

APPENDIX 3

Theme B: Joint Working and Partnerships - Cuts Proformas

DRAFT

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Changes to Children's Social Care services
Reference:	B-02, C-03, E-06, F-03, F-04, F-05
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Lucie Heyes
Service/Team area:	Children's Social Care
Cabinet portfolio:	Chris Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Luke Sorba

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
1. Improve partner contributions to the placement costs for children in care	No	No	No
2. Increase in permanent staffing leading to a reduction in agency staffing costs	No	No	No
3. Claiming of increased UASC grant + reduction in accommodation costs for care leavers	Yes	No	No
4. Increase in the number of in-house foster carers and a reduction in use of independent foster carers	No	No	No
5. Reduction in SGO payments	No	No	No
6. VFM placements	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
A range of services and functions sitting within Children's Social Care and in particular the budget for providing placements for children and young people in care or who are care leavers. This budget is currently over-spending.
Cuts proposal*

3. Description of service area and proposal

It is firstly important to note that the budget for child placements is significantly overspending at present. All the savings listed below are in train already and are contributing to a reduction in the overspend in this financial year. The proposals will reduce the overspend, but given the scale of current spend here they are not anticipated to lead to additional cuts in the budget over the next 3 years. Managing the budget with little or no overspend however removes some future financial risks to the Council.

1. Partner contributions to children in care placements

It is estimated that this should generate a minimum of £1.2M savings over the next two years. Work is still underway to achieve this including an in-year reduction in expenditure and the level of savings may increase. Actions include ensuring that the education costs for care placements are fully attributed to the High Needs Block of the DSG. Ensuring that young people who are eligible for Housing benefit claim this and the cost of the accommodation is reduced in recognition of the contribution the benefit makes to this cost. Finally discussions are currently taking place with the CCG to develop a process for agreeing Health contributions to care placement costs where an element of the support provided is health care.

2. Staffing savings

As part of the CSC improvement programme a target of 90% permanent staffing has been set (20/21). In recent months there have been successful recruitment rounds and this target is felt to be achievable. An increase in permanent staff and therefore a reduction in agency social care staff is anticipated to lead to a saving of £430k.

3. Care leaver accommodation costs & UASC grants

A total saving of £300k for 2021/22 is anticipated based on ensuring that the UASC grant for care leaver costs is fully claimed for. In addition work has already started with Housing to develop accommodation pathways for both young people under the age of 18 who become homeless (Children's Services have a statutory requirement to accommodate young people in this situation) and also care leavers. It is difficult to quantify this saving at present but a figure assuming a 5% reduction in costs is currently assumed. Work is underway at present to develop improved housing pathways that should also be cheaper than the current arrangements. Once this work is completed the savings figure should increase, in particular for Year 2 after any investments in new accommodation and support have been made.

4. Increase in in-house foster care

The Council is dependent on a high number of foster carers who are employed by independent foster agencies. Such placements are significantly more expensive than in-house placements. There have been attempts previously to increase the number of in-house carers, but with equal numbers of foster carers being lost, we have not achieved a net gain. A more fundamental review of our current service offer will be taking place and work with our communications team, to upscale our advertising campaigns to recruit new carers is required. In year one this will require some investment that will off-set any savings achieved. An estimate of £250k savings in both Year 2 and Year 3 are currently assumed.

5. Reduction in SGO payments

Financial support for carers who look after a child through a Special Guardianship Order is currently being reviewed with an estimate of a saving of £60k.

3. Description of service area and proposal

6. Improvement in the value for money of commissioned placement costs

In the current financial year a range of actions are already under way to reduce the average unit cost for all children in care external placements (Independent Fostering and Residential placements). The placement service and processes are subject to a review, to create efficiencies. Over and above the reduction in costs this year a further reduction of £250k is assumed for next year. This figure should increase further once the full impact of current changes have been felt.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Actions currently underway have generated a significant reduction in expenditure. The actions listed above should continue with this direction of travel.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The actions listed above should not have a negative impact on the quality of care and in many cases should lead to an improvement in the service offer. These proposals do not involve denial or downgrading of services to protect children and young people: quite apart from the Council's strong commitment to the safety and wellbeing of our most vulnerable children, the services concerned are governed by strict statutory requirements.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

