

<b>Mayor and Cabinet</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Comments of the Public Accounts Select Committee on the Budget 2011/12		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	5
<b>Ward</b>	All		
<b>Contributors</b>	Public Accounts Select Committee		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	17 February 2011

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report informs Mayor and Cabinet of the comments and views of the Public Accounts Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the Budget 2011/12 at the Committee's meeting on 15 February 2011. Comments made on the report to the Public Accounts Select Committee by other Select Committees, are attached at Appendix 1.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 Mayor and Cabinet is recommended to note the views of the Public Accounts Select Committee as set out in section three of the report and the views of the other Select Committees as attached at Appendix 1.

## 3. Public Accounts Select Committee Views

- 3.1 On 15 February, the Public Accounts Select Committee considered the Budget 2011/12. The Committee considered written and verbal evidence from officers at the meeting.
- 3.2 The Committee would like to make the following comments on the proposals within the report:

### Children and Young People

- 3.3 The Committee would like to endorse the comments of the Children and Young People Select Committee (on CYP13, CYP15, CYP43, CYP78, CYP92 and CYP93) as recorded in Appendix 1, with the following additions/amendments:

**CYP15** - When seeking alternative delivery arrangements, the costs and benefits of requiring pension contributions to be included in salary costs should be considered, in addition to encouraging providers to pay their staff the London living wage.

The Children and Young People Select Committee should be recommended to keep this issue under review and test the assumptions behind this proposal (including those around capacity), once alternative delivery arrangements are in place.

**CYP92 & CYP93** – The Committee endorses the request of the Children and Young People Select Committee that a review be undertaken of the strategic implications of these two proposals, in relation to the SEN strategy, but believes that this should not result in a delay to the proposal being implemented.

#### Community Services

- 3.4 The Committee would like to endorse the comments of the Healthier Communities Select Committee (on COM05, COM16, COM17, COM19, COM21, COM22, COM27, COM28 and COM33) and the comments of the Safer Stronger Select Committee (on COM35), as recorded in Appendix 1, with the following additions/amendments:

**COM16, 17, 19, 21 & 22** – The Committee seeks assurance that these re-organisations will result in a minimal loss of outcome for service users and encourages the Council to consider (especially in relation to COM22) mutual, co-operative or voluntary and community sector organisation models of employment. The Committee agrees that if the changes in provision lead to more relevant services for service users being developed and delivered; and if the aim of these proposals is to promote genuine independence and improvements, then they should be recommended.

**COM35** – The Committee notes that the Mayor is minded to withdraw this savings proposal and delete the Mayor's Fund; and create a replacement fund of £18,500 per local assembly (£15,000 for the assembly to allocate and £3,500 for the ward councillors to allocate).

#### Customer Services

- 3.5 The Committee would like to endorse the comments of the Housing Select Committee (on CUS04, CUS11 and CUS46) and the Sustainable Development Select Committee (on CUS04), as recorded in Appendix 1.

**CUS11** - The Committee notes that the Housing Select Committee will keep this proposal under review, in particular the element proposed for 2012/13.

#### Resources

- 3.6 **RES16/17** - The Committee endorses the Mayor's suggestion that, once the budget has been agreed, the entire governance structure of the Council, including the number of committees and councillors, should be reviewed. The Committee would like elements of this review to be included within relevant Overview and Scrutiny work streams.
- 3.7 **RES21** – The Committee feels that this proposal does not go far enough and would encourage the Mayor to consider if additional savings can be made.

#### Fees and Charges

- 3.8 The Committee would like the Sustainable Development Select Committee to undertake a review of parking charges, including the implications of the proposed

increases and how charges might reflect demand and need (especially with respect to pay and display and visitor permits for carers).

#### **4 Financial Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se, although the financial implications of accepting the Committee's recommendations will need to be considered.

#### **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to refer reports to the Mayor and Cabinet, who are obliged to consider them.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Budget 2011/12 – Officer Report to Public Accounts Select Committee (15.02.11)

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Charlotte Dale, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49534), or Kevin Flaherty, Head of Committee Business (ext. 49327).

Public Accounts Select Committee			
<b>Report Title</b>	Comments of the Sustainable Development Select Committee on the Budget 2011/12		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	3 (Appendix Y19)
<b>Ward</b>	All		
<b>Contributors</b>	Sustainable Development Select Committee		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	15 February 2011

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the Budget 2011/12 at the Committee's meeting on 25 January 2011.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee as set out in section three of the report.

## 3. Sustainable Development Select Committee Views

- 4.1 On 25 January, the Sustainable Development Select Committee considered the Budget 2011/12 report. The Committee considered the written and verbal evidence from officers at the meeting.
- 4.2 The Committee would like to make the following comment on the proposals:
- 4.3 The Committee were pleased that they would have the chance to scrutinise the future detailed proposals that were outlined in the report, particularly in relation to savings proposals put forward by the Regeneration directorate.
- 4.4 The Committee were concerned at the levels of increases for parking permit charges discussed at the meeting and the impact this could have on local residents. Though the Committee accepts that Lewisham charges low fees compared to other authorities in London, it felt that a large percentage increase in charges would have a disproportionate effect on the less well off in the borough. Because the full fees and charges document was not available at the meeting, the Committee would urge the Public Accounts Select Committee to pay close attention to the proposed increases in parking permit charges.

