
Sexual Orientation:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender reassignment			High			Medium			Low		
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :											
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :											
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken											
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal											
All Wards :			If individual Wards, please state:								
YES											
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal											
Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector											

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure							
Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?						YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:						YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:							
Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)							
♠ (not covered by council employee)							
♦ (covered by council employee)							
♥ including posts covered by agency)							
(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)							
	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		2	1	7	2		
Head Count		2	1	7	2		
Vacant♠				2			
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							
Workforce Profile Information							
Please provide a breakdown of your service area:							
Gender:	Female: 7			Male: 5			
Ethnicity:	BME: 5		White: 6		Other: 1		Not Known:
Disability:	0						
Sexual Orientation:	Where known: 4 Heterosexual			Not Known: 8			
Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations							
From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?							
	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE				1			
Head Count							
How do you expect to reduce these posts?							
	Redundancy		TUPE			Delete vacant post	
FTE :						1	
Head Count:							
Grades :							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Standards and Achievement

REF: CYP03

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 2

SERVICE: Early Years

LEAD OFFICER: Sue Tipler

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's
337	55	282

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Early Years Improvement Team provides advice, support and training for practitioners working with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage in the maintained and non-maintained sector.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £58k

It is proposed to make a saving on £58k through a review of work.

Local authorities are required to make arrangements to secure that early childhood services in their area are provided in an integrated way that facilitates access to services and maximises the benefits to children, parents and prospective parents.

Early years providers providing early years for which they are registered under the Childcare Act 2006 (or would be required to register but for being exempted) are required to ensure compliance with the “Early Years Foundation Stage”. The proposed review of work in this area will have to ensure that sufficient advice, support and training will be available to ensure early years providers comply with their requirements to deliver the “Early Years Foundation Stage”.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

The team will have to do less with early years providers and childminders. We will focus on areas of support which have the greatest impact.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services

YES

NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value:

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 to 2015

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – School Standards & Achievements

REF: CYP04

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 2

SERVICE: Looked after Children Education Team

LEAD OFFICER: Sue Tipler

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
62	0	62

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are: The Looked After Children Education Team oversees the education of Looked After Children, including providing tuition to support their learning, support in transition from primary to secondary school, and peer mentoring. The team also ensure that destinations data is collected to monitor pathways and ensure the right support is provided to individuals.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: **£62k**

Most of the funding is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant (£200k) although there is a contribution of £62k to the service from the General Fund. In future all costs will be contained within the Dedicated Schools Grant.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

A review of the service will be required. The education of our Looked After Children will continue to be a priority.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services YES NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £62k

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)? YES NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Children & Social Care

REF: CYP05

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Business Support, Placements & Procurement

LEAD OFFICER: Ian Smith

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Finance

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
2,617	Nil	2,617

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Business Support within Children's Social Care providers administrative support for all the services in the division. These are Referral & Assessment; Family Social Work; Looked After Children; Adoption; Leaving Care; Fostering; Placements & Procurement; Quality Assurance; and Children with Complex Needs.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

As well as the Business Support teams based in the front line services, there are currently 2 specialist teams providing centralised functions in compliance with separation of duties under Financial Regulations. This contributes to safeguarding functions by freeing up and supporting Social Workers to concentrate on direct work with vulnerable children and families. A review of business support across the Children's Social Care Division is being undertaken to examine the opportunities for reshaping current activities and identifying opportunities for sharing resources with other support teams in the Council such as Finance and Adult Social Care. These are in addition to the savings in the previous two years of £575k.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

It is anticipated that the make up of staff teams will change through the delivery of this proposal.

Does this proposal require a full report . (Seek advice from Legal Services)

YES

NO

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" ie. span over different Services

YES

NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15:	2015/16:	Total 2014 / 16:
100	50	150

Percentage of Net Budget proposed:

Effect on HRA/DSG: / YES NO If YES, outline the effect below

HRA:

DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:

YES

NO

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)											
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory											
Consultation with staff will be undertaken.											
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable											
4			2			3			4		
Impact on Corporate Priorities:											
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:-					
G - Protection of children			B - Young people's achievement and involvement			A. Community Leadership and empowerment					
						B. Young people's achievement and involvement					
						C. Clean, green and liveable					
						D. Safety, security and a visible presence					
						E. Strengthening the local economy					
						F. Decent Homes for all					
						G. Protection of children					
						H. Caring for adults and the older people					
						I. Active, health citizens					
						J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity					
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority								
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral						
Level of Impact			Level of Impact								
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low						
What is the overall impact on equalities?											
2014/15			2015/16			2016/17					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low			
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:											
Ethnicity:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender:			High			Medium			Low		
Age:			High			Medium			Low		
Disability:			High			Medium			Low		
Religion/Belief:			High			Medium			Low		
Pregnancy/Maternity			High			Medium			Low		
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High			Medium			Low		
Sexual Orientation:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender reassignment			High			Medium			Low		
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :											
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :											
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken											
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal											
All Wards :			If individual Wards, please state:								
YES											
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal											
Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector											

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:		

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ♦ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency)
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE	2	4	17.8	2	1		
Head Count	2	5	18	2	1		
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female: 21	Male: 7		
Ethnicity:	BME: 16	White: 12	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:	4			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:	Not Known:		

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							

How do you expect to reduce these posts?

	Redundancy	TUPE	Delete vacant post
FTE :			
Head Count:			
Grades :			

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Children & Social Care

REF: CYP06

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Looked After Children

LEAD OFFICER: Ian Smith

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Finance

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's
2,711	Nil	2,711

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The leaving care team currently works with children looked after from the age of sixteen.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

We propose to make savings and improve the performance of the service by changing the way the service functions. Currently there are three Looked after Children's Teams that work with looked after children from roughly the age of 5 to 16 at which point they transfer to one of three Leaving Care Teams who provide support as the young person leaves care and onwards until they are 21 (or 25 if they are in full time education). Feedback from the Children in Care Council is that they would prefer not to have the change of worker at the age of 16.

We are therefore proposing to have Looked after Children Teams that will take young people through to 25 where required. We can achieve this with 5 teams and delete one team manager post. The staff from that team will be spread out amongst the remaining teams.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

Service users will have fewer changes of social workers, which is something they have requested. It is envisaged that this change will also improve service user experience of transition points.

For staff, there will be a gradual change in caseload. Training will be offered to all staff to manage this.

Does this proposal require a full report . (Seek advice from Legal Services)

YES

NO

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” ie. span over different Services

YES

NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15:	2015/16:	Total 2014 / 16:
0	100	100

Percentage of Net Budget proposed:

Effect on HRA/DSG: / YES NO If YES, outline the effect below

HRA:

DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:

YES

NO

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)											
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory											
Consultation with staff will be undertaken.											
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable											
1			2			3			4		
Impact on Corporate Priorities:											
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:-					
G - Protection of children			B - Young people's achievement and involvement			A. Community Leadership and empowerment					
						B. Young people's achievement and involvement					
						C. Clean, green and liveable					
						D. Safety, security and a visible presence					
						E. Strengthening the local economy					
						F. Decent Homes for all					
						G. Protection of children					
						H. Caring for adults and the older people					
						I. Active, health citizens					
						J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity					
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority								
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral						
Level of Impact			Level of Impact								
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low						
What is the overall impact on equalities?											
2014/15			2015/16			2016/17					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low			
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:											
Ethnicity:			High	Medium	Low						
Gender:			High	Medium	Low						
Age:			High	Medium	Low						
Disability:			High	Medium	Low						
Religion/Belief:			High	Medium	Low						
Pregnancy/Maternity			High	Medium	Low						
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High	Medium	Low						
Sexual Orientation:			High	Medium	Low						
Gender reassignment			High	Medium	Low						
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :											
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :											
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken											
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal											
All Wards :			If individual Wards, please state:								
YES											
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal											
Services can be provided to young people who are defined as being eligible, under the Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000 and the 1989 Children Act. The duties are:											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a duty to advise, assist and befriend a looked after young person with a view to promoting their welfare when they cease being looked after; a duty to advise and befriend a young person who was previously looked after and is under 21 years; a power to assist a young person who was previously looked after and is under 21 years (and beyond if help needed is regarding education/ training or employment and the course begins before they are 21). A power to assist other young people who were accommodated by a health authority, education authority or privately fostered. 											

Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:		

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ♦ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		5.6	8	37.1	7.6	2	
Head Count		6	8	41	8	2	
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female: 53	Male: 12		
Ethnicity:	BME: 34	White: 24	Other: 1	Not Known: 6
Disability:	2			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known: 1 Bisexual 14 Heterosexual		Not Known: 50	

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							

How do you expect to reduce these posts?

	Redundancy	TUPE	Delete vacant post
FTE :			
Head Count:			
Grades :			

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Children & Social Care

REF: CYP07

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Contact

LEAD OFFICER: Ian Smith

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
19,683	Nil	19,683

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

We are required by legislation to provide contact between some parents and their children who have been removed from their care.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £50k (2015/16 only)

Some of these contacts need to be supervised and most of which are ordered by the courts. The Supervised Contact is provided in a safe place due to risks that the parent may still pose to the child. There is a requirement in many instances for birth parents to have contact with their children in Local Authority care. Contact will often be in secure environments, as some parents have difficult and challenging behaviour. We currently use specialist agencies to carry out this contact, who charge for premises. It is proposed to use Council premises in the future which will mean we will save on the cost of premises hire and/or alternatively negotiate significant reduction in room hire and other costs. This is in addition to the previous savings of £200k in 2013/14 and already offered for 2014/15.

The proposed saving relates to a reduction in costs of premises where the service is located. Any new competitive procurement would seek bids which could reduce this cost.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There is no anticipated impact on staff or service users.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000's

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
---	------------	-----------

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Children & Social Care

REF: CYP08

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Adoption Service

LEAD OFFICER: Ian Smith

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
2,900	1,048	1,852

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Adoption Support Team provide services and advice to families to assist them through the process of adoption and as required by legislation provide contact between some parents and their children who have been removed from their care. We are currently implementing the Government reforms on adoption. The reforms included an equalisation of the assessment fee to £27k.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: **£50k**

Historically the adoption service has not targeted Lewisham families for adoption as many Lewisham LAC cannot be placed in the borough in close proximity to their birth families.

The equalisation and reform grant monies mean we now have capacity to recruit surplus adopters, including Lewisham based adopters, that other Local Authorities and Adoption agencies can use. We anticipate that this will generate income for Lewisham. £50k represents two additional assessments.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

Lewisham has a good reputation for recruiting adopters, and being able to recruit adopters in Lewisham will be beneficial for children needing placements regionally, and across the country. Staff will now be able to target Lewisham families for adoption, and the service has the capacity to do this through the Adoption Reform Grant.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services YES NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value:

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)? YES NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Children & Social Care

REF: CYP09

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Family Social Work

LEAD OFFICER: Ian Smith

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
643	Nil	643

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Meliot Road is a family centre that provides support to vulnerable families and Court reports as part of care proceedings.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £15k

It is planned to sell surplus capacity to other London boroughs.

Where the Council sells surplus capacity to other London Boroughs, officers must ensure that there are appropriate contractual arrangement in place to cover such arrangements.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There is no anticipated impact on staff or service users.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services

YES

NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value:

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♣ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♣							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Note: Where the saving proposal is cross cutting or an aggregation of lower value savings to arrive at the de-minimis level of £100k, please ensure that sufficient detail is maintained locally to support these.

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Targeted services and Joint Commissioning

REF: CYP10

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Early Intervention

LEAD OFFICER: Warwick Tomsett

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
151	NIL	151

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

This budget covers delivery of the Family Information Service which provides a directory that covers early years and childcare, employment and training, health, housing, safety and other issues.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £45k

The database has been brought in house and the cost has therefore reduced.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

This service will now be delivered through the Council's Callpoint service. There will be no impact on staff and service users will continue to have access to the same information.

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" i.e. span over different Services

YES

NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value:

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♣ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♣							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Targeted Services and Joint Commission

REF: CYP11

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Early Intervention

LEAD OFFICER: Warwick Tomsett

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
1,650	NIL	1,650

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Targeted Family Support contract - the commissioned Targeted Family Support contract provides support to vulnerable families.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £100k

Through better commissioning arrangements savings can be made as we have managed the current Targeted Family Support contract to deliver to a lower value than initially set aside for the contract. This saving does not reduce the number of families who will receive support from the service, but does reduce the unit costs

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There is no anticipated impact on staff or service users.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services YES NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value:

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)? YES NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Note: Where the saving proposal is cross cutting or an aggregation of lower value savings to arrive at the de-minimis level of £100k, please ensure that sufficient detail is maintained locally to support these.

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Targeted Services and Joint Commission

REF: CYP12

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 2

SERVICE: Attendance and Welfare

LEAD OFFICER: Warwick Tomsett

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Finance

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
1,087	Nil	1,087

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Attendance and Welfare Service - Parents have a legal responsibility to ensure that their child is attending school regularly. The service works closely with families, schools and other agencies to improve school attendance. Failure to attend school regularly could result in the Council taking legal action. Magistrates can also impose a Parenting Order, requiring parents or carers to attend counselling or guidance sessions for a period of up to three months.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

A full re-organisation of the service was proposed in the last budget round, including de-layering of management as well as considering the caseloads of staff and the areas of work that have the greatest impact on absence. Savings of £200k have already been agreed. It will become a traded service for non-statutory elements. A further saving is now believed possible to make. The total saving is £500k or 50% of the original budget (£1,087k), taking expenditure into line with our statistical neighbours.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There is a likely reduction in staff. Discussions are taking place with schools about the work they do on attendance and the expectations on them in future to take greater responsibility for casework. Secondary schools already have developed infrastructures for doing this, and primary schools will be offered support in moving to the new model. Schools will be offered the opportunity to buy a range of services to supplement what they deliver themselves, and there will be a number of core statutory services which will remain free. It is planned to implement the changes in September 2014 delivering a part year saving in 14/15

Does this proposal require a full report . (Seek advice from Legal Services)	YES	NO
Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15:	2015/16:	Total 2014 / 16:
100	200	300

Percentage of Net Budget proposed:

Effect on HRA/DSG: / YES NO If YES, outline the effect below

HRA:
DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year: YES NO

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)											
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory											
Consultation is under way with staff, schools and the third sector but is not yet complete.											
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable											
4			2			3			4		
Impact on Corporate Priorities:											
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:-					
<i>B - Young people's achievement and involvement</i>			<i>J - Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity</i>			A. Community Leadership and empowerment					
						B. Young people's achievement and involvement					
						C. Clean, green and liveable					
						D. Safety, security and a visible presence					
						E. Strengthening the local economy					
						F. Decent Homes for all					
						G. Protection of children					
						H. Caring for adults and the older people					
						I. Active, health citizens					
						J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity					
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority								
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral						
Level of Impact			Level of Impact								
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low						
What is the overall impact on equalities?											
2014/15			2015/16			2016/17					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low			
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:											
Ethnicity:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender:			High			Medium			Low		
Age:			High			Medium			Low		
Disability:			High			Medium			Low		
Religion/Belief:			High			Medium			Low		
Pregnancy/Maternity			High			Medium			Low		
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High			Medium			Low		
Sexual Orientation:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender reassignment			High			Medium			Low		
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :											
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :											
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken											
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal											
All Wards :			If individual Wards, please state:								
YES											
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal											
Under The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2012 "Expenditure arising from the authority's functions under Chapter 2 of Part 6 of the 1996 Act (school attendance)" falls within the Non Schools Education Budget as set out at Schedule 1 to the Regulations. It follows that such expenditure should properly be funded from general local authority resources (not DSG). This does not prohibit the charging of school budgets for all services provided which relate to school attendance.											
Where the responsibility rests with the local authority then the local authority are not able to seek to charge											

schools for such activities, e.g. school attendance orders and school attendance prosecutions. Where however the charge relates to functions additional or ancillary to the local authority functions then it seems that the local authority may seek charges from schools.

