APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Benefits Realisation of Oracle Cloud
Reference:	RES1
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Financial Services
Service/Team area:	Financial Services Division
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Oracle Cloud benefits realisation £350k	No	No	Yes for 20/21

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Following the implementation of a fully integrated enterprise, resource planning (ERP) solution for HR, finance, procurement and payroll, it is anticipated that moving to full deployment of employee self-service will lessen the need for much of the transactional activity which currently takes place in the various finance teams (financial services, accounts payable, payroll etc.,). This will put the onus more onto the business, but once officers are provided with the right tools, effectively trained in their use and provided with appropriate support, it is expected that Oracle Cloud will help facilitate practices that are more efficient. To achieve this, the re-shaping of a number of teams in the financial services area will be necessary.

Cuts proposal

The proportion which has been attributed to Financial Services is to target at a savings level of 15% would equate to some £440k on the Financial Services net budget which is just under £3m in 2018/19. This target can only be achieved in the context of ensuring that the council continues to meet its financial statutory obligations for these years and beyond.

In order to deliver further savings of this magnitude whilst considering the context of those savings already delivered, would be hugely difficult, but remains possible. In comparison to other London Boroughs of this size, Lewisham already had a significantly leaner finance operation, by some distance. To deliver any further savings (in addition to those which have already been committed to 2018/19, and in the process of being delivered) it would be necessary to have a further in-depth review of the council's finance function in terms of how the staff teams are arranged and specific duties they are required to undertake and in the context of the introduction and full adoption of Oracle Cloud. This will be done, and is the second part of this two stage cuts proposal. To do this however would require an investment over and above the resources already committed to the Oracle Cloud Programme.

By continuing to make reductions as we have done traditionally, then cuts of this order will have a significant impact on the council's ability to achieve its statutory obligations, the most fundamental one of which is to close the annual accounts and achieve a clean audit opinion at the end of that process. The council would be at significant risk of not being able to meets obligations. Cuts of this magnitude will inevitably lead to a greater reliance on managers and budget-holders being more self-

3. Description of service area and proposal

servicing and better able to monitor and manage the budgets which fall within their areas of responsibility. This however is where the Oracle Cloud solution would facilitate this practice. The aspiration is to move the function more towards that advisory type position, but it will take time to get there. For all of this to be achieved successfully, officers will need to ensure that our systems capability is fit for purpose.

Currently, our systems are not effective enough to enable that, although much work is being done to improve the IT infrastructure and systems in the council. For this reason, some investment would be needed up front to put towards staff training for various aspects of financial responsibility. A once-off training and change management resources of £250k would need to be identified on a spend-to-save basis in the first instance. This will enable a small proportion of the cuts required to be delivered in 2019/20, some £90k, with the majority of the savings of £350k (through restructure and re-organisation) to come through in 2020/21. An assessment of how achievable the second year cut of £350k is, would need to be undertaken in the autumn of 2019.

The decision to integrate finance, procurement, HR and payroll through the development and implementation of an integrated Enterprise Resources Planning (ERP) solution, is a significant move and will serve as main enabler to deliver these cuts. However, it will require the organisation to understand the solution and for existing business process to change sufficiently to adopt the new solution. The strategic vision is to deliver a solution which enables joined up information, processes and decision making. Amongst the most important element of business change, which financial services want to assist with, is encouraging business managers to take an enterprise view, by providing them with properly joined up information and a single entry point to initiate actions, rather than the separate ones for Finance, HR etc.

Many processes (like the staff joiners, movers and leavers processes) require managers to ensure information is set up correctly in both HR, Finance and payroll. This needs to be done as simply and efficiently as possible, ideally without managers and corporate services staff having to manually ensure the information is correct across many systems. Similarly, extracting information from HR, Payroll and Finance systems for planning, monitoring and bidding purposes needs to be as simple and as accurate as possible. Core elements of the ERP solution went ‘live May 2018.

As a finance function, any re-shaping of the division will need to provide due consideration to: strengthening the schools Finance Team to support schools much more; provide appropriate coverage to social care and other complex budgetary areas, children’s, adults etc., and strengthen financial accounting and control, but less financial accounting and more forward thinking management accounting. E.g. Financial modelling, financial analysis, options appraisals etc.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Some routine finance responsibilities such as making statutory government returns (NNDR, Section 251, CTB, RA and RO forms etc.,) could continue to be affected with such a significant reduction to an already lean finance staffing structure. Unless the finance function is deemed fully ‘business ready’ by April 2019 when the full Oracle suite is expected have gone live, then there would be major risks of taking any more money out of the function. With the review of the structure and the implementation of the ERP solution underway, with some risk, revenue budget savings of £90k in

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal
2019/20 and £350k in 2020/21 could be achieved.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
As above

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	4,488	(1,472)	3,016	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Oracle Cloud benefits realisation	90	350	0	440
Total	90	350	0	440
% of Net Budget	3%	12%	0%	15%
Invest to save required	(250)			(250)
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
C	B	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens**
10		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Medium		10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

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

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Not applicable			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Not applicable at this stage
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There will be general staffing implications if any reorganisation is to be implemented. Information security issues will need to comply with GDPR and Data protection Act 2018

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing Commence the reorganisation of the finance functions to
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Legal fees increase
Reference:	RES2
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Law
Service/Team area:	Legal
Cabinet portfolio:	Democracy, Refugees & Accountability
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) Increase fees £50k	No	No	No
b) Systems Overview £32k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Legal Services carries out a number of legal tasks for the Council, including advice, representation and transactions.

Cuts proposal

This proposal suggests a number of increases in charges to 3rd parties (e.g. the Section 106 agreements, charges on receipt of notices of transfer, Right To Buy). An increase of 15% should increase income by approximately £50k.

The second part of this proposal anticipates savings in year 2 from a result of a Council wide review of IT support which should produce savings of £32k in Legal Services

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The increase in charges will be the responsibility of 3rd parties, individuals, developers and organisations.

It is not known whether the review of IT support would have implications for staff at this stage.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Demand for the Council's legal input reduces so income target not met.

The review of IT support is not completed in time.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	2,180	(330)	1,850	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a)	50	32		82
Total				
% of Net Budget	3%	2%	%	5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
D	C	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
10		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

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

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact			
		Partnerships:	
Age:		**Sexual orientation:**	
Disability:		**Gender reassignment:**	
Religion / Belief:		**Overall:**	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
An EAA would be conducted if any staffing implications arise from the review of IT. Outcome of review will determine whether any staff impact.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Not by increasing income

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					TBC
Workforce profile:					
Posts	**Headcount in post**	**FTE in post**	**Establishment posts**	**Vacant**	
				Agency / Interim cover	**Not covered**
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific legal implications. Legal Services only charges where this is power to do so.