### CUS04

- 4.5 The Committee were disappointed that this savings proposal had returned in phase 2 of the budget round unaltered. The Committee echoed the concerns expressed at

their 25 October 2010 meeting over the impact that the reduction in staffing within the Environmental Health Residential team will have on the Council's ability to drive up standards in private sector housing. Therefore the Committee felt that this savings proposal should be rejected as a whole, with the possibility to either disaggregate the proposal into individual service proposals for consideration or to delete the Environmental Health Residential reduction in posts from the overall proposal in order to accept it.

## **5 Financial Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se, although the financial implications of accepting the Committee's recommendations will need to be considered.

## **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.2 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Budget 2011/12 – Officer Report to Sustainable Development Select Committee  
(25.01.11)

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Andrew Hagger, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49446), or Kevin Flaherty, Head of Committee Business (ext. 49327).

<b>Public Accounts Select Committee</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Comments of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee on the Budget 2011/12		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	3 (Appendix Y19)
<b>Ward</b>	All		
<b>Contributors</b>	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	15 February 2011

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the Budget 2011/12 report at the Committee's meeting on 2 February 2011.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee as set out in section three of the report.

## **3. Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee Views**

- 3.1 On 2 February, the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee considered the Budget 2011/12 report. The Committee considered the written and verbal evidence from officers at the meeting.

- 3.2 The Committee would like to make the following comments on the proposals:

### COM35

- 3.3 Members acknowledged the valuable work that local assemblies do and that there should be continued funds available to local assemblies for local projects. Therefore the Committee urges the Public Accounts Select Committee to look closely at the amalgamation of the Local Assemblies Fund with the Mayors Fund into a single fund and to ensure that this fund will be accessible for Local Assemblies.
- 3.4 Under their equalities remit the Committee also expressed concern at the number of savings proposals that will impact on Children and Young People. There was particular concern about the potential impact these savings will have on those pupils most in need due to the reduction in support services.

#### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se, although the financial implications of accepting the Committee's recommendations will need to be considered.

#### **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.3 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Budget 2011/12– Officer Report to Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee (2.2.11)

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Andrew Hagger, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49446), or Kevin Flaherty, Head of Committee Business (ext. 49327).

<b>Public Accounts Committee</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Comments of the Children and Young People Select Committee on the Budget 2011/12		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	3 (Appendix Y19)
<b>Ward</b>	All		
<b>Contributors</b>	Children and Young People Select Committee		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	15 February 2011

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Children and Young People Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the Budget 2011/12 report at the Committee's meeting on 7 February 2011.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Children and Young People Select Committee as set out in section three of the report.

## **3. Children and Young People Select Committee Views**

- 3.5 On 7 February, the Children and Young People Select Committee considered the Budget 2011/12 report. The Committee considered the written and verbal evidence from officers at the meeting.

- 3.6 The Committee would like to make the following comments on the proposals:

### CYP13

- 3.7 The Committee broadly endorsed the move from a universal approach to targeted services, as a response to government grant reductions. The Committee also noted that the desired impact of services needs to be clearly outlined from specification, through procurement of providers, and then monitored through to delivery, to ensure that services are targeted to those most in need, and are delivering real improvements in outcomes for children in need. The Committee also felt that it should have a role in scrutinising the developing specifications for service delivery, to ensure targeting is effective and appropriate.

### CYP15

- 3.8 The Committee felt that, when alternate providers are sought to deliver services at children's centres, an expectation of the providers paying their staff the London



living wage should be expressed as part of the tendering process, in line with a previous Council motion.

#### CYP43

- 3.9 The Committee suggest considering delaying this proposal for up to 12 months, until assured that other funding streams and activities negate the need for this fund and that there will be no negative impact on vulnerable families.

#### CYP78

- 3.10 Members expressed concern that the removal of this grant will negatively impact on the achievement of Black and minority ethnic pupils unless the Schools Forum agreed that programmes such as BPAP and the Pupil Ambassadors should continue

#### CYP92 and CYP93

- 3.11 The Committee felt that a review of the strategic implications of these two proposals, in relation to the SEN strategy, should be undertaken before these savings proposals are agreed.

### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se, although the financial implications of accepting the Committee's recommendations will need to be considered.

### **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.4 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Budget 2011/12– Officer Report to Children and Young People Select Committee (7.2.11)

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Salena Mulhere, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 43380), or Kevin Flaherty, Head of Committee Business (ext. 49327).

<b>Public Accounts Select Committee</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Comments of the Housing Select Committee on the Budget 2011/12		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	3 (Appendix Y19)
<b>Ward</b>	All		
<b>Contributors</b>	Housing Select Committee		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	15 February 2011

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Housing Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the 2011/12 Budget report at the Committee's meeting on 8 February 2011.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Housing Select Committee as set out in section three of the report.