The "School Attendance" statutory guidance confirms "Only local authorities can prosecute parents and they must fund all associated costs."

Local authorities are statutorily responsible for ensuring that parents fulfil their legal duty that their child/ran of compulsory school age receive suitable, efficient fulltime education either by regularly attending school or otherwise. Local authorities are statutorily required to make arrangements to enable them to establish (as far as it is possible to do so) the identity of children in their area who are not receiving a suitable education.

Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector

Neutral

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:	CYP46, Jan 2013	

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		3.6		18.8	1		
Head Count		5		19	1		
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female: 23	Male: 2		
Ethnicity:	BME: 12	White: 11	Other: 1	Not Known: 1
Disability:	3			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known: 8 heterosexual		Not Known: 17	

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Targeted Services and Joint Commission

REF: CYP13

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Youth Service

LEAD OFFICER: Warwick Tomsett

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
2,977	160	2,817

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Youth Service has been reorganised and provides directly and through commissioning a range of services supporting young people in the borough aged 8-19, up to 25 with LDD covering: 1:1 intensive support for young people with identified vulnerabilities, Issue based group work for specific vulnerable groups, Street based youth work and Access to positive activities through fun and vibrant places to go and things to do. With activities targeted at young people at the greatest risk of poor life outcomes. All services are aimed at achieving impact for young people of: Improved life skills, Increased involvement in education, employment or training, Staying safe and well, and preventing needs from escalating.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £100k

It is now proposed to reduce the commissioned work for youth by a further £100k from the currently allocated £965k.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

Service users will continue to have access to a wide range of youth provision. There will be no impact on Council staff, since this money is related to commissioning services from external providers. It will mean less provision. However, the pot would remain large and therefore there would still be a range of high quality provision and providers.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services

YES

NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value:

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – School Standards and achievements

REF: CYP14

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 2

SERVICE: School Improvement

LEAD OFFICER: Alan Docksey

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Service Level agreements are offered by the council to schools and cover a variety of support services. Schools pay for these services from their delegated formula budgets.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £150k

The services continue to trade successfully with schools and are increasing the value of services they are selling. It is proposed to increase the range of charges to schools and to ensure that all services to schools by the council are achieving the 15% overheads recovery.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users: By increasing the range of charged for services and decreasing the number of “free” services then schools will find that their delegated budgets do not enable the same amount of services to be procured as previously. It is expected that the percentage impact on a school’s budget is 0.1%.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services - CYP YES NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £75k

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)? YES NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Children & Young People – Cross Directorate Savings

REF: CYP15

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 9

SERVICE: Safeguarding and early intervention

LEAD OFFICER: Alan Docksey

PORTFOLIO: Children & Young People

SELECT COMMITTEE: Children & Young People

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
50,068	4,889	45,179

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are: The Directorate has been operating a Departmental Expenditure Panel (DEP) for two years in order to challenge the need for all proposed expenditure. The departmental expenditure panel consists of the Executive Director of Children of Young People and the Directorate's Head of Resources. It approves all expenditure that is incurred within the Directorate before it is committed unless it is an emergency or is for a social care / special educational needs placement.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: **£216k**

This has already resulted in in-year savings through stopping expenditure or budget holders deciding it is no longer appropriate to undertake expenditure in these austere times. It is proposed now to take out of the budget the savings that have been delivered in the past through this process.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users: This proposal brings the budget for the Directorate into line with the reduced spending level as a result of operating the DEP.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services - CYP

YES

NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value:

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♣ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♣							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Community Services

Ref COM01

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: T 1

SERVICE: Adult Social Care

LEAD OFFICER: Joan Hutton/ Dee Carlin

PORTFOLIO: Assessment/ Care Management. Provision of care

SELECT COMMITTEE: HCSC

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's)

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's
107,500	26,500	81,000

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The aim of adult social care services is to enable residents who are eligible for social care funding to:

- gain maximum independence
- make choices about their care
- stay healthy and safe and
- increase their ability to participate in family and community life.

Adult social care fulfils the council's statutory duties in respect of vulnerable adults under the National Assistance Act 1948 and subsequent related legislation. By April 2014, all of this legislation will be streamlined into the one Social Care Act,

Councils are required to complete a thorough assessment of people's needs and to meet these assessed needs in the most cost effective manner by providing community care services.

The eligibility criteria is set by the Department of Health's Fair access to services FACS

The service also provides information and advice for residents who are not eligible for adult social care.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: **£ 2.5m**

This proposal builds on a number of previous savings proposals (Rounds 1 and 2) that bring together adult health and care services.

The integrated adult health and care programme has been established to deliver better outcomes for residents and, through the joining up of health and care services, and the removal of duplication across the whole health and care system, deliver a range of efficiencies.. The integrated care programme will focus on developing teams of professionals and support services that work closely with GP practices to reduce duplication of assessment , care planning and management of care. It is anticipated that this way of working will enable a saving of £2.5 m to be made in 2014/15.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users: Making significant financial savings at the same time as meeting the needs of vulnerable adults is clearly a challenge, but joint working should make it possible to decrease costs without impacting on the quality of care offered

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
---	-----	----

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000’s

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/)?	YES	NO
--	-----	----

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ♦ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency)
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Community Services

REF: COM02

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 4

SERVICE: Cultural and Community Development Service - Leisure

LEAD OFFICER: Liz Dart

PORTFOLIO: Community Services

SELECT COMMITTEE: Healthier Communities

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's)

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
£2,500	£0	£2,500

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The leisure budget is managed by the Community Resources Team within Culture and Community Development. Leisure services are delivered through two contracts that manage ten sports and leisure facilities across the borough ranging in size from playing fields at Warren Avenue to our newly opened flagship Glass Mill Leisure Centre in Loampit Vale.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £0.2m

Both Leisure contracts include provision for free swims for under 16s and over 60s. In future, given the recognised benefits of swimming in terms of health and wellbeing, Public Health funding will be used to deliver this provision going forward as part of their physical activity programme. The commitment to free swims for under 16s and over 60s will therefore remain and partnership working with Public Health will take place to promote the scheme and increase take up.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There are no staff or service impacts from this proposal.