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Executive Office – Administrative Support Staff Reduction
Reference:	RES3
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Policy & Governance
Service/Team area:	Executive Office (Secretariat/Personal Assistants)
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Democracy, Refugees & Accountability
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Salaries budget cut – staff reductions £104k	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

This service provides secretariat and administrative support to the Executive Management Team (EMT), Heads of Service and support to service managers in the Children & Young People's Directorate.

The business of all four Directorate Management Teams (DMT) is co-ordinated from this office. The work includes diary management, liaison with third parties on behalf of senior officers and co-ordination of a range of administrative tasks to support the delivery of reports and answering of questions for Council, Mayor & Cabinet, Scrutiny Committees and regulatory committees.

As a consequence of earlier cuts in senior strategic lead officers, some directorates have become more reliant on this secretariat for activities not originally ascribed to the service. This secretariat has absorbed this work on an already reduced number of staff. This work has included representing directorates at Agenda Planning (for the co-ordination of committee reports), administering risk registers, business continuity plans and health & safety documentation and reporting.

Cuts proposal

The service salaries budget, at £669k, makes up 97% of the function (£22k operational budget). Cuts in this area will again impact on the salaries budget and staff numbers. A £104k cut (15% of the overall budget) would, subject to consultation, mean the loss of up to 2.5-3 posts.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Subject to staff consultations, the impact would be to reduce staff numbers with the potential for redundancy costs.

The team has, on an already significantly reduced budget, absorbed a significant array of new duties. As the number of Heads of Service have reduced, more activities have been displaced into the Executive Support Office. In some areas, this includes management of directorate risk registers and business continuity plans. This also includes the highly pressured and time consuming task of coordinating directorate

4. Impact and risks of proposal
papers for committee. This work is already an area of acute pressure, with big risks for failure. The wider range of commitments absorbed so far into the service could not be sustained under any further cuts proposals. Alternative management arrangements would need to be made prior to the implementation of any such cuts hence the need to plan for such a change on a phased basis. The current ratio of 1-1 PA support to Executive Directors and 1-4 Heads of Service would have to be reviewed. This already represents significant reduction from a time when most Heads of Service had more regular access to a PA. The fact that the team also provide support to the CYP service managers would also have to be reviewed. Further staffing changes would have to be consulted upon but the PA to senior management ratios would have to deteriorate yet further on any reduction in the number of staff effected by this cuts proposal. There is a certain level, at which reputational damage follows, if Senior Managers cannot keep up with routine demands, some of which have been mediated to date, in part, by the administrative and secretariat capacity that rests in the Executive Support function.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Decisions need to be made for the reallocation of work that has to date been absorbed into the Executive Support Office as a consequence of the reduction in the number of strategic Heads of Service in previous years. This is particularly the case in relation to management of risk registers, business continuity plans and committee papers. A decision might also have to be made to restrict the service to a fewer number of senior managers to sustain a satisfactorily level of support to those senior managers to be prioritised. A phased implementation could allow for alternative arrangements, for some business critical activities like committee paper co-ordination, risk registers and business continuity plans to be reorganised at directorate level to take back more of these duties.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
General Fund (GF)	690		690	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Staff reductions		104		104
Total		104		
% of Net Budget	%	15%	%	15%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
10	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	High	

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

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	Low
Gender:	Low	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	Low
Age:	Low	**Sexual orientation:**	Low
Disability:	Low	**Gender reassignment:**	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	**Overall:**	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	**Headcount in post**	**FTE in post**	**Establishment posts**	**Vacant**	
				Agency / Interim cover	**Not covered**
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2	**9**	9	**9**		
PO1 – PO5	**6**	6	**6**		
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total	**15**	15	**15**		

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
A staff consultation paper would be required to be to be produced for any consideration of a downsizing or restructuring of staff support to the service to effect savings of up to £104k. Redundancies may arise. The equalities impact will need to be fully evaluated as part of a staff consultation process and subsequent outcome of such consultation.

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
Post March 2019	Preparations for appropriate staff consultations

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Policy, Service Design and Intelligence – Reduction on staffing
Reference:	RES4
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Policy & Governance, Policy & Partnership
Service/Team area:	Policy & Governance/Policy, Service Design and Intelligence
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Democracy, Refugees & Accountability
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Salaries budget cut – staff numbers cut £155k	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The function is the core of the Council's strategic support service providing for the development of policy (including equalities), development of key strategic documents (including the Children and Young People's Plan), providing demographic intelligence to support decision making, performance management (to effect performance reporting and statutory returns – see legal implications below), consultation (developing the framework for compliance with the Council duties and providing advice and support), support to a number of partnership boards (e.g. health & well-being board) and co-ordination of a wide range of inspections (including Ofsted and CQC).

Cuts proposal

Over 95% of the £1m budget supporting this service is spent on salaries. Operational budgets are largely spent on licence agreements for performance software, demographic software and consultation software. A 15% cut on the budget at £155k, subject to staff consultations, would be equivalent to up to 3FTE on a team of just 15 staff (significantly fewer in number than such strategic support services in other Councils).

Staff consultation would be required.

Phasing to year 2 would better reflect the need for an immediate focus for the team's limited capacity on supporting the new Administration's strategic priorities and supporting the needs of both children's and adults services for preparing their statutory data returns and making preparations for intense inspection demands to come.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

This service area has taken significant financial cuts. The most recent saving of over £1m led to the centralisation of the function and the halving of staff numbers. The

4. Impact and risks of proposal

impact now would be a further reduction in responsiveness to demands on the team and some significant risks would arise in relation to timely submission of statutory data returns, preparations for external inspection/review and support to services on policy development, performance management and consultation. There is also a wide range of strategic needs to be met supporting the new Administration which may also be compromised by further cuts.

The service area undertakes a number of statutory returns signed off by the respective Children's and Adult's directorates. The statutory returns on data include:

- Adults Social Care Survey 2017/18 (submitted May 2018)
- Short and Long Term Support Return 2017/18 (submitted May 2018)
- Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Return (submitted May 2018)
- Safeguarding SAC return 2017-18 (submitted June 2018)
- Children's 903 Return
- Quarterly Adoption Return
- Children in Need Census
- Schools Census (three times per year)

The team also supports the organisation's compliance with equalities and consultation duties. Cuts in this service area increase the risk of non-compliance in respect of these key statutory duties.