Some of the actions taken previously to manage demand, for example for high-cost placements, have not delivered the savings anticipated. The current proposals are being closely monitored by both the Executive Director for Children and Young People and the Executive Director for Finances and Resources, together with the two Cabinet Members. All of these savings have been achieved in other Local Authorities.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	56,103	-3,834	52,269	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Partner Contributions	600	600		1200
Staffing savings	215	215		430
Care leaver accommodation costs	200	100		300
Increase in in house foster carers		250	250	500
Special Guardianship	60			60
Value for money placements	250	250		500

5. Financial information				
Total	1325	1415	250	2990
% of Net Budget	2.9%	2.9%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	Yes	No	yes
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:		Re-alignment of some costs to the DSG HNB		Some recharge to the CCG for health related costs

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
1.	Corporate priorities 1. Open Lewisham 2. Tackling the Housing Crisis 3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life 4. Building an inclusive local economy 5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support 6. Making Lewisham greener 7. Building safer communities 8. Good governance and operational effectiveness
2.	
3. Giving Children and Young People the best start in life	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8. Good governance and operational effectiveness	

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

8. 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:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	low	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:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No
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					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

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
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
November to December 2020	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
November to December 2020	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where required) prepared
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget
March 2021	Cuts implemented

*If there are any 'invest to save' requirements for the proposal please describe them here and adjust the saving impact in the relevant year(s) to reflect this, please see section 5.2 of t

1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Stop Smoking Service medications
Reference:	B-04
Directorate:	Community Services
Director of Service:	Catherine Mbema
Service/Team area:	Public Health
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Chris Best
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
To stop recharging of Stop Smoking Medications delivered via primary care	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Lewisham's Stop Smoking Service is provided by Lewisham and Greenwich Trust (<https://www.lewishamandgreenwich.nhs.uk/>) and commissioned by Lewisham Public Health. It offers evidence based interventions: a combination of behavioural support and medication for up to 12 weeks, in line with NICE guidance, which states that all smokers who wish to stop smoking should be offered intensive support usually at an NHS Stop Smoking Service.

Cuts proposal*

The proposal is for South East London CCG (Lewisham Borough Based Board) to fund the stop smoking service medication costs associated with the service due to the system-wide benefits of smoking cessation.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Lewisham's Stop Smoking Service is provided by Lewisham and Greenwich Trust (<https://www.lewishamandgreenwich.nhs.uk/>) and commissioned by Lewisham Public Health. It offers evidence based interventions: a combination of behavioural support and medication for up to 12 weeks, in line with NICE guidance, which states that all smokers who wish to stop smoking should be offered intensive support usually at an NHS Stop Smoking Service.

3. Description of service area and proposal

The proposal is for South East London CCG (Lewisham Borough Based Board) to fund the stop smoking service medication costs associated with the service due to the system-wide benefits of smoking cessation.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Impact on service users would be neutral however this would produce a cost pressure for South East London (SEL) CCG, so will need approval from the SEL CCG Governing Body.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Stop Service Medication Costs	£221,494			
Total				
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact

	Corporate priorities
2.	1. Open Lewisham
3.	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
4.	3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life
5. Impact of SEL CCG (cost pressure)	4. Building an inclusive local economy
6.	5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
	7. Building safer communities

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact

7.	8. Good governance and operational effectiveness
8.	

7. Ward impact

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

8. 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

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No
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					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Approval required from SEL CCG Governing Body.

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
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
November to December 2020	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
November to December 2020	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where required) prepared
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget
March 2021	Cuts implemented

*If there are any 'invest to save' requirements for the proposal please describe them here and adjust the saving impact in the relevant year(s) to reflect this, please see section 5.2 of the guidance notes.

1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Housing – Capitalise project costs to the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG)
Reference:	B-05
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Fenella Beckman
Service/Team area:	Housing Improvements and Assistance Team
Cabinet portfolio:	Housing and Planning
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Housing Select Committee

2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
Capitalise DFG administration costs	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Housing Improvements and Assistance Team (Grants and Loans Team), assesses and provides grants and loans for home improvements. These include repairs for older and disabled people, moving costs, emergency home repairs and grants to bring empty properties into a rentable condition.

Cuts proposal*

Capitalise Programme costs

This proposal is to capitalise the cost of administering the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG). This proposal will need to be agreed by the Better Care Fund Board which is meeting at the end of November.