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" i.e. span over different Services YES NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000's

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)? YES NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Community Service

REF: COM03

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C4

SERVICE: Cultural and Community Development Service – VCS grants

LEAD OFFICER: Liz Dart

PORTFOLIO: Community Services/Third Sector

SELECT COMMITTEE: Safer Stronger Select Committee

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's
£6,400	£0	£6,400

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Cultural and Community Development Service works in partnership with residents and the voluntary and community sector to deliver on Lewisham's priorities by:

- Encouraging people to be involved and active
- Building the capacity of the voluntary and cultural sectors
- Giving individuals and community groups a voice
- Encouraging enterprise and innovation

The community sector grants programmes provide funding to voluntary and community sector organisations across the borough and contributes to the London Borough Grants Scheme to ensure Lewisham residents have access to pan London services.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £0.5m

It is proposed to reduce the £6.4m grants budget by £0.5m. This saving proposal will not impact on the small grants, faith fund or existing commitments in the main grants programme. The saving will be taken from unallocated funds. Savings have become available through reduction to the required contribution to London Borough Grants Scheme and previously agreed tapered funding.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There is no impact on staff from this savings proposal. The proposed £0.5m saving relates to unallocated funds within the grants budget so will not require any reduction to existing main grant commitments.

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
--	-----	----

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000's

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
--	-----	----

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ (including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Community Services - Crime Reduction and Supporting People

REF: COM 04

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: T 1

SERVICE: Supporting People

LEAD OFFICER: Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney

PORTFOLIO: Cllr Chris Best

SELECT COMMITTEE: Healthier

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's)

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
14,062	266	13,796

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Service delivers against the following objectives:

- to provide vulnerable people with the support needed to achieve and maintain independent living
- to prevent and avoid more intensive and high cost services
- to prevent homelessness
- to provide support and accommodation for people where there may also be a statutory duty. For example, high support mental health schemes, emergency accommodation in relation to domestic violence, young people and people with learning disabilities.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal:

£100 k

The Supporting People service received an additional amount within its budget to cover inflation costs. However the Supporting People Framework Agreement and call-off contracts under it do not provide for indexation or any inflationary increase and this additional funding can therefore be offered as a saving.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: na

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Community Services Crime Reduction and Supporting People

REF: COM05

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: T 1

SERVICE: Drugs and Alcohol

LEAD OFFICER: Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney

PORTFOLIO: Cllr Janet Daby

SELECT COMMITTEE: Safer Stronger / Healthier Communities

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's)

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
5,981	-5,445	536

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Service delivers against the following objectives :

- to reduce harm caused by drug use both to the individual and to the community
- to deliver a service for offenders with drug use
- to deliver rehabilitation and detoxification provision
- to provide community treatment services
- help drug and alcohol users achieve tangible treatment gains and recovery
- to provide outreach and education and information

People accessing residential rehab will usually have:

- Failed in community treatment more than once
- Longer and more entrenched drug and alcohol misusing careers
- A range of problem substances
- Poorer physical and psychological health
- More significant housing problems

Service users attending residential rehab are likely to be more complex.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £300 k

Savings will be delivered through improved efficiencies, following a review of the drug and alcohol treatment budget and reallocation of resources in line with priorities. The Drug and Alcohol Action Team is working closely with Public Health in this work.

The Tier 4 (detox and rehab) panel has been overhauled and the Tier 4 provider framework recommissioned. This ensures improved utilisation of rehabilitation provision and mitigates against the possible reduction in overall rehab places.

In order to support people leaving rehab, an Aftercare service (TTP) has been commissioned and this ensures wraparound support is provided to residents following a period in a rehab setting. This results in sustained recovery. Local community based detox provision has also been established (also known as ambulatory detox) which is less costly than a residential rehab placement.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: n a

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
--	-----	----

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ♦ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency)
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services, Strategic Housing

REF: CUS01

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 5

SERVICE: Housing Strategy and Programmes

LEAD OFFICER: Jeff Endean

PORTFOLIO:

SELECT COMMITTEE: Housing Select Committee

2013/14 (000's) – seek information from Finance

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
422	17	405

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The service contract manages the direct provision of housing services for the Council's retained housing stock of c 18,000 homes through Lewisham Homes and the Brockley PFI. It manages the Council's partnerships with the broader housing sector, including where stock has been transferred to RPs. It manages the Council's policy agenda in relation to housing and homelessness, seeks to ensure housing objectives are delivered through private developments, supports the Executive Director in responding to the Housing Select Committee, provides business planning support across the housing division and oversees the housing capital programme.

The service also oversees the Housing Matters change programme, reviewing the ownership options for the Council's retained housing stock and ALMO, overseeing Council new build housing, and improving housing specifically for older people.

The team also manages the large estate regeneration schemes such as Excalibur, although this is 100% HRA funded and therefore not affected by this proposal.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

This proposal is to restructure the entire Housing Strategy and Programme team to provide a more streamlined approach by merging three teams into two new units, which will reduce management overheads, duplication and streamline processes.

Of the £173k, £100k is already accounted for in the 2014/15 budget with a further £73k being a new saving achieved by a wider scale restructure of the team

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

The nature and focus of the teams work is changing and the make-up of the team needs to reflect this. It is likely that a review of the clienting relationship functions between the Council and its key Housing Management Partners will need to take place with a transfer of some of the existing functions to our Partners. In addition, there also needs to be a review of the nature and structure of the policy function across the team.

Does this proposal require a full report? (Seek advice from Legal Services)

YES

NO

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" i.e. span over different Services

YES

NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)										
2014/15			2015/16			Total 2014 / 16				
73						73				
Percentage of Net Budget proposed:										
Effect on HRA/DSG: /		YES	NO	If YES, outline the effect below						
HRA: DSG:										
Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:						YES	NO			
If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:										
Outcome of Consultation (if required)										
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory										
This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.										
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable										
1			2			3			4	
Impact on Corporate Priorities:										
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity				
F			J							
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority							
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral					
Level of Impact			Level of Impact							
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low					
What is the overall impact on equalities?										
2014/15			2015/16			2016/17				
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low		
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:										
Ethnicity:			High	Medium	Low					
Gender:			High	Medium	Low					
Age:			High	Medium	Low					
Disability:			High	Medium	Low					
Religion/Belief:			High	Medium	Low					
Pregnancy/Maternity			High	Medium	Low					
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High	Medium	Low					
Sexual Orientation:			High	Medium	Low					
Gender reassignment			High	Medium	Low					
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :										

Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :

Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken

As this savings proposal has staffing implications, the service will be required to undertake an equalities analysis assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process. As part of their operational business processes, the service will monitor the impact of any staffing implications on service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal

All Wards : YES /NO	If individual Wards, please state:
-------------------------------	------------------------------------

Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

None

Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector

None

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:	2014/15 – CUS31	

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ♦ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency)
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE				8	4	1	
Head Count				7	3	1	
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥				1	1		

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female: 9	Male: 4		
Ethnicity:	BME: 3	White: 10	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:	0			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							

Head Count							
How do you expect to reduce these posts?							
	Redundancy	TUPE			Delete vacant post		
FTE :							
Head Count:							
Grades :							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services, Environment Division

REF: CUS02

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 6

SERVICE: Beckenham Place Park, Bereavement Services Refuse & Fleet Services

LEAD OFFICER: Nigel Tyrell

PORTFOLIO:

SELECT COMMITTEE: Sustainable Development

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £000's £53k

Staff related cost reviews in Beckenham Place Park, Bereavement Services Refuse & Fleet Services: £53k

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

No impact on service users. Increased workload for staff. Reduction of 1 part-time post.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services

YES

NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000's

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♣ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE	28%						
Head Count							
Vacant♣							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services, Environment Division

REF: CUS03

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 6

SERVICE: Refuse

LEAD OFFICER: Nigel Tyrell

PORTFOLIO:

SELECT COMMITTEE: Sustainable Development

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
5,641	2,161	3,480

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Refuse Collection Service collects domestic and trade waste and provides a recycling collection service.