Potential inspection challenges ahead include:

- Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services (ILACS). Preparation for ILACS is well underway and a full ILACS inspection is expected any time in the next 12 months. The Council was last subject to a full statutory inspection in 2015;
- Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI). As with other local authorities, Lewisham can expect up two JTAI's in the three years between the main statutory children's inspection. To date the authority has not been subject to a JTAI in any of the three rounds that have been announced to date. However, Lewisham must prepare for a JTAI as though it were imminent.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The team is already comparatively much smaller than other strategic teams elsewhere in London. The Lewisham team (15 staff) is supporting a full range of policy development, performance management and consultation needs of the organisation and is already smaller than one dedicated directorate (CYP) performance team in Greenwich. The Greenwich directorate team (15) focuses almost exclusively on service performance. In Tower Hamlets in comparable roles to Lewisham, there are up to 32 members of staff with 11 focusing on Adults and 11 on Children's services.

Two thirds of the existing capacity of the Lewisham service is currently focused on Children and Young People's needs. Work arising out of a current external challenge to better meet performance needs in Children's Social Care and Adults will probably point to the need for more investment rather than less in the areas of performance management. Further cuts, at this time, would therefore make support to both service specific needs in Children's and Adult's more difficult to meet as well as compromising the capacity available to deliver the wider strategic agenda for the new Administration.

Deferring this cut into 2020/21 would allow for some essential adjustments to be made

4. Impact and risks of proposal
for over an extended period. Any earlier cut would compromise the capacity to assure Children's and Adult's statutory data returns and as well as preparations for intense rounds of inspection/external review (see legal section below).

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	1,000	0	1,000	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Salaries & Supplies Cut		155		155
Total				
% of Net Budget	%	15%	%	15%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
10	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	High	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

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

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Medium	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	Medium
Gender:	Medium	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	Medium
Age:	Medium	**Sexual orientation:**	Medium
Disability:	Medium	**Gender reassignment:**	Medium
Religion / Belief:	Medium	**Overall:**	Medium
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	**Headcount in post**	**FTE in post**	**Establishment posts**	**Vacant**	
				Agency / Interim cover	**Not covered**
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5	**5**	4.5	**5**		
PO6 – PO8	**7**	6.5	**7**		
SMG 1 – 3	**3**	2	**3**	**1**	
JNC					
Total	**15**	13	**15**	**1**	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Staff consultation would be required for this proposal. The equalities impact will need to be fully evaluated as part of a staff consultation process and subsequent outcome of such consultation. The service area undertakes a number of statutory returns signed off by the respective Children's and Adult's directorates. The team also supports the organisation's compliance with equalities and consultation duties. Cuts in this service area increase the risk of non-compliance in respect of these key statutory duties. The statutory returns on data include: • Adults Social Care Survey 2017/18 (submitted May 2018) • Short and Long Term Support Return 2017/18 (submitted May 2018) • Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Return (submitted May 2018) • Safeguarding SAC return 2017-18 (submitted June 2018) • Children's 903 Return

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

11. Legal implications
• Quarterly Adoption Return • Children in Need Census • Schools Census (three times per year) The Council has statutory duties in relation to consultation. The framework for which needs to be kept up to date and support and advice for compliance provided.

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019 – December 2019	Preparation for any consultations due on any agreed cuts proposals

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Withdrawal of Councillor Car Run Delivery Service
Reference:	RES5
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Policy & Governance
Service/Team area:	Governance Support/Business & Committee
Cabinet portfolio:	Democracy, Refugees and Accountability
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
10k by securing Councillor agreement to end twice weekly car run delivery of agendas and other post	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Post received at the Town Hall and agendas for formal committee meetings are delivered twice weekly by car to the homes of elected members. Elimination of the service and replacement by personal collection or email notification is proposed.

Currently the Constitution states the following:
[Summons]... may be served by:-

a) sending it to, or leaving it at the member's usual place of residence; or
b) where the member has specified an address other than their usual place of residence, by sending it to, or leaving it at, that other address; or
c) where the member has given consent for the summons to be transmitted in electronic form to a particular electronic address (and consent has not been withdrawn) sending it in electronic form to that address.

Cuts proposal

A £10k saving could be achieved by removing the car run service with members receiving their Council papers by email and collecting their post at the Civic Suite. Standard substitution by use of Royal Mail would double existing costs and is not a recommended option.
Members' access needs would continue to be catered for on individual basis.

Delivery of this cut would require members to self-select either option b) as the Town Hall, or option c).

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Members will need more secure and accessible postal racks. Some minor facilitation works for postal racks will be required on the 2nd floor of the Civic Suite.

A review will be undertaken to (1) encourage the replacement of Council generated internal correspondence by email as much as possible and (2) consider the ability and

4. Impact and risks of proposal
scope of scanning external circulars correspondence. It is not anticipated that this proposal will prevent any current personal access needs to continue to be catered for and this will be kept under review.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Members have a statutory right to receive official agenda summonses at home and would need to agree in writing to waive all existing rights. Verification of any proposed waiver documentation would be required from the Head of Law.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	4,590	(259)	4,331	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) 10k by ending Councillor car run	10	0	0	10
Total	10			10
% of Net Budget	0.2%	%	%	0.2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E	C	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older**
10	1	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on	**Level of impact on**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
main priority – High / Medium / Low	**second priority – High / Medium / Low**	**people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
Low	Low	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	No specific impact but elected members in all wards affected.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	n/a	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	n/a
Gender:	n/a	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	n/a
Age:	n/a	**Sexual orientation:**	n/a
Disability:	n/a	**Gender reassignment:**	n/a
Religion / Belief:	n/a	**Overall:**	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
n/a			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Yes – elected members will have to voluntarily agree to extinguish all rights under various legislation to have deliveries made to their home addresses.

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Increase income supporting the Funding Officer post and review the Economy and Partnerships Function
Reference:	RES6
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Policy & Governance
Service/Team area:	Strategy & Partnerships/Economy & Partnerships
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) Increase Income £30k	No	No	No
b) Restructure £80k	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The function supports key aspects of the Council's economic development work covering: Local Labour and Business Scheme/S106 work with developers and contractors, apprenticeships, cross borough work on Jobs and Skills and inward investment.

Cuts proposal

The proposals would be to increase income in this area for 2019/20 and also review the function's staffing structures for 2020/21 targeting future cuts on salaries budgets.

The specific income proposal is to increase the target for covering the current dedicated funding officer post from 50% currently to 100% cost recovery, in 2019/20, netting approximately £30k.

The second proposal is for a longer term review of the overall function and evaluation of the scope for closer working across different service areas of the Council with an objective of salaries savings of up to £80k for 2020/21.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The first proposal is to target an increase in income that would support the only dedicated funding post in the team. The Council is facing pressures across the board and senior officers no longer have the capacity to go out and look for new discrete funding streams and often they do not have capacity to bid for the standard funding streams from GLA etc.