It is proposed that we allocate the cost of administering the DFG to a DFG / Better Care Fund capital programme budget from financial year 21/22. We propose to capitalise £425k which would cover all eligible costs such as the Co-ordinators, the Health and Housing Officer, Surveyors and Occupational Therapists.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

N/A – to customers as this relates to staffing salaries rather than service provision. The impact to other Council services is that the costs of staff from Adults Social Care (£250k) and Housing (£175k) involved in facilitating the allocation of DFG will be charged to the grant.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

N/A

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	33,422	28,777	4,645	
HRA	?	?		
DSG	NA	NA		
Health	NA	NA		
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Capitalising DFG administration costs	425			425
Total				
% of Net Budget	9.1%	%	%	9.1%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact

1. Good governance and operational effectiveness	Corporate priorities
2. Delivering and defending health, social care and support	1. Open Lewisham
3. Tackling the Housing Crisis	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
4.	3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life
5.	4. Building an inclusive local economy
6.	5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support
7.	6. Making Lewisham greener
8.	7. Building safer communities
	8. Good governance and operational effectiveness

7. 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?

8. Service equalities impact

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

Ethnicity:	NA	Pregnancy / Maternity:	NA
Gender:	NA	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	NA
Age:	NA	Sexual orientation:	NA
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	NA
Religion / Belief:	NA	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	Yes
---	-----

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

No

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					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

At this time, it is the source of the staff funding budget that is being proposed to be changed, not a change to any contractual terms nor is it being proposed to change any service provision. If this is approved this will be dealt with through financial accounting processes.

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
-------	----------

11. Summary timetable

September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
November to December 2020	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
November to December 2020	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where required) prepared
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget
March 2021	Cuts implemented

DRAFT

1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Main Grants Programme
Reference:	B-06
Directorate:	Communities, Partnerships and Leisure
Director of Service:	James Lee
Service/Team area:	Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Jonathan Slater
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer and Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
£800,000	Yes	Not statutory, but Consultation with Vol/Community Sector required under the terms of the Compact	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The main grants programme has a budget of £2,636,308 p.a. till March 2022, with additional funding from the Better Care Fund of £428,000 to fund social prescribing activity. The last grant programme began in August 2019 and is due to end in March 2022.

42 voluntary and community organisations are funded through the main grants programme under the following themes:

1. Strong and Cohesive Communities
2. Communities that Care
3. Access to Advice Services and
4. Widening Access to Arts and Sports

Funding ranges from grants of £1,000 to a large partnership grant of c£866,000 for advice services.

As a response to the pandemic, key grant funded voluntary sector partners were asked to develop a community response hub. The hub has successfully supported residents during the pandemic through a single point of contact, working in partnership and flexing services as needed as demand grew. As lockdown ended, the hub has transitioned to a new service model, learning from the good practice developed by the hub. Community Connections Lewisham now provides the single point of contact for residents to access a wide range of community and voluntary sector services, working in partnership with 25 organisations in the initial phase.

3. Description of service area and proposal

In line with these developments, we propose to review the main grants programme to respond to the needs of Lewisham residents, and develop a strategic voluntary sector offer that enables resource to follow demand.

The approach to arts and sports funding will be influenced by Lewisham's London Borough of Culture Programme for 2022 and the forthcoming Physical Activity Strategy respectively.

Cuts proposal*

The final structure of the main grants programme after the budget cut would be finalised following a public consultation, as committed to under the Compact.

However, it is anticipated that the priorities to be consulted on would include a single front door for residents, working with statutory services and building on the learning through COVID-19 and the success of the Community Response Hub.

This front door would work close with the social prescribing services delivered through primary care networks in order to reduce duplication/increase efficiencies in order to generate an element of the saving.

Further areas of direct delivery would be maintained as a grants with key areas of focus tied into the single front door. The key areas of focus will be identified through the demand mapping of the front door either via phone calls, web enquiries or direct service use. This is to ensure that all funding is targeted at areas of need rather than funding services due to historic patterns of provision e.g. an increase in digital support services is likely to be required in coming years.

It is proposed that work on equalities will continue and some resource is made available to match-fund a collaborative fundraising initiatives with voluntary sector partners. This will maximise capacity for leveraging funding in to the sector from external sources.