The service customers are Lewisham residents and local business, including local housing providers. The stakeholders are residents, local business, members and central government.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: **£000's £270,000**

1.Reduction of recycling collection round and vehicle (x1). There are currently 9 rounds. Route optimisation will allow for one round to be reduced.

2.Income from bin hire charges introduced this year is exceeding original estimate. There is no indication that this will reduce in future years.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

No impact on service users. Increased workload for remaining staff Reduction of 4 agency posts (driver and 3 loaders).

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000's

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services, Strategic Housing

REF: CUS04

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 5

SERVICE: Private Sector Housing Unit: TRANSFER OF HOSTELS TO THE GENERAL FUND

LEAD OFFICER: Madeleine Jeffery

PORTFOLIO:

SELECT COMMITTEE: Housing Select Committee

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget: (note this is General Fund, there is also an HRA element)

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
795	119	676

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Council currently operates 24 hostels comprising of 334 rooms. These are made available to homeless households while they await the offer of a permanent social tenancy within the Council's main housing stock. The hostels are contained within the Housing Revenue Account and are managed by the Private Sector Housing Agency. The Council charges rents and a service charge for the hostel properties to residents. For those residents that are not working these charges are met through housing benefit. Working households meet the rental costs themselves. In addition to rent the hostel residents pay a heat, light, water and power charge directly.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £200k for 2015/16

There are two elements to this proposal. The two elements are:

1. To transfer the hostels from the HRA to the General Fund. This requires Secretary of State approval. It would however place the hostels in the same place as other TA types such as B&B and PS leasing which are already managed within the General Fund. The clientele are the same (i.e. transient residents and those who face hardship as a result of homelessness) and locating the management of all of the stock allocated to these residents in one place would make sense.
2. The second element to the change is an increase in the rents charged to residents of hostels. The proposed level of increased rents is set out below and would work within the current HB limitations but does not maximise this. If we took the rents to the limitation maximums then this would raise the 1 bed space rents by 59% or £70pw and the 2 bed space rents by 23% or £36pw. The proposal dampens the impacts as follows:

Bedspace	Current	Proposed	Change (£)	Change (%)
1	119.58	150.00	30.02	25.0
2	154.21	165.00	10.79	7.0
3	188.44	190.00	1.56	0.8
4	205.58	190.00	-15.58	-7.6
5	205.58	190.00	-15.58	-7.6
6	205.58	190.00	-15.58	-7.6
7	205.58	190.00	-15.58	-7.6

The total estimated additional income that would be generated by these changes is £201,768 after allowing for 10 per cent void loss. The issue of any increased interest costs coming from an increased valuation have not been calculated in this surplus.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There will be a minimal impact on working service users housed in 1 and 2 bed space units who meet their own rent and service charge costs as a result of the proposed change from the HRA to the General Fund.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000’s

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ◆ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency)
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant◆							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services, Strategic Housing

REF: CUS05

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 5

SERVICE: Housing Strategy and Programmes: MILFORD TOWERS HOUSING PROJECT

LEAD OFFICER: Jeff Endean

PORTFOLIO:

SELECT COMMITTEE: Housing Select Committee

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget: (note this is General Fund, there is also an HRA element)

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
0	250	(250)

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

In anticipation of the wider Catford town centre regeneration, the decant of Milford Towers began in April 2012. Market conditions slowed the regeneration process, and so the opportunity arose to use the decanted properties for a meanwhile use. This has been undertaken in combination with Notting Hill Housing who are targeting these properties to local residents at a discount to market rents. This meanwhile, can be expected to continue for a minimum of at least two years while options for the regeneration are developed and then pursued. A more detailed analysis is being undertaken of the budget for this project by the finance team to confirm the contributions over the next 2 – 3 years.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £158k

This saving will be achieved by absorbing an element of the expected £516k management costs within the Council as a result of the fact that now a large number of the properties have been let the resource requirement to manage the scheme has reduced. The effect of these efficiencies is a reduction in the expenditure budget for the Milford Towers project of £158k in this year.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There will be no impact on service users. Staff will achieve the saving through efficiencies in the way in which the management of the scheme is managed, leading to reduced management costs.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services	YES	NO
--	-----	----

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000's

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
---	-----	----

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services Directorate / Public Services Division

REF: CUS06

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 7

SERVICE: Service Point

LEAD OFFICER: Roy Morgan

PORTFOLIO: Cllr Susan Wise

SELECT COMMITTEE: Safer Stronger

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
2,585	662	1,993

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Service Point is responsible for the Access.Point, Call.Point and Registration services. Customers are those needing to contact the Council for a service. Stakeholders are the services that Service Point administers and the General Register Office (part of HM Passport Office).

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal: £200K

The Registration Service provides a Nationality Checking Service (NCS) which generates an income (budgeted income of £116K). The savings proposal increases the income budget by £200K to £316K. There is a significant demand for the NCS service and this is expected to continue for the next 2 years. The increase will be achieved by increasing the number of appointments available and processing more checks. The increased income assumes 60% of customers will go on to attend a Citizen Ceremony.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There are no staff impacts. Service Users will benefit from the proposal.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services

YES

NO

If proposal delivers part year saving in 2014/15, state value: £000's

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?

YES

NO

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♠ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♥							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services Directorate / Public Services Division

REF: CUS07

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 7

SERVICE: Service Point

LEAD OFFICER: Roy Morgan

PORTFOLIO: Cllr Susan Wise

SELECT COMMITTEE: Safer Stronger

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's
2,585	662	1,993

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Service Point is responsible for the Access.Point, Call.Point and Registration services. Customers are those needing to contact the Council for a service. Stakeholders are the services that Service Point administers and the General Register Office (part of HM Passport Office).

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal:

The CallPoint service currently delivers an out of hours emergency telephone service. This savings proposal recommends the outsourcing of the service. Previous recommendations were to outsource the service to the London wide shared service centre operated by Vangent. However, concerns were raised over performance and risk. This proposal recommends the service is put out to tender rather than using the London wide shared service centre. Soft market testing suggests that once set up £200K savings are possible. Other providers (e.g. Agilisys and Capita) both deliver for other local authorities who report they are satisfied with the services received.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

There are 8 FTE involved in the delivery of the service. Of these 4.5 FTE would TUPE to the new provider and 3.5 would return to the day time service and release agency staff. At least the same level of service would be provided to customers. There is also the potential to deliver a more robust service as more staff would be on duty.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15	2015/16	Total 2014 / 16
100	100	200

Percentage of Net Budget proposed:

Effect on HRA/DSG: / YES NO **If YES, outline the effect below**

HRA:

DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:

YES

NO

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)											
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory											
This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.											
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable											
1			2			3			4		
Impact on Corporate Priorities:											
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity					
J											
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority								
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral						
Level of Impact			Level of Impact								
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low						
What is the overall impact on equalities?											
2014/15			2015/16			2016/17					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low			
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:											
Ethnicity:			High	Medium	Low						
Gender:			High	Medium	Low						
Age:			High	Medium	Low						
Disability:			High	Medium	Low						
Religion/Belief:			High	Medium	Low						
Pregnancy/Maternity			High	Medium	Low						
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High	Medium	Low						
Sexual Orientation:			High	Medium	Low						
Gender reassignment			High	Medium	Low						
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :											
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :											
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken											
As this savings proposal has staffing implications, the service will be required to undertake an equalities analysis assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process. As part of their operational business processes, the service will monitor the impact of any staffing implications on service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.											
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal											
All Wards : YES / NO			If individual Wards, please state:								
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal											

Outsourcing the service would require the service to be competitively tendered through a procurement process which must be carried out in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and the Council's Constitution. Any savings achieved will be dependent upon the outcome of the procurement process. The outsourcing of the service may result in a TUPE transfer under the TUPE Regulations 2006.

Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:	2013/14 – CUS22	

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		8					
Head Count		8					
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female: 7	Male: 1		
Ethnicity:	BME: 6	White: 2	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:	0			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:	Not Known:		

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							

How do you expect to reduce these posts?

	Redundancy	TUPE	Delete vacant post
FTE :			
Head Count:			
Grades :			

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Customer Services Directorate / Public Services Division

REF: CUS08

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 7

SERVICE: Service Point

LEAD OFFICER: Roy Morgan

PORTFOLIO: Cllr Susan Wise

SELECT COMMITTEE: Safer Stronger

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's) – seek information from Group Finance Managers

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
2,585	662	1,993

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Service Point is responsible for the Access.Point, Call.Point and Registration services. Customers are those needing to contact the Council for a service. Stakeholders are the services that Service Point administers and the General Register Office (part of HM Passport Office).

Description of saving proposed

Please provide savings value and sufficient details on the proposal:

Reorganise Service Point staff to delayer and rationalise management duties. Delete remaining 6 x Sc6 supervisor posts, but create 1 scheduling and planning officer and 2 x Sc4.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

No impact on service delivery.

Deletes 6 x Sc6 but opportunity to apply for scheduling and planning officer or go to lower grade of Sc4.

Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” i.e. span over different Services

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15	2015/16	Total 2014 / 16
25	25	50

Percentage of Net Budget proposed:

Effect on HRA/DSG: / **YES** **NO** **If YES, outline the effect below**

HRA:

DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:

YES

NO

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)											
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory											
This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.											
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable											
1			2			3			4		
Impact on Corporate Priorities:											
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity					
J											
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority								
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral						
Level of Impact			Level of Impact								
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low						
What is the overall impact on equalities?											
2014/15			2015/16			2016/17					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low			
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:											
Ethnicity:			High	Medium	Low						
Gender:			High	Medium	Low						
Age:			High	Medium	Low						
Disability:			High	Medium	Low						
Religion/Belief:			High	Medium	Low						
Pregnancy/Maternity			High	Medium	Low						
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High	Medium	Low						
Sexual Orientation:			High	Medium	Low						
Gender reassignment			High	Medium	Low						
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :											
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :											
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken											
As this savings proposal has staffing implications, the service will be required to undertake an equalities analysis assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process. As part of their operational business processes, the service will monitor the impact of any staffing implications on service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.											
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal											
All Wards :			If individual Wards, please state:								
YES / NO											
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal											

Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector							
Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure							
Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?						YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?						YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:						2013/14 – CUS21	
Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)							
♠ (not covered by council employee)							
♦ (covered by council employee)							
♥ including posts covered by agency)							
(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)							
	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		6					
Head Count		6					
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							
Workforce Profile Information							
Please provide a breakdown of your service area:							
Gender:	Female:			Male:			
Ethnicity:	BME:		White:		Other:		Not Known:
Disability:							
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:			Not Known:			

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations							
From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?							
	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
How do you expect to reduce these posts?							
	Redundancy		TUPE			Delete vacant post	
FTE :							
Head Count:							
Grades :							

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Resources & Regeneration – Audit & Risk

REF: RNR01

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 1

SERVICE: Internal Audit; Anti-Fraud & Corruption Team; Health & Safety

LEAD OFFICER: David Austin

PORTFOLIO: Resources

SELECT COMMITTEE: Public Accounts Select Committee

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's)

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's
5,439	-2,333	3,106

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Audit & Risk Service is responsible for the Council's corporate internal audit, counter fraud, insurance, risk management and health & safety arrangements. It provides assurances on and contributes to the safe, efficient and effective delivery of Council's Services, acting as an agent to challenge where the need and opportunity for improvement is identified.

The Service has a combined net budget of £3.1m (gross £5.4m), 20 staff, a seconded police officer, and manages two large (OJEU) contracts with an internal audit service provider and insurance broker. Other than for H&S it has SLAs with Lewisham Homes and Schools.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

The savings proposal is £130k.

Internal Audit – review assurance priorities and delivery mechanisms to save £75,000.

Counter Fraud – reduce resourcing of Housing Benefit Investigation by £25,000 (part year) ahead of move to the Single Fraud Investigation Service under Department for Work and Pensions direction. The post is currently vacant.

Health & Safety – delete the vacant post for administration support H&S post to save £30,000 and connect this team to the Business Support Services review to get administration support centrally.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

The internal audit saving will enable the current level of internal assurance work to be provided but via a different approach.

The Counter Fraud saving will reduce the level of housing benefit investigation casework able to be conducted although mitigations around case prioritisation will be introduced in the run up to the service transfer to the Department for Work and Pensions.

The Health & Safety saving will mean the current pressure from not filling the vacant post will continue on the team for a while longer (currently it has been 18 months), pending corporate business support changes.

Does this proposal require a full report. (Seek advice from Legal Services)

YES

NO

Is this proposal "cross-cutting?" ie. span over different Services

YES

NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)										
2014/15:			2015/16:			Total 2014 / 16:				
130						130				
Percentage of Net Budget proposed: 4%										
Effect on HRA/DSG: /		YES	NO	If YES, outline the effect below						
HRA: DSG:										
Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:						YES	NO			
If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:										
Outcome of Consultation (if required)										
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory										
This proposal is subject to processes stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.										
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable										
4			2			3			4	
Impact on Corporate Priorities:										
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:-				
J – Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity						A. Community Leadership and empowerment				
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority			B. Young people's achievement and involvement				
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral	C. Clean, green and liveable				
Level of Impact			Level of Impact			D. Safety, security and a visible presence				
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	E. Strengthening the local economy				
						F. Decent Homes for all				
						G. Protection of children				
						H. Caring for adults and the older people				
						I. Active, health citizens				
						J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity				
What is the overall impact on equalities?										
2014/15			YYYY/YY			YYYY/YY				
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low		
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:										
Ethnicity:			High			Medium		Low		
Gender:			High			Medium		Low		
Age:			High			Medium		Low		
Disability:			High			Medium		Low		
Religion/Belief:			High			Medium		Low		
Pregnancy/Maternity			High			Medium		Low		
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High			Medium		Low		
Sexual Orientation:			High			Medium		Low		
Gender reassignment			High			Medium		Low		
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :										

Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :

Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken
An EAA is not required.

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal

All Wards :	If individual Wards, please state:
YES /NO	

Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

No specific legal implications have been identified. Statutory obligations will continue to be met.

Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector

No specific impact on the voluntary sector has been identified.

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:		

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ◆ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency)
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		1	1	14.86	1.86	2	
Head Count			1	13	2	1	
Vacant♠		1		1			
Vacant◆							
Vacant♥				1		1	

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female: 11	Male: 6		
Ethnicity:	BME: 6	White: 10	Other: 1	Not Known:
Disability:	1			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		1		1			
Head Count							

How do you expect to reduce these posts?