Since the role of the funding post role was created in 2017, the post holder has been involved in many of the Council's funding bids egg the Good Growth Fund, the Strategic Investment Pot, the Housing Infrastructure Fund and some smaller bids for the Children's Directorate – specifically the youth service.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
However, if the target for increased income generation to support the Funding post is not met, in any one year, then there will be a pressure on this budget related to any shortfall. The second proposal is for a review of this area of work providing an opportunity to evaluate the best way of structuring the function going forward and mitigating the impact of any targeted cuts on the salaries budget for 2020/21. The loss of any posts in this service area could undermine the coherence of our approach to these important areas of work. These areas of work also cover a number of the new Administration's economic development priorities.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The proposal for a review of this area of work provides an opportunity to evaluate the best way of structuring the function and mitigating the impact of any targeted cuts on the salaries budget for 2020/21.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	3,423	(2,681)	742	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) Increase income on funding post	30			30
b) Restructure		80		80
Total	30	80		110
% of Net Budget	4%	11%	%	15%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	E	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low	High	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment**

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
10	5	**2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Neutral	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low	High	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Not Applicable

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	Low
Gender:	Low	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	Low
Age:	Low	**Sexual orientation:**	Low
Disability:	Low	**Gender reassignment:**	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	**Overall:**	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	**Headcount in post**	**FTE in post**	**Establishment posts**	**Vacant**	
				Agency / Interim cover	**Not covered**
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5	**1**	1	**1**		
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5	**3**	3	**3**		
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3	**1**	1	**1**		
JNC					
Total	**5**	5	**5**		

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Staff consultation would be required for this proposal. The equalities impact will need to be fully evaluated as part of a staff consultation process and subsequent outcome of such consultation.

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduce corporate apprenticeships salaries budget
Reference:	RES7
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Policy & Governance
Service/Team area:	Strategy & Partnerships/Economy & Partnerships
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) Reduce apprenticeship budget £55k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The corporate apprenticeship budget is used to facilitate the Mayors Apprenticeship Programme by part funding (50%) the salaries of Council based apprentices. Most of our apprentices are employed for 14 months, the budget pays for 7 months salaries and on cost.
Cuts proposal
This proposal is for a cut of £55k on the Council's apprenticeship budget (12% of the budget).

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The impact would be a reduction on Council led apprenticeships equivalent to 5-6 apprentices out of an overall programme with the capacity of up to 30-35 apprenticeships each year. The Administration have a commitment to support an extra 250 apprentices through the Mayor's Apprenticeship Service. The Council has a statutory target for apprentices. There are current challenges to meeting the target and this cut could contribute to those difficulties.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
There would be little scope for mitigation.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	456	0	456	
HRA				
DSG				

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) Cut apprenticeship budget		55		55
Total		55		
% of Net Budget	%	12%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
A	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	High	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
5	5	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	High	

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

9. Service equalities impact
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact			
Ethnicity:		**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	
Gender:		**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	
Age:		**Sexual orientation:**	
Disability:		**Gender reassignment:**	
Religion / Belief:		**Overall:**	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The legal issue is set out in the paper, relating to the risk to the Council meeting the target for apprenticeships set by the Public Sector Apprenticeship Targets Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/513).

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation: **The main cuts timetable for 2019/20 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.**	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Insurance costs – premium reduction
Reference:	RES8
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Insurance & Risk
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
£30k contract efficiency	N	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Insurance and Risk ensures the Council has sufficient insurance cover (in the market or by way of reserves) and manages claims promptly and fairly to reduce the impact of risks should they materialise. The Council's insurance services are also offered to schools and housing to enable them to access the expertise and economies of scale the Council's arrangements provide.
Cuts proposal
The Council insurance contracts are currently being retendered and through negotiation on the combination of assets and risks to be covered and excess and aggregate risks in the portfolio it is expected to negotiate a £100k reduction in premium costs, £30k of which are to the General Fund with the balance recharged.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no direct impact to service users or staff. This proposal is about ensuring the Council has sufficiently robust and resourced insurance arrangements in place in the event of a serious incident that results in a claim against the Council.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The balance of risk in the Council's insurance portfolio is being maintained.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	4,493	(2,999)	1,494	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
contract efficiency	30			30
Total	30			30
% of Net Budget	2%	%	%	2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
10		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Neutral		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low		

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

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	
Gender:		**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	
Age:		**Sexual orientation:**	
Disability:		**Gender reassignment:**	
Religion / Belief:		**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what			

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact	
mitigations are proposed:	
N/A	
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Final contract evaluation
October 2018	Scrutiny review of key decision and contract award
November 2018	New insurance arrangements implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Insurance costs – self insurance reserves
Reference:	RES9
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Insurance & Risk
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Finance skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
£200k reduction in level of insurance reserves (for 10 yrs.)	Y	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Insurance and Risk ensures the Council has sufficient insurance cover (in the market or by way of reserves) and manages claims promptly and fairly to reduce the impact of risks should they materialise. The Council's insurance services are also offered to schools and housing to enable them to access the expertise and economies of scale the Council's arrangements provide. It is also responsible for setting and promoting the Council's policy and procedures for strengthening good risk management practices in the Council's day to day management of operations.
Cuts proposal
A reduction in the level of reserves held for self-insurance purposes by releasing current reserves of £200k per annum for ten years. This will reduce the Council's insurance reserves by £2.0m.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no direct impact to service users or staff. This proposal is about ensuring the Council has sufficiently robust and resourced insurance arrangements in place in the event of a serious incident that results in a claim against the Council.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
No immediate service impact however an increase in carried risk for the organisation. The risk is higher as it increases the likelihood of the Council holding insufficient reserves to cover the self-insured elements if incidents. Should the risk materialise I there would be an immediate cash call on reserves and/or service revenue budgets.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	**Spend**	**Income**	**Net Budget**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
General Fund (GF)	**£'000**	**£'000**	**£'000**	
	4,493	(2,999)	1,494	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
£200k reduction in level of insurance reserves (for 10 yrs.)	200	-	-	200
Total	200	-	-	200
% of Net Budget	13%	%	%	13%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:	Yes	The Council self-insurance is for its own and DSG and HRA activities. The reserves are there for all claims that are eligible and the cut could therefore impact these funds.		