## **3. Housing Select Committee Views**

- 3.12 On 8 February, the Housing Select Committee considered the 2011/12 Budget report. The Committee considered written and verbal evidence from officers at the meeting.

- 3.13 The Committee would like to make the following comments on the proposals:

### CUS04

- 3.14 Further to the comments made by the Committee when this proposal was first considered in November 2010 and in light of recent reports that around 1m people in England rent non-decent private sector housing<sup>1</sup>, the Committee would like to reiterate its concern about the impact that the reduction in Environmental Health (Residential) staff will have on the Council's ability to drive up standards in private sector housing. The Committee notes that there has been a significant increase in the size of the private rented housing sector in Lewisham over the last 9 years and feels that a reduction in staff at this time will put increased pressure on an already pressurised service. The Committee would like the proposal to reduce the Environmental Health Residential team by 0.8 of a post (equivalent to £40k with on costs) to be reconsidered as it will likely have a detrimental effect on future levels of service.

<sup>1</sup> See: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-12371904>

## CUS11

- 3.15 The Committee would like officers to keep the proposal to reduce the number of benefits officers by 13 posts over the next two years under review, in particular the element proposed for 2012/13. Demand for the housing benefits service is likely to increase as (a) more claims are likely to be made as the deficit reduction plan is implemented; and (b) more claims might be queried as a result of changes to legislation governing the payment of housing benefit, both of which will have an impact on the deliverability of this proposal.

## CUS46

- 3.16 The Committee is concerned about the proposed reduction in staffing levels within the Public Health & Noise Team as the noise abatement service is an essential service for people living in private dwellings. Members feel that reducing the team will have a negative impact on people living in the private sector, for whom the team is one of the few means available for trying to tackle anti-social noise. The Committee would like the noise abatement element of this proposal to be reconsidered and would like officers to look again at the demand for this service.

## **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se, although the financial implications of accepting the Committee's recommendations will need to be considered.

## **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.5 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

2011/12 Budget – Officer Report to Housing Select Committee (8.2.11)

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Charlotte Dale, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49534)

<b>Public Accounts Committee</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Comments of the Healthier Communities Select Committee on the Budget 2011/12		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	3 (Appendix Y19)
<b>Ward</b>	All		
<b>Contributors</b>	Healthier Communities Select Committee		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date</b>	15 February 2011

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 This report informs the Public Accounts Select Committee of the comments and views of the Healthier Communities Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the Budget 2011/12 report at the Committee's meeting on 10 February 2011.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Public Accounts Select Committee is recommended to note the views of the Healthier Communities Select Committee as set out in section three of the report.

## **3. Healthier Communities Select Committee Views**

- 3.17 On 10 February, the Healthier Communities Select Committee considered the Budget 2011/12 report. The Committee considered the written and verbal evidence from officers at the meeting.

- 3.18 The Committee makes the following comments on the proposals:

### COM05

- 3.19 The Committee noted the proposal and commented that, subject to Mayor and Cabinet decision, any formal applications to run services from the library buildings in question would need to have robust business plans in place and be subject to a rigorous evaluation process.

- 3.20 The Committee further noted the Executive Director's assurance that signposting to independent bodies for advice and guidance on completing effective applications will be included in any information packs provided to organisations expressing an interest in providing a service from the library buildings.

### COM16 and 19

- 3.21 The Committee was concerned that there were not more specific details available in the report about the numbers and range of posts affected by these proposals, and

therefore would request further assurance that there would be no loss of outcome to service users as a result of these particular proposals.

#### COM 17,21 and 22

- 3.22 The Committee notes the proposals and hope that the changes in provision lead to more relevant services for service users being developed and delivered. The Committee considered that if the aim of these proposals were to promote genuine independence and improvements then they should be recommended.

#### COM27

- 3.23 The Committee noted the proposal, and considers that, when making a decision, the Mayor should have regard to the additional budget pressures on people with disabilities at this current time.
- 3.24 The Committee also considered that there needs to be an assurance that all staff will be fully trained so they can advise service users, and administer it, effectively.
- 3.25 The Committee also considers that clear information about how to make a claim for support and how charges are calculated should be made widely available to service users

#### COM28

- 3.26 The Committee notes the proposal to increase the charges by 20% but urges officers to bear in mind the need to ensure that high quality meals are provided to these most vulnerable service users.
- 3.27 The Committee recommends that officers ask service users to provide comments on the quality of the service they are currently receiving when notice of the new charges are given, to further inform discussions with providers about the quality of the meals provided.

#### COM33

- 3.28 The Committee notes the proposal and look forward to the detail being provided at a future meeting.

#### COM34

- 3.29 The Committee notes the proposal.

### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report *per se*, although the financial implications of accepting the Committee's recommendations will need to be considered.

## **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.6 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Budget 2011/12– Officer Report to Healthier Communities Select Committee (7.2.11)

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Salena Mulhere, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 43380), or Kevin Flaherty, Head of Committee Business (ext. 49327).