	Redundancy	TUPE	Delete vacant post
FTE :			2
Head Count:			
Grades :			Sc 3-5; PO1-5

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Resources & Regeneration - Planning

REF: RNR02

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 8

SERVICE: Development Management, Policy, Conservation & Urban Design

LEAD OFFICER: John Miller

PORTFOLIO: Regeneration

SELECT COMMITTEE: Sustainable Development

2013/2014 BUDGET (£000's)

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
3,692	1,527	2,165

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The planning system guides the future development and use of land in the long term public interest. This is achieved through the preparation of guidance in the development plan and a positive and proactive approach to shaping, considering, determining and delivering development proposals. It is led by the Planning Service, working closely with those proposing developments and other stakeholders. This service is a 'front-line' service and instrumental in both driving change and development in the Growth Areas of Deptford / New Cross, Lewisham and Catford and resisting inappropriate development across the borough. The preliminary figure for new homes completed in the Borough during 2012/13 is 1,752. This increased level of development means that the service is potentially generating the Council £8-10m per annum in New Homes Bonus funding. The service has also secured £3.7m in Section 106 contributions over the last 2 years.

The Planning Service leads on the future allocation of uses and development of land within Lewisham in the long term public interest. The Service provides a strong policy framework to promote regeneration and work closely with those proposing new development. They also provide a planning service to Lewisham residents seeking advice and information about planning issues in their areas, including for Ward Assemblies and other local meetings. They are responding to and supporting the 'Localism Agenda'. The Planning Service's pages on the Council's web site receive amongst the highest number of hits of any service.

The Planning Function works in tandem with the economic development team within the service, which provides strategic expertise on matters relating to the economy as well as providing guidance, commissioning and delivery of employment and business support. It also provides an EU funding and advisory role council wide. The service supports Lewisham residents seeking employment, employment support providers and independent businesses. The service is also a council wide resource on matters relating to Economic Development, Employment, Business, Local Labour and Inward Investment.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

Planning Service introduced a fee of £1000 plus VAT for the provision of pre-application advice on Major planning applications with a £40,000 income target per annum. This fee was introduced on 1 April 2011. At the time, the Service stated that it would assess the potential to extend pre-application fees to other planning application categories including householder applications.

The provision of the pre-application advice service has now been internally reviewed by the Planning Service and also benchmarked against other comparable London Boroughs.

A combination of an increase in fees for pre application advice on Major planning applications and a new

fee for householder and other small scale scheme pre-application advice should enable an additional £50k to be achieved in fees.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

When the paid pre-application service is fully implemented from 1 April 2014 customers will be able to make an appointment with a Planning Officer. The Planning Officer will deal with both the pre application advice and the planning application when submitted. They will also advise the applicant on how to undertake local consultation on their proposals. The advice will be followed up in writing and will provide a level of certainty to the applicant that a future application should be determined more efficiently and quickly if the development proposals follow the pre-application advice.

Does this proposal require a full report. (Seek advice from Legal Services)	YES	NO
Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” ie. span over different Services	YES	NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15:	2015/16:	Total 2014 / 16:
50		50

Percentage of Net Budget proposed: 2.3%

Effect on HRA/DSG: / YES NO If YES, outline the effect below

HRA:
DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)

Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory

This proposal is not subject to statutory or non-statutory consultation with service users, strategic partners or staff as this will be a discretionary service.

Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable

4	2	3	-4
----------	----------	----------	-----------

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:-					
E – Strengthening the local economy			J – Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity 					
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority								
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral						
Level of Impact			Level of Impact								
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low						

What is the overall impact on equalities?

2014/15			YYYY/YY			YYYY/YY		
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:			
Ethnicity:	High	Medium	Low
Gender:	High	Medium	Low
Age:	High	Medium	Low
Disability:	High	Medium	Low
Religion/Belief:	High	Medium	Low
Pregnancy/Maternity	High	Medium	Low
Marriage & Civil Partnerships	High	Medium	Low
Sexual Orientation:	High	Medium	Low
Gender reassignment	High	Medium	Low
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :			
An Equalities Analysis Assessment will be completed as this proposes a change to the way the service is delivered which will impact on a large number of people.			
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :			
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken			
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal			
All Wards : YES / NO	If individual Wards, please state:		
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal			
<p>The proposal is to increase the current fees for provisions of pre-application advice on Major planning applications and to introduce a new fee for householder and other small scale scheme pre-application advice.</p> <p>The power to charge for pre-application advice, which is a discretionary service, is derived from S93 of the Local Government Act 2003.</p> <p>That power allows a best value authority, (of which Lewisham is one), to charge for the discretionary element of its services, if the recipient has agreed to receive that service. This does not apply where the Council has another specific power to charge or where it is expressly prohibited from doing so.</p> <p>However, under Section 93 any charge must be on a not-for-profit basis (year-by-year) and, taking one year with another, the income from charges for such services must not exceed the cost for providing them.</p> <p>The Council is prohibited by law from planning for such a surplus and therefore the Council must ensure that the proposed level of fees are a reasonable estimate of what it will actually cost it to provide the proposed services.</p>			
Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector			
No specific impact on the voluntary sector has been identified.			
Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure			
Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO	
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:	YES	NO	
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:			

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female:	Male:		
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:	Not Known:		

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							

How do you expect to reduce these posts?

	Redundancy	TUPE	Delete vacant post
FTE :			
Head Count:			
Grades :			

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Chief Executive's – Policy & Governance

REF: RNR03

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 1

SERVICE: Chief Executive's Office; Policy & Partnerships Unit; Governance

LEAD OFFICER: Barrie Neal

PORTFOLIO: Strategy & Communications

SELECT COMMITTEE: Public Accounts Committee

2013/14 BUDGET (£000's)

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure £000's	Income £000's	Net Budget £000's
2,502	(54)	2,448

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

The Policy & Governance Division includes the Chief Executive's Office, the Policy & Partnerships Unit, Governance Support and secretariat support to the Resources & Regeneration and Customer Services Directorates.

The Policy function supports the Council's activities in relation to strategic planning, policy development (including statutory equalities duties), consultation & research (including Census intelligence) and performance management. The work underpins and supports robust decision-making and corporate management of the organisation.

The Governance function supports the Mayor and elected members in the administration of effective decision making responsibilities and overview & scrutiny duties. The function also covers responsibilities for member allowances, education appeals, member development, publicity for member surgeries and a whole range of civic events plus international partnerships.

Stakeholders include:

Chief officers, Mayor and Cabinet, senior managers, partners, elected members, MPs, visiting dignitaries, Borough organisations, members of the public, private and public sector institutions.

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

A saving across the salaries budgets is proposed at £128k for 2014/15 through the deletion of 2.4 vacant posts.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

The vacant posts proposed for deletion arise in relation to:

- one of only two posts supporting the Chief Executive's Office;
- a post in the central policy team
- a part-time post in Governance (Business & Committee services)

The overall reduction will impact on the capacity of teams across the Division to co-ordinate corporate initiatives, undertake high profile projects, deliver and support the preparation of statutory reports, contribute to partnership projects and respond to reactive work on Council priorities.

More specifically the part-time post in governance, now vacant, has traditionally supported the administration of Council meetings and civic events. The deleting of this part-time post would therefore increase pressures in these areas where any additional demands might arise.

Does this proposal require a full report .	YES	NO
Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” ie. span over different Services	YES	NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000’s)			
2014/15:	2015/16:		Total 2014 / 16:
128			128

Percentage of Net Budget proposed: 5.2%

Effect on HRA/DSG: /	YES	NO	If YES, outline the effect below
----------------------	-----	----	----------------------------------

HRA:
DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year:	YES	NO
---	-----	----

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)

Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory

This proposal is subject to processes stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies.

Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

Main Priority – Most Relevant	Secondary Priority	Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
J – Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity	A – Community leadership and empowerment	
Impact of saving on corporate priority	Impact of saving on corporate priority	
Positive Negative Neutral	Positive Negative Neutral	
Level of Impact	Level of Impact	
High Medium Low	High Medium Low	

What is the overall impact on equalities?