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
E		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
10		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Negative		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low		

8. Ward impact	
Geographical	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

8. Ward impact	
impact by ward:	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	
Gender:		**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	
Age:		**Sexual orientation:**	
Disability:		**Gender reassignment:**	
Religion / Belief:		**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
N/A			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared
September 2018	
October 2018	Scrutiny review of proposal
November 2018	M&C decision on level of insurance reserves
April 2019	Implement decision over ten yrs. noting end budget pressure

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Cease the graduate development programme
Reference:	RES10
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Organisational Development and Human Resources
Service/Team area:	Talent & Recruitment
Cabinet portfolio:	Finance, Skills and Jobs
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
£156k cease the graduate programme	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The graduate development programme consists of a two year programme for graduates joining us from the National Local Government graduate programme. Lewisham takes on two graduates a year, who at the end of the two year period apply for a permanent job in the Council and move from the HR budget to a normal employing service budget. At any one time, we have four graduates employed.
Cuts proposal
To cease the graduate development programme by letting the current graduates run their course and take on further graduates thereafter. Therefore, there are no implications to existing graduates who have a two year programme with us and may then apply for permanent employment with the Council.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Reduction in new talent pipeline of two graduates per year who are then comprehensively trained. These posts also cover a role of advisory support to the Chief Executive as a six month placement, so an alternative solution would need to be found.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
We struggle to get the intake to represent the ethnicity of the Borough and attract Lewisham residents. To look at our future talent needs and, if a graduate intake programme forms part of this, work at a more local level with local universities to recruit candidates.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	2,800	(300)	2,500	
HRA				

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) a) £156k cease the graduate programme	78	78	-	156
Total	78	78	-	156
% of Net Budget	3%	3%	0%	6%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
N/A		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 11. Community leadership and empowerment 12. Young people's achievement and involvement 13. Clean, green and liveable 14. Safety, security and a visible presence 15. Strengthening the local economy 16. Decent homes for all 17. Protection of children 18. Caring for adults and the older people 19. Active, healthy citizens 20. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
10		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

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

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil	N/A

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact			
		Partnerships:	
Age:	Low	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
N/A			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
November 2018	Proposals to M&C
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Planning Service
Reference:	RES11
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Interim Head of Planning
Service/Team area:	Planning
Cabinet portfolio:	Mayor
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
increase income £100k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

In early 2018, the Government increased the statutory planning application fees by 20%...

However, we are only able to take advantage of the 20% increase in fees if we do not reduce our base budget. This Government requirement has been introduced to ensure that the application fee increase will be "ring-fenced" to improve planning capacity and customer service. Therefore, the Development Management (E44613) base budget of £1,781,683 cannot be reduced in the budget savings exercise for the foreseeable future.

The Planning Service have therefore looked to identify opportunities to generate additional income as opposed to savings to the base budget.

Cuts proposal

£50k increase in income to the DM budget through a further review of and increase to chargeable services. This will predominantly be through a review of our Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) with developers. Our aim is to ensure that the costs of processing / advising on major schemes is fully recoverable from the developer. This cost recovery will be additional to the statutory fee for the planning application and any costs of reviewing the proposed scheme at the design panel.

As the Planning Service proposed budget savings are all income related, it is impossible to predict any potential saving for 2020/21, although overall the service is aiming to reduce the net budget. Recent research into the funding positions of other London planning authorities have identified that none are currently fully "cost neutral".

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

There will be an impact on service users through the increase of fees. However, we would be seeking to ensure that we are fully recovering the cost of providing the service which will be balanced against estimated take-up of the service at the proposed increase. The Planning Service are continuing to improve the Planning web

4. Impact and risks of proposal
pages to ensure that a free offer is available to any householders looking to undertake works in the Borough. Discussion with developers has indicated a willingness to pay increased fees if it enables a good level of service to be provided.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
There is a risk that by increasing fees, less customers and developers will choose to use the service. In order to minimise this, the Planning Service are already looking at ways of delivering good levels of customer satisfaction and methods of promoting and marketing services.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	2,641	(1,852)	789	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Pre-app income	50	50		100
Total	50	50		100
% of Net Budget	1.9%	%	%	1.9%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	E	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older**
6	5	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on	**Level of impact on**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
main priority – High / Medium / Low	**second priority – High / Medium / Low**	**people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
Low	Low	

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

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	N/A	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
As increasing income to cover the full cost of undertaking service, no legal implications

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Catford complex office rationalisation
Reference:	RES12
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Regeneration and Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Mayor
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Catford complex office rationalisation £250k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Capital Programme Delivery team is responsible for the investment in and improvement of the council's office accommodation. Budget has already been agreed for the refurbishment of Laurence House to replace lighting for LEDs, improve the heating and ventilation, and update welfare facilities and so on. Alongside this, the team is responsible for the delivery of the Catford town centre regeneration programme which includes key office accommodation sites.
Cuts proposal
This is a combination of projected cost savings and income generation from ongoing investment in Laurence House (budget already approved) with a view to rationalising the office accommodation provision within the Catford complex into Laurence House. The investment will lead to improved energy performance in Laurence House, reduced building maintenance call outs as well reducing the probability of a catastrophic failure of the building in the short to medium term. There will be a small rental income from sharing space with the CCG, who will be moving in to the refurbished Laurence House. Twinned with the current investment programme are other ongoing corporate projects such as paperless and agile working which together provide an opportunity for better utilisation of the office space in Laurence House enabling further consolidation of office accommodation across the Catford complex. Consolidation provides opportunities for savings and or income generation from underutilised buildings within the complex.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
No impact to service users. CCG to move in to Laurence House as part of refurbishment and will pay annual £72k all inclusive rent (tenancy still to be signed). Impact on staff: work is already underway to prepare for the refurbishment of Laurence House, including temporarily moving staff to alternative locations (within Laurence House and other Catford offices) whilst one floor at a time is refurbished. This requires staff to work on average 7:10 desk to person ratio.

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
- Staff do not have adequate IT kit to work remotely / in agile way thereby reducing capacity to consolidate staff in to Laurence House. Mitigated through ongoing corporate discussions to determine budget and approach. - Income from sub-letting other Catford office spaces is not realised due to lack of interest in those properties. Market has not yet been tested however, previous interest in Old Town Hall and partner requirements suggest there may be a market. Mothballing to save on running costs is also an option for consideration to reduce estate running costs.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	6,672	(696)	5,977	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Catford complex office rationalisation		250		250
Total				
% of Net Budget	%	4%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	B	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all**
5	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Positive	Positive	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		7. Protection of children **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	Medium	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	Laurence House is based in Rushey Green ward but impact is borough wide in terms of council delivery of services.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	N/A	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No (one has been completed already)

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	YES – general impact as per no.4 above

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
N/A

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

12. Summary timetable	
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in Business Rates for the Corporate Estate
Reference:	RES13
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Mayor
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Business Rates reduction on corporate estate £100k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Corporate Estate is managed within the Estates Compliance and Contracts service group, however the business rates budgets are held and managed by the Estates Team in the Property, Asset Strategy and Estates service group. There are no proposals to review this service or team itself but look to grow the value of the estate that they manage.
Cuts proposal
This proposal is in relation to challenging and appealing the valuations that underpin the calculation of business rates chargeable for the Corporate Estate. A revaluation exercise took place in 2017, the first since 2011. Since the last revaluation exercise, the Council has appealed across the estate, resulting in total annual savings (including schools) of more than £400k per annum. This proposal relates to business rates appeals for Corporate Estate, not schools.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
No impact to service users, partners or other Council services. However, it could affect the overall amount received directly by the Council as a result of the changes to how business rates are allocated/kept by the Borough that collects them.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
N/A