This proposal will result in a saving of £800,000 p.a. from April 2022.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Any reduction in funding to the voluntary sector represents a risk as, without effective mitigation, the level of service to vulnerable groups will be reduced. The service providers via the voluntary sector underpin a range of preventative activity and reduction in this service may increase demand on statutory services.

It is likely that the intended service model may mean that very localised and smaller organisations find it hard to bid for Lewisham Council grants, unless they are able to respond to the specific service areas outlined in the programme, i.e. the grants programme will be less general and more focused on identified need than the previous programme.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Proposals to develop a single, prevention-focused front door is being explored with ASC and health partners in the next three months. A sustainable service build on the experiences of the COVID Community Response Hub is being developed with voluntary sector partners working together, that can eventually align more closely with the proposed grants programme from 2022. It is intended that this coordinated effort can realise efficiencies that mitigate the impact of the cut.

A pilot for a collaborative funding model will also be trialled during the year to increase income into the sector from external sources. The collaborative fundraising pilot will trial identifying sectors with less capacity and support them to draw in funding from other sources

Additionally, we plan to bring funders together in a London Funders-type model for Lewisham, to explore the opportunity of pooling resources with other funders to increase the funding available to our voluntary and community sector. Through this approach will work with other funders to both increase the funding pot for local organisations but also to ensure that our grants programmes complement each other and cover all parts of the sector

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	2,949		2,636	
HRA				
DSG				
Health		313 (BCF)		
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Main Grants Programme	0	800		800
Total	0	800		800
% of Net Budget	%	30%	%	30%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact

1. Delivering and defending: health, social care and support	Corporate priorities 1. Open Lewisham 2. Tackling the Housing Crisis 3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life 4. Building an inclusive local economy
2. Giving Children and young people the best start in life	
3. Building Safer Communities	
4. Open Lewisham	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
5. Building an inclusive local economy	5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support
6.	6. Making Lewisham greener
7.	7. Building safer communities
8.	8. Good governance and operational effectiveness

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which? Specific impact in some wards where local activity is currently funded, particularly wards with higher levels of deprivation.

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	L	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	L	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	L
Age:	L	Sexual orientation:	L
Disability:	L	Gender reassignment:	L
Religion / Belief:	L	Overall:	L
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
It is difficult to fully assess the impact of the cut on particular groups ahead of the consultation and design of the programme, and ultimately the grants application round, but it is anticipated that due to the mitigation set out above the overall, and specific, impact will be kept low.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes – the letting of the main grants programme includes a full EIA

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

9. Human Resources impact

SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

--

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
October 2020	Proposals prepared
October – November 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
Jan - March 2021	Consultation undertaken with voluntary and statutory sector partners and grant funded organisations
May 2021	Proposals to M&C, including budget and initial EIA
June - Aug 2021	Launch of new grants programme and application round
September - October 2021	Grant applications assessed
December 2021	M&C approval of recommended bids and final EIA. Three months' notice to currently funded groups.
1 April 2022	New grants start/Cuts implemented

1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Council Events
Reference:	B-07
Directorate:	Community Services
Director of Service:	Liz Dart, Director of Culture, Libraries and Learning
Service/Team area:	Culture Team
Cabinet portfolio:	Deputy Mayor, Cllr Chris Best
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger

2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
Cease Blackheath Fireworks	No	No	No
Efficiencies in civic events programme	No	No	No
Review events delivery after Borough of Culture	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The council currently delivers the annual Blackheath Fireworks display, the Biennial Lewisham Peoples Day and a programme of smaller Civic Events.

Cuts proposal*

- 1) Cease the annual Blackheath Fireworks display with an annual saving of £35k
- 2) Seek efficiencies in the delivery of the Civic Events programme through working in partnership with other organisations and using the council budget as match funding for external funding applications – annual saving of £35k
- 3) In 2023, following Borough of Culture, review the delivery of remaining events programme and seek further efficiencies – annual saving of £30k from 2023/24

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Annual Blackheath Fireworks display that attracts 60-100,000 people will cease. This is one of London's last free annual displays providing a safe way for families to mark Guy Fawkes night. There would be no council supported alternative to this event. The council would still retain Lewisham People's Day in some form and a mixed civic events programme.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

4. Impact and risks of proposal

The scale of the remaining events programme would be dependent on achieving income targets.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	339	143	196	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Blackheath Fireworks	35			35
Civic Events	35			35
Review Events post BoC			30	30
Total	70		30	100
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	51%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact

1. Building Safer Communities	Corporate priorities
2. Giving Children and young people the best start in life	1. Open Lewisham
3. Open Lewisham	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
4. Good governance and operational effectiveness	3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life
5.	4. Building an inclusive local economy
6.	5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support
7.	6. Making Lewisham greener
8.	7. Building safer communities
	8. Good governance and operational effectiveness

7. Ward impact

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

8. Service equalities impact

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

Ethnicity:	low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:	low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
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

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

No

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					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

None

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
-------	----------

11. Summary timetable

September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
November to December 2020	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
November to December 2020	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where required) prepared
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget
March 2021	Cuts implemented

DRAFT

1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	No longer offer money management services for ASC clients lacking mental capacity to do so themselves
Reference:	B-08
Directorate:	Corporate Resources
Director of Service:	Ralph Wilkinson
Service/Team area:	Public Services / Revenues and Benefits
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr De Ryk
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	TBC by Governance Services

2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
Automation £0.16m	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Revenues Service administers and collects Council Tax, Business Rates, Housing Benefits overpayments, sundry debt and processes all financial transactions. The Benefits Service administers Housing Benefit, Council Tax Reduction, adult social care financial assessments and concessionary awards.

Cuts proposal*

The Benefits Service currently offers financial support and management to around 380 adult social-care clients who either lack mental capacity or are unable to manage their own financial affairs. Currently, we are only able to charge those clients that we have power of attorney for. If we were to stop providing this service, external providers would be able to offer this service for clients at a cost.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Although the Council currently offer these services, they are doing so at their own cost. Some clients – around 100 that we manage under power of attorney arrangements – are done so at a cost based on the value of assets/funding the client holds, but this amount does not cover the services offered. For those managed under appointeeship – around 280 - there is no funding available to the Council and the clients are not charged for our managing their finances.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

There are risks associated with this. Requiring vulnerable clients to pay for external providers to provide this service may pose a risk of financial abuse. In the past, efforts have been made by external providers to maintain standards and maximise growth for clients but these may not always be successful. For those clients we currently have power of attorney for, they will be required to pay significantly more for financial support compared to what we currently charge. For those clients where we are appointees, the clients will be expected to pay for the first time and from very limited amounts of income (i.e. welfare benefits). The service will look at measures over the coming months to mitigate these risks.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	7,634	(6,198)	1,436	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	Total £'000
Cease money management activity for ASC clients		160	0	160
Total		160	0	100
% of Net Budget		26%		26%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	Y	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Open Lewisham 2. Tackling the Housing Crisis 3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life 4. Building an inclusive local economy 5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support 6. Making Lewisham greener 7. Building safer communities 8. Good governance and operational effectiveness
8		
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	
High		

7. 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?

8. 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

8. Service equalities impact

For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:

Note: This option will impact on around 380 of Lewisham's most vulnerable residents. To try and minimise the impact, a number of alternative options need to be considered that will maintain effective management of individual finances – some of which are significant – without the costs continuing to fall to the Council although it would be expected that the Council would have some responsibility in working with any providers to ensure the appropriate levels of assurance and probity apply.

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No

No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

Workforce profile:

Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5	1				
Sc 6 – SO2	4				
PO1 – PO5	0.20				
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
	4.2	1			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	3	2.2			
Disability	Yes	No			
	0	0			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
				5.2	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

None

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
October 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)
November 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
December 2020	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing

11. Summary timetable

January 2021	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest
March 2021	Cuts implemented

DRAFT

1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Ending free travel provision through the discretionary freedom pass scheme
Reference:	B-09
Directorate:	Corporate Resources
Director of Service:	Ralph Wilkinson
Service/Team area:	Public Services / Revenues and Benefits
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr De Ryk
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	TBC by Governance Services

2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
Automation £0.3m	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Revenues Service administers and collects Council Tax, Business Rates, HB overpayments, sundry debt and processes all financial transactions. The Benefits Service administers Housing Benefit, Council Tax Reduction, adult social care financial assessments and concessionary travel awards including freedom passes, blue badges and taxi-cards.

Cuts proposal*

Freedom passes are concessions providing free travel in England for disabled residents. There is a mandatory scheme whereby residents only receive the concession if they meet the required criteria but Lewisham offers a similar concession for those individuals with medical conditions but where those conditions are not sufficiently severe to meet the criteria to qualify for a mandatory award. This discretionary scheme allows them to travel within London.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Currently, it is projected that 500 vulnerable residents will no longer be able to take advantage of free travel in London. However, other concessions are available for some of those clients who may lose out and which are not funded by Lewisham including the "60+ concession" for residents over the age of 60 and the elderly freedom pass (> 66 years of age). This change could be implemented in a few different ways to soften the impact including phasing the change in is no longer accepting new applications or not extending the concessions to clients on renewal (every 5 years); Stopping the concession from a fixed point in future is 1 April 2021 or phasing so that – for example – every client retains the concession for a further period of time.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

The pass holders are vulnerable and benefit from free travel concessions by being able to travel freely using their concession. Withdrawing these would be seen as a negative given their vulnerability and there is only very limited scope to mitigate against this.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	7,634	(6,198)	1,436	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	Total £'000
Cease the provision of free travel through discretionary freedom pass arrangements		300	0	300
Total		300	0	300
% of Net Budget		%	0	%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	Y	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Open Lewisham 2. Tackling the Housing Crisis 3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life 4. Building an inclusive local economy 5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support 6. Making Lewisham greener 7. Building safer communities 8. Good governance and operational effectiveness
8		
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	
High		

7. 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?

8. 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

8. Service equalities impact

Religion / Belief:	n/a	Overall:	n/a
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>Note: This proposal has a negative impact on equalities for residents. Withdrawal of the free travel concession will make it harder for vulnerable clients to travel – socially or otherwise – potentially creating more isolation of vulnerable residents. For some there are other concessions available that may reduce the numbers losing a travel concession. It is difficult to mitigate against any impact arising from residents losing the concession if the scheme is stopped but some of the potential actions would be to try and maximise benefit take-up so that the clients may be better able to afford to pay for their travel.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: No					
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					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
	19			57	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

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

11. Summary timetable

October 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)
November 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
December 2020	Final details from pilot presented and final stop / go decision submitted
January 2021	
February 2021	
March 2021	Cuts implemented

DRAFT

1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Assemblies
Reference:	B-10
Directorate:	Communities, Partnerships and Leisure
Director of Service:	James Lee
Service/Team area:	Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Jonathan Slater
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
2x posts for Assembly management, coordination and support (1xPO6 and 1x PO3) £118,574	Yes	Yes	Yes
Assembly meetings £59,700	Yes	Yes	No
Councillors Discretionary Funds £45,700	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Assemblies are part of Lewisham's Council's constitution and are currently the agreed key mechanism for consultation and engagement with communities. 4x meetings per ward are held every year and residents and community organisations are invited to attend. The meetings are coordinated and supported by the Community Development Team. A coordinating group is convened for each ward made up of the three ward councillors and representatives from the community. A ward newsletter (delivered to each resident) publicises the Assemblies.

The Councillor's discretionary fund is approximately £2,500 per ward.

Cuts proposal*

The Assembly programme is currently being reviewed in light of The Democracy Review, and the Seldom Heard Voices report, with a view to exploring different approaches to engaging with communities, consulting with them and ensuring better representation.

It is anticipated that as a result of this review, engagement and consultation with communities at ward level can be undertaken in a more efficient and innovative way

3. Description of service area and proposal

by officers directly working with communities, engaging Councillors and community organisations as needed.

This work will become a core part of the Community Development Team's work. Therefore it is proposed that the management, coordination and support of assembly meetings will no longer be needed. However, moving forward the alternative and innovative ways recommended by the review of consulting with, engaging and co-producing with communities will need to be resourced.

It is difficult to give an accurate picture of the overall budget available for Assemblies based on the fact that the service is integrated into a wider grants and community development service – the overall salary budget of the team is £554,000. NB This budget is currently supplemented by £110,000 per annum of NCIL administration funds.

The proposal to deliver consultation and community engagement differently will enable a saving of 1xFTE salary at ward officer level and 1xFTE manager, equating to £118,574. The remaining staff resource will be deployed to work on a new model of engagement with communities as identified by the review.

Additional savings will include the fund for assembly meetings (venue, publicity, etc.) of £59,700. It is proposed that the Councillor's Discretionary Fund of £45,000 is also put forward as a saving.

It is proposed that the Councillor's Discretionary Fund is ended from April 2021 but the existing staffing structure would be required for a further year to complete the allocation process for the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL).

The review of assemblies is currently being undertaken by Officers and will involve developing up to date ward profiles, looking at representation at the Assemblies, and feedback received from consultations in the last two years. As Assemblies are part of The Council's constitution, a proposal setting out a number of options on the future of Assemblies will be taken to Mayor and Cabinet in January 2021. Following a decision by Mayor and Cabinet, a process of consultation will begin with Councillors, ward coordinating groups and residents on the way forward and will be undertaken over a period of 9 months to ensure all stakeholders are aware of the change and can participate in how the Assembly function is delivered going forward.

If the option to cease Assemblies as they are currently delivered is agreed, this will be in place by April 2022.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The Assembly meetings will not take place in the way that they have traditionally been held, and regular meetings of this kind at ward level may not continue.

Councillors will not have a discretionary fund over which they have direct control to support activities at ward level.

One F/T manager and 1 FTE officer post will be made redundant

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

The Assemblies, while recognised as sometimes unrepresentative of the demographics of the ward, offer a structured process for consultation at ward level. The lack of such a structured process may create a gap in terms of agreeing needs and use of funds at ward level between the Council and residents. Councillors play a significant role in the coordination and running of Assemblies, enabling a clear mechanism for engagement with communities.

The lack of this larger-scale mechanism for engagement may mean that Councillors are not able to have engagement with their residents at such large or ward-level scale, i.e. they may need to have duplicate discussions with a range of communities/residents

A regular assembly/meetings function ensures continuation of discussion with residents and allows for progression of a range of issues that may be difficult to resolve in one-off meetings or events

Mitigation

The review of assemblies recognises the benefit that Assemblies bring and is looking to develop a model that retains the benefits of the assemblies function while improving the areas that need strengthening. This includes:

- More robust and ongoing online engagement
- the use of social media and WhatsApp groups to engage with people
- Engagement with community leaders who play a large part in their communities but are not affiliated to a formal group
- More innovative ways of gathering data, intelligence and feedback directly from a range of communities who would not otherwise engage with Assemblies

Additionally, we will be undertaking consultation with Councillors, community groups and residents as part of this process.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	659	0	659	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
NB – it is difficult to give an accurate picture of the overall budget available for Assemblies based on the fact that the service is integrated into a wider grants and community development service – the above is the total staffing budget for the entire service plus the Assembly coordination fund and the Cllrs discretionary fund.				
Salaries	0	119		119
Assembly meetings	0	59		59

5. Financial information				
Councillors Discretionary Funds	45	0		45
Total	45	178		223
% of Net Budget	7%	27%	%	34%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
1. Open Lewisham	Corporate priorities 1. Open Lewisham 2. Tackling the Housing Crisis 3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life 4. Building an inclusive local economy 5. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support 6. Making Lewisham greener 7. Building safer communities 8. Good governance and operational effectiveness
2. Building Safer Communities	
3. Delivering and defending: health, social care and support	
4. Good governance and operational effectiveness	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	

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

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	L	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	L	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	L
Age:	L	Sexual orientation:	L
Disability:	L	Gender reassignment:	L
Religion / Belief:	L	Overall:	L
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>Reviewing Assemblies and identifying a different mechanism for engagement with communities is likely to have a positive impact on equalities as under-representation of some groups is a key aspect driving the review. However, ensuring an improved mechanism for engagement is critical to mitigating an impact on equalities.</p>			

8. Service equalities impact

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	Yes
---	-----

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					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5		1	1		
PO6 – PO8		1	1		
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total		2	2		
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The Assembly Programme is part of the Council's Constitution so this proposal, if accepted, would require that document to be amended.

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
December 2020	Review of Assemblies completed
January 2021	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
March 2021	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments. Cllr Discretionary fund cut taken.
April – September 2021	Process of consultation with Councillors and residents to re-design Assembly function
Sept-Nov 2021	Paper prepared with consultation findings for M&C
March 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget
March 2022	Cuts implemented

11. Summary timetable

April 2022

New Process in place for consultation with residents and communities

*If there are any 'invest to save' requirements for the proposal please describe them here and adjust the saving impact in the relevant year(s) to reflect this, please see section 5.2 of the guidance notes.

DRAFT