2014/15			YYYY/YY			YYYY/YY		
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

Ethnicity:	High	Medium	Low
Gender:	High	Medium	Low
Age:	High	Medium	Low
Disability:	High	Medium	Low
Religion/Belief:	High	Medium	Low
Pregnancy/Maternity	High	Medium	Low
Marriage & Civil Partnerships	High	Medium	Low
Sexual Orientation:	High	Medium	Low
Gender reassignment	High	Medium	Low

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :

Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken

This proposal is subject to processes stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal

All Wards : If individual Wards, please state:
YES /NO

Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

This proposal is subject to processes stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.

Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector

No specific impact on the voluntary sector has been identified.

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:		

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

♠ (not covered by council employee)

♦ (covered by council employee)

♥ including posts covered by agency)

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE		1	5.4	15	7	3	1
Head Count		1	5	13	6	3	1
Vacant♠			0.4	2	1		
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female: 18	Male: 11		
Ethnicity:	BME: 4	White: 23	Other: 2	Not Known:
Disability:	1			
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:		Not Known:	

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE			0.4	1	1		
Head Count							

How do you expect to reduce these posts?

	Redundancy	TUPE	Delete vacant post
FTE :			2.4
Head Count:			
Grades :			Sc3-5; PO1-5; PO6-8

BUDGET SAVING PROPOSAL 2014 / 16

DIRECTORATE AND DIVISION: Chief Executive - Strategy

REF: RNR04

THEMATIC (T) / CROSS-CUTTING (C) Ref: C 4

SERVICE: Strategy

LEAD OFFICER: Robyn Fairman

PORTFOLIO: Strategy & Communications

SELECT COMMITTEE: Safer Stronger

YYYY/YY BUDGET (£000's) – seek information form Finance

Net Controllable Budget:

Expenditure	Income	Net Budget
£000's	£000's	£000's
2,840	(424)	2,416

Description of Service

Briefly describe your service and state who your customers and stakeholders are:

Strategy includes the Mayor and Cabinet Office (support to Mayor and Cabinet, and the Young Mayor) Communications (corporate communications, media and internal communications) and the Local Strategic Partnership Team (support to partnerships, co-ordinating major partnership activity such as Troubled Families Programme, Community Budgets, Youth Task Force implementation, and Apprenticeships).

Description of saving proposed

Please provide sufficient details on the proposal:

A budget reduction of £100k for the Community Budgets Project which will mean a reduction in cross-partner project work.

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff and service users:

As this savings proposal will mean a reduction in cross-partner project work around innovation, the service will develop a business case and seek resources for specific projects from external sources when needed rather than drawing on baseline funding.

Does this proposal require a full report . (Seek advice from Legal Services)	YES	NO
Is this proposal “cross-cutting?” ie. span over different Services	YES	NO

Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

2014/15:	2015/16:	Total 2014 / 16:
100		100

Percentage of Net Budget proposed: 4.1%

Effect on HRA/DSG: / YES NO If YES, outline the effect below

HRA:
DSG:

Can this saving be taken in current Financial Year: YES NO

If YES to previous question, what is the value that can be taken:

Outcome of Consultation (if required)											
Please outline the outcome and mitigation (where appropriate) of any consultation undertaken on this proposal to cover, where relevant, Service User/Strategic Partner and Staff – statutory and non statutory											
This proposal is not subject to statutory or non-statutory consultation with service users, strategic partners or staff.											
Risk to Achievability: Please use the following to quantify risk: 1-Least achievable to 4 – most achievable											
1			2			3			4		
Impact on Corporate Priorities:											
Main Priority – Most Relevant			Secondary Priority			Corporate Priorities:-					
E – Strengthening the local economy			J – Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity			A. Community Leadership and empowerment					
Impact of saving on corporate priority			Impact of saving on corporate priority			B. Young people's achievement and involvement					
Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral	C. Clean, green and liveable					
Level of Impact			Level of Impact			D. Safety, security and a visible presence					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	E. Strengthening the local economy					
						F. Decent Homes for all					
						G. Protection of children					
						H. Caring for adults and the older people					
						I. Active, health citizens					
						J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity					
What is the overall impact on equalities?											
2014/15			YYYY/YY			YYYY/YY					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low			
Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:											
Ethnicity:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender:			High			Medium			Low		
Age:			High			Medium			Low		
Disability:			High			Medium			Low		
Religion/Belief:			High			Medium			Low		
Pregnancy/Maternity			High			Medium			Low		
Marriage & Civil Partnerships			High			Medium			Low		
Sexual Orientation:			High			Medium			Low		
Gender reassignment			High			Medium			Low		
If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :											
Outcome of full Equalities Analysis Assessment (if required) :											
Please outline the outcome of the full EAA if undertaken An EAA is not required.											
Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal											
All Wards :			If individual Wards, please state:								
YES /NO											
Legal Implications – State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal											
No specific legal implications have been identified. There are no contractual issues for this as there is no budget committed under any contracts.											
Impact on Voluntary Sector – State any impact of this proposal on the Voluntary Sector											
No specific impact on the voluntary sector has been identified.											

Human Resources Implications – Details relating to the Existing structure

Will this saving proposal have an impact on staffing levels within your team (yes/no)?	YES	NO
Is this a continuation of a previous proposal?:	YES	NO
If YES, please state the previous Reference No.(s) and year:		

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in your current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 ♠ (not covered by council employee)
 ♦ (covered by council employee)
 ♥ including posts covered by agency)
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							
Vacant♠							
Vacant♦							
Vacant♥							

Workforce Profile Information

Please provide a breakdown of your service area:

Gender:	Female:	Male:		
Ethnicity:	BME:	White:	Other:	Not Known:
Disability:				
Sexual Orientation:	Where known:	Not Known:		

Human Resources Implications – To be completed on conclusion of consultations

From your proposals, how many posts will be deleted within your structure by grades (FTE equivalent & Head Count)?

	Scale 1 - 2	Scale 3 - 5	Scale 6 - SO2	PO1 – PO5	PO6 – PO8	SMG1 – SMG3	JNC
FTE							
Head Count							

How do you expect to reduce these posts?

	Redundancy	TUPE	Delete vacant post
FTE :			
Head Count:			
Grades :			

APPENDIX E

Key Dates – Budget timetable for 2014/15

Key task	Key dates
Mayor & Cabinet agree budget process	13 Nov
Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel (OSBP) – Strategic Financial Review Update report	26 Nov
Select Committees review budget savings proposals	29 Nov to 16 Dec
Trade union consultation (Joint Consultative Committees and Corporate Joint Council, Works Council)	TBC
Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement (expected)	w/c 16 Dec
Mayor & Cabinet consider budget savings proposals	18 Dec
OSBP – option to consider Mayor & Cabinet decisions on budget proposals	TBC
Mayor & Cabinet considers Council Tax Base report	15 Jan
Council agree Council Tax Base report	22 Jan
Public Accounts Select Committee review 2014 Budget Report	6 Feb
Final Local Government Finance Settlement and GLA precepts notification (expected)	20 Jan to 13 Feb
Mayor & Cabinet review proposals and 2014 Budget Report	12 Feb
OSBP - 2014 Budget Report	18 Feb
Despatch Budget Report to Council	18 Feb
Mayor & Cabinet consider Budget Report update (precepts and final Settlement)	19 Feb
Council agree 2014 Budget Report	26 Feb
Council 'fall back' date for 2014 Budget Report	5 March