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	1,277	0	1,277	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Business Rates reduction on corporate estate		100		100
Total		100		100
% of Net Budget	%	8%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	E	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
5	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Low	Low	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	No specific impact but this is across multiple wards
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

9. Service equalities impact			
Ethnicity:	N/A	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	N/A	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Corporate Estate FM Contract Insourcing
Reference:	RES14
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Mayor
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Corporate Estate FM Contract Insourcing	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The existing Corporate Estate Maintenance contracts and compliance are managed by the FM and Regulatory Management Team in the Contract and Compliance service group. There is a proposal to review this service and partly insource the corporate FM contract to produce some savings for the LBL Corporate properties portfolio maintenance and compliance.

Cuts proposal

This proposal identifies that savings could be made by part insourcing the FM contract for all Corporate Estate properties.

There is a proposal to part insource the corporate FM contract for response repairs and PPM (Planned Preventive Maintenance) for the Corporate Estate – potential savings from carrying out elements of PPM and response repairs in-house.

It is proposed that an initial £100k investment for the contract mobilisation process would be estimated to achieve savings in the region of £100k per annum for LBL Contract and Compliance Group.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

There will be no negative impact to service users or partners, or other Council staff; impacts will generally be positive. Positive impact on FM management and compliance across corporate properties portfolio. This is an option that would allow for in-house management of more than 80% of M&E services which would give us a greater control and certainty of estates compliance. It would also meet a manifesto pledge of insourcing where appropriate and the letting of smaller more specialist packages would seek to encourage the retention of Council spend within the borough through sustainable communities and engaging with SMEs and a local workforce.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The risks associated with this proposal are generally low and will be dependent on the delivery model to be taken forward. Primarily, the approach will focus on the LB

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Croydon FM Management model, which has no significant upfront costs, and has produced some savings and good results for statutory compliance. LB Croydon currently works off a similar model and compliance is 99%. The main risks, however, are associated with some TUPE implications as a result of this insourcing project. The risks also include being able to find good value-for-money local subcontractors on time to perform a number of smaller specialist contracts. Whilst this risk can never be fully mitigated, employing one mobilisation project manager for six months will reduce any possible risk of overspending or running out of time and compromising any services.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	6,672	(696)	5,977	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Corporate Estate FM Contract Insourcing	100	100		200
Total				
% of Net Budget	2%	2%	2%	5%
Invest to save	(100)			(100)
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	E	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local**
10	5	
Impact on main priority – Positive /	**Impact on second priority – Positive /**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Neutral / Negative	**Neutral / Negative**	**economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	Medium	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	No specific impact but this is across multiple wards
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	N/A	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
N/A			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The main legal implications relate to TUPE employment law and regulations as a result of this insourcing project.

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers)**
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

12. Summary timetable	
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Commercial Estate Growth
Reference:	RES15
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Mayor
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Growth of existing commercial estate £500k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The existing Commercial Estate is managed by the Estates Team in the Property, Asset Strategy and Estates service area. There are no proposals to review this service or team itself but look to grow the value of the estate that they manage.

Cuts proposal

This proposal is in relation to growth of the existing Commercial Estate, increasing income from existing and new sources, including:

- Outstanding casework on high performing retail parades;
- Letting of vacant premises;
- Dealing with outstanding forfeiture cases;
- New commercial premises from existing land sales

Whilst the majority of the estate is tertiary in nature, there are still some higher performing parades such as those on New Cross Road, Evelyn Street and Loampit Vale that generate significantly more and where there are either existing new lettings which will come to fruition over the next two years or where there is still room for further rental growth to market levels.

There are a number of properties where we have taken litigation action and going through forfeiture proceedings to get leases back and relet the properties at market level. Currently we are not receiving rent for these properties and this proposal depends on the successful outcome of those cases.

Finally, there are new properties which will come into the Commercial Estate over the next 18months as a result of previous land transactions.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

No impact to service users, partners or other Council services. There are always a small number of cases every year where tenants make representations as to the level of their rent, particularly where they are voluntary sector organisations providing

4. Impact and risks of proposal
services as opposed to running businesses, but these representations are assessed on a case by case basis.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
As above

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	2,366	(5,560)	(3,195)	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a)		500		500
Total				
% of Net Budget	%	16%	%	16%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
5	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	Low	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	No specific impact but this is across multiple wards
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	N/A	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Commercial Property Investment Acquisitions
Reference:	RES16
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Mayor
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Commercial Property Acquisitions £280k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The existing Commercial Estate is managed by the Estates Team in the Property, Asset Strategy and Estates service area. There are no proposals to review this service or team itself but look to grow the value of the estate that they manage.

Cuts proposal

This proposal is separate to the proposal around growth of the Commercial Estate, as that describes work and opportunities to grow the existing portfolio. This proposal is in relation to becoming more proactive in seeking out opportunities to acquire commercial property investments, using either borrowing or existing revenue reserves.

An investment strategy would set the parameters for investment, for example location, use, lease details and terms, financial parameters, amongst other things.

It is proposed that an initial £5m be put forward for acquisitions, which would be estimated to achieve in the region of £280k per annum.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

No impact to service users or partners, or other Council staff. However, this would require amending the current Treasury Strategy to enable future acquisitions to be made.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The main risk however is around investment in commercial real estate at a time of uncertainty in this sector, in particular the medium and long term stability of retail based income streams. There is no certain future for the retail market in particular and over investment could have revenue ramifications if, following lease ends, there are significant void periods, particularly if borrowing is set over a longer time frame, for example 40 year borrowing period vs 15 year certain lease term.

Whilst this risk can never be fully mitigated against, certain criteria could be set to try and mitigate as far as possible. For example, an investment strategy could focus on

4. Impact and risks of proposal
those uses which are more likely to have longevity, even in the retail sector, such as food based convenience stores around station and town centre locations and other such uses. It could also set strict parameters around risk – lease terms, tenant covenant strength etc. Any investment strategy would also need to include an exit strategy.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	2,366	(5,560)	(3,195)	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Commercial Property Acquisitions	140	140		280
Total				
% of Net Budget	4%	4%	%	8%
Invest to save	(5,000)			(5,000)
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens**
5	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Positive	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Medium	Low	10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact but this is across multiple wards
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Beckenham Place Park – income generation
Reference:	RES17
Directorate:	Regeneration & Place
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Capital Programme Deliver/Strategic Asset Management
Cabinet portfolio:	Mayor
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
a) letting of restored buildings £138k	No	No	No
b) letting of unrestored Foxgrove Club £25k	No	No	No
c) letting of restored Foxgrove Club £100k	No	No	No
d)			

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The service areas involved are Capital Programme Delivery who are raising funds for restoration and co-ordinating the works and Strategic Asset Management who will assist with the letting strategy for the restored buildings.

Cuts proposal

Funding has been secured and work is underway to restore the stable block at Beckenham Place Park this will be completed by June 2019. The building will include a café which can be let or managed to generate income estimated at £25k per annum.

The homesteads cottages (3 in number) are also being restored and can be let on completion to generate c.£10k per unit per annum.

The Foxgrove Club requires up to c. £250k of work to deal with dilapidations although a significant proportion of this is decorative and could be carried out by an occupier. The restored building could generate £50k per annum but without investment and in its current condition a rent free period may be needed to cover the costs involved in carrying out basic repairs.

Future income from letting the mansion is a possibility but it requires significant investment c. £3m or more before its full commercial potential is likely to be realised. This investment and the works is not likely to be completed within the timescales of this cuts round.

These proposals do not impact on any existing service areas as the revenue generating buildings are currently unused. The Foxgrove building has property guardians in place for security from which a small income is derived.

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The impact of these proposals should be positive, with new public facing uses/facilities & workspaces in the park.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Costs of restoration exceeding budget – this is being managed by the project manager and quantity surveyor to ensure work can be completed within available resources **Lack of market interest in renting buildings** – promotion of the park is ongoing and footfall has doubled since closure of the golf course creating a much more positive business environment. There is significant interest in renting spaces and we will develop a bespoke marketing strategy for these unusual assets to maximise the potential of the opportunity. **Rental income falling below expectations** – the assumptions above reflect conservative assumptions of income potential

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) letting of restored buildings	27.5	55	55	137.5
b) letting of unrestored Foxgrove Club	0	0	25	25
c) letting of restored Foxgrove Club	0	50	50	100
d)	27.5	105	130	262.2
Total	Total varies depending on investment approach to Foxgrove Club			
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Invest to save	(200)			(200)
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services**
D		
Level of impact on	**Level of impact on**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
main priority – High / Medium / Low	**second priority – High / Medium / Low**	**D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
Low		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
5	3	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	Medium	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	Positive impact in Bellingham Ward where the unused assets are situated
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	N/A	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Buildings will be let following an appropriate marketing exercise to ensure that the council achieves market value for the buildings.

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
November 2018 – January 2019	Marketing of buildings
February 2018	Agreement to lease
March 2019 –May 2019	Legal agreements completed
June 2018	Buildings occupied and rental income commences

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Electric Vehicle charging points
Reference:	RES18
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Parks, Neighbourhoods and Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
Electric vehicle charging points £100k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The provision of electric vehicle charging points is managed by the Transport Policy & Development Team, in the Highways & Transport Service. There are no proposals to review this team or service area, following extensive re-organisations in 2011 and 2015, and a management review in 2017. Instead, the service is focussed on opportunities to generate income, such as through the provision of electric vehicle charging points.

Cuts proposal

This proposal identifies a new income source generated by charging a licence fee (or a revenue share model) from providers of electric vehicle charging infrastructure situated on Council land and Highways.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

In general, there will be no negative impact to service users or partners, or other Council staff; impacts will generally be positive, with outcomes including improved air quality and health. Local impacts may occur due to the siting of infrastructure, and any local concerns, such as loss of general parking spaces or visual impact, will be managed through public consultation as part of the associated planning approval and traffic orders.
The Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy is currently under development alongside the new LIP Strategy, both of which are due to be adopted by March 2019.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The risks associated with this proposal are generally low, but this is dependent on the delivery model(s) to be taken forward.

Primarily, the approach will focus on the Source London model, which has no upfront costs, and generates income through an agreed annual licence fee.

Alternative operating models are currently being investigated as part of the emerging Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy, which require match-funding and therefore carry

4. Impact and risks of proposal
some financial risk, which includes the potential for ongoing revenue costs but could also generate increased fees as a percentage of revenue. This model will be taken forward as a pilot through the Go Ultra-Low City Scheme (GULCS), which is a procurement framework organised by London Councils. Match funding has been identified through the TfL funded LIP programme, which will provide the required investment in infrastructure costs as well as short-term staffing costs related to the pilot. Should this model be rolled out in the future, ongoing revenue costs will need to be taken into account as part of a future invest to save proposal.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	5,613	(2,466)	3,147	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
Electric vehicle charging points	50	50		100
Total				
% of Net Budget	1.6%	1.6%	%	3.2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
D	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older**
3	9	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on	**Level of impact on**	

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
main priority – High / Medium / Low	**second priority – High / Medium / Low**	**people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
High	Medium	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	All wards will be included in the programme
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	L	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	L	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Low impact: - The uptake of electric vehicles is disproportionate by more affluent communities, primarily due to the high purchase cost of modern vehicles. This is turn means that there may be lower uptake among BME communities, as well as the younger and older drivers. However, although these groups are less likely to benefit directly from the scheme, the improved air quality will benefit the whole community, and any disbenefits are likely to be minor and very localised, and considered through the usual robust consultation processes.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The Council's legal team are involved in the establishment of contracts and procurements relating to electric vehicle charging, which relies on a range of local government legislation relevant to, for instance, parking, and charging for use of the highway.

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

12. Summary timetable	
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	School Crossing Patrol
Reference:	RES19
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Parks, Neighbourhoods and Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	**Key Decision Yes / No**	**Public Consultation Yes / No**	**Staff Consultation Yes / No**
School Crossing Patrol £160k	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The School Crossing Patrol is managed by the Policy & Development Team, in the Highways & Transport Service. The School Crossing Patrol covers 28 school sites across the Borough, and is delivered in-house with each site staffed by a permanent part-time member of staff.

Cuts proposal

This proposal considers the impact and risks of cutting the School Crossing Patrol, and, in view of the possible political, reputational and legal risks, identifies potential mitigation, including alternative options such as scaling-back the School Crossing Patrol service, retaining sites with the highest assessed risk factors.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The School Crossing Patrol offers assistance to primary aged children and their parents in crossing busy roads on the way to school. School Crossing Patrols are highly valued by schools and parents, and are an important feature of the Council's efforts to support safe, car-free travel to school.

The removal of the service will be viewed as a road safety risk, but also as a removal of support, that currently enables older primary school children to walk to school independently, resulting in parents opting to drive their children to school, exacerbating concerns about road safety and poor air quality.

Cutting the service would have an impact on the work and objectives of Public Health, who take a close interest in the promotion of active travel and air quality, as well as the reduction of road deaths and injuries.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Due to the nature of the service, and its contribution to road safety and air quality, any cuts to the School Crossing Patrol would be highly controversial.

Cutting the service could be viewed as being in conflict the Mayor's Manifesto, which

4. Impact and risks of proposal

states that the Council will "work with parents and schools to protect our children from toxic air" and that "all Lewisham children will be encouraged to walk, cycle and scoot to school away from main roads".

The primary risk is that the removal of the service results in (or is perceived to result in) the injury or death of a child or parent/carer at the current crossing site. In such an event, it could be difficult to determine whether the removal of the School Crossing Patrol would be a causal factor, but it would also be difficult to rule out. In a worst case scenario, this is a legal risk around perceived liability. This is therefore a very serious proposal to consider, and of course the Service advises against it unless absolutely necessary.

The most likely risk is the reputational and political risk around any perceived impact and the resulting communications and press interest that may follow.

Mitigation and option assessment
In view of the political difficulties in fully cutting the service, this proposal considers two additional options as part of the possible mitigation:

Option 1 – Full Service Cut (saving £161k)
Mitigation for this option would be predominantly in the form of road safety advice and school travel planning support that is currently offered to all schools in the Borough. Site specific information could be provided to the affected schools advising on safe crossing locations and the safe use of pedestrian crossings. During 2019/20 Speed surveys would be undertaken to establish the risk, along with an audit of the 20mph speed limit signs and any associated traffic calming measures at each of the sites, and additional capital funding may be required to make any necessary improvements. However, this is unlikely to offer significant mitigation against the political impact of the service cut.

Option 2 – Paid-for Service (saving £161k)
This option would offer mitigation against the cuts, by offering schools the option of paying to retain a School Crossing Patrol service. However, the Service would not recommend this option as it considers it is vital that any road safety service is provided to all schools equitably, or is prioritised on an appropriate basis. Prioritising based on ability to pay could raise equality concerns for schools unable to pay for the service. It may also pose a political and reputational risk.

Option 3 – Reduced Service on Risk-Assessed Basis (saving £54k)
This option would offer mitigation by scaling back the School Crossing Patrol service, retaining those schools with the highest risk factors. For example, cuts could be focussed on those sites which are located on pedestrian crossings such as zebra crossings (approximately 10 out of 28 sites), or where observed traffic speeds are low. Additional mitigation could be considered as per Option 1, in the form of site specific information and training on the safe use of pedestrian crossings. It would also include speed surveys and an audit of the 20mph limit signs and any associated traffic calming measures at each of the sites, and funding would be required to make any necessary improvements. This option would require further work to assess the road safety risks of each site and prioritise the limited budget accordingly, and we would propose that this option be investigated in more detail for consideration as part of a future savings proposal.

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	**Spend £'000**	**Income £'000**	**Net Budget £'000**	
	5,624	(2,480)	3,144	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	**2019/20 £'000**	**2020/21 £'000**	**2021/22 £'000**	**Total £'000**
a) School Crossing Patrol	0	160		
Total	0	0		160
% of Net Budget	%	5%	%	5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	**General Fund**	**DSG**	**HRA**	**Health**
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Lewisham 2020 priorities** **A. Strengthening Community input** **B. Sharing Services** **C. Digitising our Services** **D. Income Generation** **E. Demand Management**
A	E	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
Medium	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	**Second priority**	**Corporate priorities** **1. Community leadership and empowerment** **2. Young people's achievement and involvement** **3. Clean, green and liveable** **4. Safety, security and a visible presence** **5. Strengthening the local economy** **6. Decent homes for all** **7. Protection of children** **8. Caring for adults and the older people** **9. Active, healthy citizens** **10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity**
4	4	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	**Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative**	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	**Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low**	
High	High	

13. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	**No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more**
	Specific impact in 16 wards
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	(Perry Vale) Adamsril - Adamsril Road (Grove Park) Baring - Baring Road / Linchmere Road

7. Impact on Corporate priorities	
	(Crofton Park) Beecroft - Brockley Road (Perry Vale) St George's - Perry Vale (Lee) Colfes - Upwood Road / Leyland Road (Crofton Park) Dalmain - Brockley Rise (Forest Hill) Fairlawn - Honor Oak Road (Brockley) St Stephens - Friendly St J/W Albyn Rd (Ladywell) Gordonbrock - Ladywell Rd (Evelyn) Grinling Gibbons - Edward Street (Lewisham C) Brindishe Green - Hither Green Lane / Beacon Rd (Blackheath) John Ball - Southvale Road (Telegraph Hill) John Stainer - Mantle Road (Telegraph Hill) John Stainer - St Asaphs Road / Finland Road (Forest Hill) Kelvin Grove - Kirkdale / Kelvin Grove (Perry Vale) Kilmorie - Cranston Road / Loxton Road (Lee) Lee Manor - Manor Lane / Southbrook Road (Grove Park) Marvels Lane - Marvels lane (Sydenham) Our Lady and St Philip Neri Junior - Sydenham Road (Crofton Park) Prendergast - Ladywell Fields, Manwood Rd (Downham) Rangefield - Rangefield Road / Glenbow Road (Downham) Rangefield,Downderry,NW - Downham Wy/GlenbowRd (Rushey Green) Rathfern - Catford Hill / Woolstone Road (Catford South) Sandhurst - Sandhurst Road (Evelyn) Sir Francis Drake - Grinstead Road / Scawen Road (Sydenham) Sydenham High - Westwood Hill / Amberley Grove (Catford South) Torridon - Torridon Road / Hazelbank Road (New Cross) Tidemill - Giffin Street

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	L	**Pregnancy / Maternity:**	N/A
Gender:	N/A	**Marriage & Civil Partnerships:**	N/A
Age:	M	**Sexual orientation:**	N/A
Disability:	N/A	**Gender reassignment:**	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	**Overall:**	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Medium impact on Age: - The loss of School Crossing Patrols would disproportionately affect primary school children and their parents/carers. Impact in deprived wards: Research suggests a link between road related casualties and deprived areas, with potential impacts on BME communities. This could be exacerbated by Option 2, which could present a potentially high differential impact on schools based on affordability, with more affluent schools better able to fund the service.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

APPENDIX 4
RESOURCES AND REGENERATION PROPOSALS

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	**Headcount in post**	**FTE in post**	**Establishment posts**	**Vacant**	
				Agency / Interim cover	**Not covered**
Scale 1 – 2	28	6	28		
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
A clear position will need to be established on the potential liability (or perceived liability) in removing road safety facilities, in the event of any future incident and potential claim against the Council.

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	**Activity**
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (**this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation**)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented