

## APPENDIX 7

### Theme F: Better demand management - Cuts Proformas

DRAFT

### 1. Cuts proposal

<b>Proposal title:</b>	Improved management of demand and productivity, Promoting and sustaining independence and making sure longer term support reflects a strength based approach to meeting assessed needs.
<b>Reference:</b>	F-01
<b>Directorate:</b>	Communities
<b>Director of Service:</b>	Tom Brown
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Adult Social Care/ Joint Commissioning
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Deputy Mayor Cllr Chris Best
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	HCSC/PAC

### 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation No and Statutory vs informal
	<p>No</p> <p>See para 16.2 of the Constitution</p> <p><a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a></p>		

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The introduction of the Care Act 2014 represented a fundamental shift towards maximising independence and set a duty for local authorities to promote wellbeing and focus on early intervention and prevention.

Further to this, The following initiatives identified from benchmarking performance and financial data have been introduced and have gone some way towards the achievement of savings for 20/21 :

- Managing demand of the enquiries through the front door of the Council by developing a whole system approach to prevention with partners by connecting people with solutions from within the community where possible
- Managing demand from the acute hospitals by making sure people are on the right care pathway at the point of discharge from the six weeks of care that is now funded by health and applying the national eligibility for fully funded continuing health care and Jointly funded care where appropriate.
- Providing effective short term intervention such as Enablement and improved use of technology to support independence and reduce reliance on long term care.
- Providing effective long term support that sustains wellbeing and independence by further development of the neighbourhood networks.
- Developing the workforce to increase productivity and manage demand, making the assessment processes leaner.

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

- Predicated on integrated working with LGT community services to deliver better

#### Cuts proposal\*

There is a further amount of **2.032m** for 20/21 that has been delayed due to COVID and is yet to be achieved from implementing the above mentioned initiatives. A further **2m** is being proposed as a further cut associated with these initiatives in 21/22 and another **1m** in 22/23 from the ASC budget.

#### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The delivery of this proposal must comply with legislative requirements for ASC. The impact of these initiatives will reduce the number of people in receipt of long term care and potentially the levels of care provided.

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

Decisions are made on an individual basis taking account of the presenting concerns, assessed needs and how these can be met and by taking into account any risks that are identified to service users and carers or any safeguarding concerns.

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	121.5m	55.4m	66.1m	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
<b>2.032 unachieved 20/21</b>	3m			5.032m
<b>Total</b>				
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	%	%	%	%
<b>Does proposal impact on:</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>DSG</b>	<b>HRA</b>	<b>Health</b>
<b>Yes / No</b>				
<b>If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:</b>				

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

1.5 Corporate priorities

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
2.1	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
3.2	
4.3	
5.4	
6.8	
7.7	
8.6	

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

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	x	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	x	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
People who contact ASC for support will have a disability or be an older resident or carer.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes			

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					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					

### 9. Human Resources impact

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:

ASC is a statutory service, all decisions made regarding how an enquiry is dealt with or the levels of care provided must comply with the care Act requirements and the national framework for Continuing health care.

### 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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:	Changes to Children's Social Care services
Reference:	F-11 and F-02
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 <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
1. Expansion of MASH to become a wider front door for families (including Early Help referrals)	No	No	Yes
2. Reduce numbers of children in care	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
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.
<b>Cuts proposal*</b>
<p>1. <u>Expansion of MASH</u> In 2021 work with the developing Early Help service and adults services and some partner agencies e.g. CAHMS will begin to explore practice and financial benefits of developing a common front door arrangement for vulnerable groups, expanding the current MASH. This is likely to be a complex piece of work and will require some project management support. The savings are assumed to be 5% of the current MASH budget arising from overall efficiencies.</p> <p>2. <u>DEMAND MANAGEMENT: Reduction of children in care (CLA)</u> Historically the rate of Children looked after in Lewisham has been high compared to other London Borough's (2018/19 Lewisham r = 72, 2019/20 r = 69. London r = 64). Through 2019, various steps were taken to prevent the overall number of CLA increasing, by reducing the number of new entries to care. This work continues and is being further strengthened by developing stronger Edge of Care Family Support</p>

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

services to support children to stay safely within their families. Through 2020 additional steps are being taken to move existing CLA into other permanent care arrangements e.g. Special Guardianship Care. There will be a period of approximately 5 – 7 years where the current high numbers of CLA have to work through the care system to adulthood and beyond Care Leaver status. Impact of this action is estimated to save up to £1m per year, initially £0.5m in the first two years.

#### 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 action taken previously to manage demand for high-cost placements has 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
Expansion of MASH with Adults Services	50			50
Reduction of children in care	500	500	1,000	2,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>2,050</b>
% of Net Budget	2.9%	2.9%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	No	No	No	No

<b>5. Financial information</b>				
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

<b>6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact</b>	
1.	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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	

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

<b>8. Service equalities impact</b>			
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

<b>9. Human Resources impact</b>					
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					



9. Human Resources impact					
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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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:	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 <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
3. Improve partner contributions to the placement costs for children in care	No	No	No
4. Increase in permanent staffing leading to a reduction in agency staffing costs	No	No	No
5. Claiming of increased UASC grant + reduction in accommodation costs for care leavers	Yes	No	No
6. Increase in the number of in-house foster carers and a reduction in use of independent foster carers	No	No	No
7. Reduction in SGO payments	No	No	No
8. VFM placements	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
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.

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

#### Cuts 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.

#### 3. 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.

#### 4. 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.

#### 5. 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.

#### 6. 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.

#### 7. Reduction in SGO payments

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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.

#### 8. 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

5. Financial information				
Special Guardianship	60			60
Value for money placements	250	250		500
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.	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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:			

### 8. Service equalities impact

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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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

### 1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Reducing costs of care for Adults with a Learning disability and Young people transitioning to adulthood
Reference:	F-06
Directorate:	Communities
Director of Service:	Tom Brown
Service/Team area:	Adult social care/ joint commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Deputy Mayor Cllr Chris best
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	HCSC/PAC

### 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>		
	No	No	No

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

**Adults with a Learning disability.** From a benchmarking analysis using performance and financial data undertaken in 2018/19 we have identified that we have low take up of meeting the Continuing healthcare eligibility and very few cases that are jointly funded with health despite the needs being complex, particularly in relation to managing challenging behavioural needs.

**Transitions** As part of the development of a preparing for adulthood strategy and plans to establish closer working arrangements across adult social care service and children with disabilities and special educational needs. We are profiling all of our contracts to develop more cost effective options to meet needs agreed within EHCP's. There is an increased cost pressure every year of c£1m as young people with complex needs transition. We have around 30-35 young people coming into adulthood each year and the average cost is £1500 per week – but many are more than £3000 per week. The plans are aimed at reducing costs with local provision, ensuring that Continuing Health Care appropriately funds care and that ongoing education costs that should be within the Higher Needs block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

#### Cuts proposal\*

There are 800K of unachieved savings for 20/21. We are proposing to achieve 760k savings for 21/22 and to further manage cost pressures anticipated at 1m

#### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

This is a scheme to improve the experience of Transitions and the outcomes that they can achieve in their lives. Reducing institutional provision and supporting independence.

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Although assessed needs will be met in accordance with legislation. This may not meet the expectations regarding parental and carer choice.

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

The savings proposal will require a programme of whole system engagement across children's and adults joint commissioning in order to develop in borough opportunities for care and support for AWLD and for young people transitioning to adulthood. This is also reliant on other parts of the council including housing, education and also external colleges and providers.

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	121.5m	55.4m	66.1m	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
<b>AWLD placements</b>	760			760
<b>Total</b>	760			760
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	%	%	%	%
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. 5	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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	
3. 2	
4. 4	
5. 1	
6. 7	
7. 6	
8. 8	



### 7. Ward impact

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

### 8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	Yes	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	Yes	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			Yes

### 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						
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:
These proposals will take account and meet requirements of the following legislation:

## 10. Legal implications

The care Act 2014, National framework for NHS CHC, Children's and Young people's Act 1989 and 2008, Children's act 1989,2004, 2010, and The breaks for carers of Disabled children regulation 2011.

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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:	Reducing ASC costs associated with care and support - Enablement
Reference:	F-07
Directorate:	Communities
Director of Service:	Tom Brown
Service/Team area:	Adult social care/ Joint commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Deputy Mayor Cllr Chris Best
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	M&C, HCSC, PAC

### 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation Yes and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes and Statutory vs informal
	Yes See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>		
	YES	YES	YES

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

**The Enablement service**, provides short term intervention up to 6 weeks to support people to get back to an optimum level of independence following a hospital stay or to prevent the need for a hospital admission. The service aims to reduce or delay the need for longer term care.

This proposal seeks approval to explore the potential of commissioning the service from external providers to reduce ASC expenditure and contribute towards savings.

#### Cuts proposal\*

**This proposal seeks approval to provide the above mentioned service in a more cost effective way.**

The costs of the In-house **Enablement service** amounts to 1.9m funded from the BCF and charges to service users. This can be provided by an external provider for a saving of at least 10% (i.e.c200k)

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The impact of these proposals will be a combination of redundancies and TUPE arrangements for the staff currently employed by the Council within the in-house service area, namely the Enablement service.

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

We will hold existing vacancies, which can be filled by interim staff over the winter period, to ensure we minimise the number of people made compulsory redundant.

Market intelligence suggests that the availability and quality of external Enablement Services may take a time to develop to deliver the outcomes required in reducing the use of long term care and supporting people to maintain independence.

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

These savings would not be delivered in 21/22 but could potentially achieve cost efficiencies from 22/23 onwards subject to approval and availability in the care market place.

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	121.5m	55.4m	66.1m	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Enablement – c. 10% gross budget		200k		
<b>Total</b>		200k		
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

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

	Corporate priorities
1.5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Open Lewisham</li> <li>2. Tackling the Housing Crisis</li> <li>3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life</li> <li>4. Building an inclusive local economy</li> <li>5. Delivering and defending: health, social care &amp; support</li> <li>6. Making Lewisham greener</li> <li>7. Building safer communities</li> </ol>
2.1	
3.4	
4.7	
5.8	
6.6	
7.3	

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

8.2

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?

All wards

**8. Service equalities impact**

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

Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	H

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

This would impact on lower paid workforce that as higher numbers of women and members of staff from BAME communities.

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: Enablement

Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	1	0.71			
Scale 3 – 5	70	61.6		2	
Sc 6 – SO2	11	10		3	
PO1 – PO5	5	4		3	
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3	1	1			
JNC					
Total	86	77.3			
Gender	Female	Male			
	64	22			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	53	32		3	
Disability	Yes	No	PNTS	Not known	
	4	34	22	29	
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	PNTS
	51	2		2	31

## 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Care Act 2014  
TUPE regulations

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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:	Reducing ASC costs associated with care and support – Telecare/Linkline
Reference:	F-08
Directorate:	Communities
Director of Service:	Tom Brown
Service/Team area:	Adult social care/ Joint commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Deputy Mayor Cllr Chris Best
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	M&C, HCSC, PAC

### 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation Yes and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes and Statutory vs informal
	Yes See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>		
	YES	YES	YES

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

**The Linkline service**, a telecare/Linkline service provided by a team within the ASC directorate. This is a call response and visiting service to vulnerable residents who make contact via the Linkline installation if they need help and assistance or are in crisis, for example, they may have fallen. The service has over 4,000 users.

The Telecare/Linklineservice offers a visiting service and prevents the need to call the emergency services where appropriate.

This proposal seeks approval to explore the potential of commissioning the services from external providers to reduce ASC expenditure and contribute towards savings.

#### Cuts proposal\*

**This proposal seeks approval to provide the above mentioned services in a more cost effective way.**

The costs of the in house **Telecare / Linkline service** amounts to 1.1m. This includes the cost for staffing equipment and licensing charges to Tunstall, the provider of equipment. There has been additional expenditure caused by the delay to upgrade the equipment by the provider. The impact of this delay has resulted in the loss of our existing partner organisation who provided disaster recovery assistance as their system is digital and ours remains analogue. There are additional costs of 35k associated with employing additional night staff to provide support and conform with lone working and Health and Safety requirements. It is estimated that the service can be provided by an external provider for a saving of at least 10% (i.e. 100k)

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The impact of these proposals will be a combination of redundancies and TUPE arrangements for the staff currently employed by the Council within the in-house service areas namely the Telecare/Linkline,

It is possible that there will be some compulsory redundancies, whilst this risk cannot be completely mitigated, we will work with external agencies to ensure staff TUPED should we commission a similar service.

Initial market testing indicates that providers are unlikely to be willing to provide a like for like service, this could lead to increased pressures on the London Ambulance Service and A&E as the current service provides a home response which results in hospital avoidance whenever possible, it may also lead to a more negative experience for service users.

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

These savings would not be delivered in 21/22 but could potentially achieve cost efficiencies from 22/23 onwards subject to approval and availability in the market place.

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	121.5m	55.4m	66.1m	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Linkline – c. 10% gross budget		100k		
<b>Total</b>		100k		
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	%	%	%	%
<b>Does proposal impact on:</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>DSG</b>	<b>HRA</b>	<b>Health</b>
Yes / No				
<b>If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:</b>				

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

1.5

Corporate priorities

2.1

1. Open Lewisham
2. Tackling the Housing Crisis



6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
3.4	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
4.7	
5.8	
6.6	
7.3	
8.2	

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

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
This would impact on lower paid workforce that as higher numbers of women and members of staff from BAME communities.			
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: Linkline					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5	2	2		1	
Sc 6 – SO2	11	11		4	
PO1 – PO5	1	1			
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total	14	14		5	
Gender	Female	Male			

9. Human Resources impact					
	7	7			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	PNTS	Not known
	4	13			1
Disability	Yes	No	PNTS	Not known	
	1	7	6		
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	PNTS
	5	1			8

10. Legal implications	
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
Care Act 2014 TUPE regulations	

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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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:	Reducing ASC costs associated with care and support – Passenger Transport
Reference:	F-09

1. Cuts proposal	
Directorate:	Communities
Director of Service:	Tom Brown
Service/Team area:	Adult social care/ Joint commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Deputy Mayor Cllr Chris Best
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	M&C, HCSC, PAC

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>	Yes and Statutory vs informal	Yes and Statutory vs informal
	YES	YES	YES

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p><b>Transport services</b>, are available to service users who have eligible social care needs and who attend day opportunities as part of their care and support plan.</p> <p>The service is provided by Lewisham Passenger transport services. This proposal seeks approval to explore the potential of commissioning the service from external providers to reduce ASC expenditure and contribute towards savings.</p>
<b>Cuts proposal*</b>
<p><b>This proposal seeks approval to provide the above mentioned service in a more cost effective way.</b></p> <p>ASC contributes 1.7-2m towards the costs of the Council run <b>Passenger transport service</b>. The service provides transport to service users who attend building based day opportunities. A review of transport requirements for this cohort of service users was undertaken using activity levels from 19/20. <b>This suggested that a savings of 600k could be achieved by using alternative transport provision as well as improving the quality and personalised provision.</b> This savings could potentially be further increased as a consequence of the impact of the COVID pandemic and social distancing guidelines as the need for building based day care has been further reduced.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
The impact of these proposals will be a combination of redundancies and TUPE arrangements for the staff currently employed by the Council within the in-house service area, namely passenger transport services.

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

It is possible that there will be some compulsory redundancies, whilst this risk cannot be completely mitigated, we will work with external agencies to ensure staff TUPED should we commission a similar service.

The impact of this for services users would be more personalised service that considers their ability to travel independently if possible,

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

These savings would not be delivered in 21/22 but could potentially achieve cost efficiencies from 22/23 onwards subject to approval and availability in the care market place.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	121.5m	55.4m	66.1m	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Passenger Services	600k			
<b>Total</b>	600k			
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
<b>If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:</b>				

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

1.5	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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
2.1	
3.4	
4.7	
5.8	
6.6	
7.3	
8.2	

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

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
This would impact on lower paid workforce that as higher numbers of women and members of staff from BAME communities. Reducing the ASC contribution to LPS could make the service unviable in current delivery form and would impact on transporting children to and from school.			
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: Passenger and Fleet Services					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5	68	51.94		5	
Sc 6 – SO2	43	40.6		4	
PO1 – PO5	7	7			
PO6 – PO8	3	3			
SMG 1 – 3	1	0.6			
JNC					
Total	122	103.14		9	
Gender	Female	Male			
	61	61			
Ethnicity	BAME	White	Other	PNTS	Not known
	62	48			12
Disability	Yes	No	PNTS	Not known	
	3	77	5	37	
Sexual orientation	Hetersexual	Gay/Lesbian	PNTS	Not known	
	75	1	42	4	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Care Act 2014 TUPE regulations

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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

## 1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Early Help (Children & Family Centres)
Reference:	F-10
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Pinaki Ghoshal (Vacancy for current Director)

### 1. Cuts proposal

Service/Team area:	Joint Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Chris Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Luke Sorba

### 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>		
Reduction in contract value of the contract for Children & Family Centres	Yes	No statutory consultation required	No as this is a commissioned service

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

A reduction in the value of the contract for the externally provided Children & Family Centres

#### Cuts proposal\*

This proposal is part of a much wider change programme to develop a comprehensive early help and prevention system that provides earlier support for families in need and avoids then requiring a later statutory intervention. As well as improving the service offer to families in need, it will reduce the number of families requiring more expensive interventions later on and will contribute in the future to savings in Children's Social Care (staffing costs and placement costs).

As part of this proposal there will be the development of an in-house Family Support team who are likely to operate out of 3 geographically placed 'Family Hubs.' Funding for this new service comes from changes to a number of contracts including the Children's Centre contracts, Youth Services and the Family Support team currently sitting with an external contractor, Polaris (previously Core Assets). This will involve the transfer of some staff from external organisations into the Council to form the new Family Support Teams. A continuation of at least 60% of the current Troubled Families grant is also assumed (early indications suggest that this grant will continue).

Children & Family Centres provide a mix of universal and targeted services primarily focussed on families with younger children. The wider redesign of the Early Help & Prevention offer will involve the development of Family Hubs which will offer a wider range of services to families, including those with older children. The detail of these changes are still in development and it is proposed that a report come to Mayor & Cabinet in December 2020 seeking a decision to make these changes. Some universal activity may need to involve charging.

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

In addition to this service reconfiguration, a cut to the value of the contract for Children's Centres is proposed of £200k. Targeted services will be protected, but there will be a reduction in their universal free offer to families. Alongside the £200k saving, other budgets will be used to redesign the current services in order to ensure there is a more joined up preventative and early help service in Lewisham so that there is a clearer focus on supporting our most vulnerable families. This is a key recommendation of the Ofsted report for Lewisham published in 2019.

#### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

The redesign of a wider Early Help service will reduce current duplication across different teams and ensure that a more comprehensive offer is in place for families.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

There will be a reduction in some of the universal services currently provided to families with younger children

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

The change outlined in this proposal is part of a much wider re-design of Early Help services. Engagement with front line staff and service users will take place during October and November 2020

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	2,500			
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Reduction in contract value	200			200
<b>Total</b>	200			200
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	%	%	%	%
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. Giving Children and young people the best start in life

2. Delivering and defending: health, social care & support

Corporate priorities

1. Open Lewisham
2. Tackling the Housing Crisis



6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
3.	3. Giving Children and young people the best start in life
4.	4. Building an inclusive local economy
5.	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
	Borough wide changes are proposed
	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:	Medium	Pregnancy / Maternity:	High
Gender:	High	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Medium
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>Children's centres users are primarily women and mothers. As a key service in the delivery of our 0-5 pathway, any changes to the service are likely to have a greater impact on women, and on women who are pregnant or in their maternity particularly. Maternity and birth outcomes are poorer for BAME women.</p> <p>Proposed changes to our 0-5 offer will include a full EAA to identify actions to mitigate this potential impact on women, women who identify as BAME and those who are pregnant especially.</p> <p>Lewisham's Maternity Voices Partnership has been consulting with members to improve services and outcomes for woman who are BAME, and this will be fed into any proposed changes.</p> <p>In the development of proposals, we will be reviewing access to support both digitally and physically, and looking to provide a more flexible access to support available.</p> <p>Our Health visiting service continues its high performance, and we seek to strengthen further our existing integration of services for families with young children to streamline our support and improve experiences for new parents.</p> <p>We will also seek to strengthen our partnership delivery with voluntary and community groups, which provides an opportunity to both create more resilient, trained and confident communities and a source of universal activities for the under 5s.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			

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

## 9. Human Resources impact

### 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:

Current contract may need to be extended with a variation.

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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

## 1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title: Housing – Optimise distribution of NRPF budget

Reference: F-12

## 1. Cuts proposal

Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Fenella Beckman
Service/Team area:	Housing
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 <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
Optimise distribution of NRPF budget	No	No	No

## 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The service supports families with children who have no recourse to public funds.

### Cuts proposal\*

Build on emerging best practice and experience to ensure clients with no recourse to public funds achieve regularised status and therefore are enabled to access the appropriate financial support available through various national benefit schemes.

As a result of applying the best practice, the number of cases (no. of families) that needed our support has reduced significantly over the last few years. This has resulted in a reduced budget requirement and enables us to make the savings of £300k from financial year 21/22.

### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

## 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

No impact as we are currently managing to deliver the service to households with children well within existing budget and what is being offered up is existing underspends.

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

No Impact

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
HRA	?	?		
DSG	NA	NA		
Health	NA	NA		
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Demand Management – optimise distribution of NRPF budget	300			300
Total	300			300
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
1. Good governance and operational effectiveness	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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. Giving Children and young people the best start in life	
3. Open Lewisham	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	

12. 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?

**13. 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:	

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
---	----

**14. 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	

**15. Legal implications**

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

This is a re-distribution of the budget. In the event there are proposals to materially change the service provision as a consequence, then an equalities assessment will be required.

## 16. 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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:	Street Cleansing - 5% Budget Saving Option for year 2022 - 2023
-----------------	---

## 1. Cuts proposal

Reference:	F-15
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Zahur Khan
Service/Team area:	Cleansing
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Sophie McGeevor - Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

## 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*  Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
	Y	N	Y

## 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

- It is proposed that a service review, for all environmental operations, be undertaken in 2020/21, to provide a full operational and management model for the borough based on a menu of options and approaches, using best practice and industry standards. This review would inform the future shape of services including any efficiencies and capital requirements
- The current service model for cleansing requires investment in mechanical sweeping machines to enhance and improve the service for the residents of the borough
- This is linked to the growth proposals around an Integrated Intelligence Hub and Environmental Enforcement.
- Cleansing Services has been cut by over 30% since 2011 and benchmarking has shown that the service is 11<sup>th</sup> in London on Cost per Km (12<sup>th</sup> when considered on Cost per Head of Population) and 2<sup>nd</sup> lowest in Inner London.

### Cuts proposal\*

However, if it was deemed necessary to remove resource from this area and prejudice the Environmental Operations review, 5% could be removed from the budget. This would involve:

- Reducing the geographical working areas from 4 to 3 areas across the borough.
- Delete 1 x Mobile team – 4 staff.
- Reorganise the Intensive Town Centres street sweeping beats and reduce the number of staff from 22 to 1

In this option the current frequency of residential sweeping will be unaffected

### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

- It is proposed that a service review, for all environmental operations, be undertaken in 2020/21, to provide a full operational and management model for the borough based on a menu of options and approaches, using best practice and industry standards. This review would inform the future shape of services including any efficiencies and capital requirements and will give the opportunity, next summer as part of the 2022/23 budget cycle, to decide on any reductions in 202/23 and 2023/34 based on a detailed and evidenced piece of work which also may allay fears and allow for greater efficiencies.
- The current service model requires investment in mechanical sweeping machines to enhance and improve the service for the residents of the borough
- This is linked to the growth proposals around an Integrated Intelligence Hub and Environmental Enforcement

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- Street Sweepers blue bags and small fly tips will remain out on the streets longer.
- With only 3 mobile teams to cover the whole of the borough, we will have to prioritise work more effectively and efficiently, and undertake to provide a more agile service but there would be delays
- There will be a number of staff affected that may have to be made redundant.
- There will be an increase in the number of complaints by residents.
- An adverse impact on the perception of the borough in terms of cleanliness, attractiveness and management of the local environment,

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

- Prioritisation of those roads swept based on need
- Communications around the service changes
- Change in approach to complaints around cleansing
- We would need to explore our methodology including an enhanced level of mechanisation, use of zoning and possible hybrids of cleansing and litter picking. This is linked to the proposed Environmental Operations review and the growth proposals around an Integrated Intelligence hub and Environmental Enforcement. Tying these together and ensuring the deadline will be essential
- Capital investment is required for mechanical sweeping and the savings contained within this paper.
- The procurement timeline for new fleet and equipment is critical to meeting the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022 implementation. Given the impact of Covid-19 on procurement, construction and delivery, there is a risk that this could be moved back to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023.
- This proposal to complete the Environmental Operations review, which will include possible phasing and any opportunities around this, will give the opportunity, next summer as part of the 2022/23 budget cycle, to decide on any reductions in 202/23 and 2023/34 based on a detailed and evidenced piece of work which also may allay fears and allow for greater efficiencies.

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	7,059	642	6,417	



5. Financial information				
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
	0	330	0	330
Total	0	330	0	330
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
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. Making Lewisham greener	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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. Good governance and operational effectiveness	
3. Building safer communities	
4. Open Lewisham	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	

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

8. 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:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			

## 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					
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:

The Environmental Protection Act 1990 and DEFRA Code of Practice

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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

## 11. Summary timetable

March 2021 – March 2022	There would be a need to ensure that the Environmental Operations review and the subsequent procurement tie in with the timeline for the 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2022
April 2022	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.

DRAFT

## Appendix 1 Public Realm Budget and Delivery Approach 2020-2024

### 1. Overview

1.1 This appendix sets out:

- the approach to making more significant service changes and efficiencies over the next 3-year budget cycle, linking the current proposals for savings/cuts with complementary investment proposals
- current proposals including those that are deemed high risk

## **2. Strategy and Staging for change and improvement**

3.1 To move the Division forward to a point where it operates on the basis of agile, demand led and prioritised services, with the potential to deliver further efficiencies, a twin track approach is required.

3.2 This approach will comprise:

### Stage 1 – Development

- A small element of initial investment to address fundamental flaws in the current operation, as already submitted as part of the 2021/22 budget process. This will provide a small strategic resource to develop the forward planning and delivery capacity required to address future growth and pressures as well as corporate and political priorities.
- Concurrent to this, a number of service reviews will be undertaken to look at the current situation, future pressures and demands and to assess alternative service delivery models.

### Stage 2 – Implementation

- Following the above work, a fuller, evidenced picture of the nature and shape of services will be available as well as details of the challenges and opportunities facing them in coming years.
- In most areas, there will be options and associated outcomes identified that will provide a menu-based approach based on intelligence and priority and corresponding opportunities around cost.

## **4. Stage 1 – Development**

4.1 At this stage, a small element of initial investment required to move forward the necessary service development and change. Table A shows the investment put forward as growth within the 2021/22 budget process.

**Table A – Invest to Save/Develop**

Investment	2021/22	2022/23
Commercial operations and Development	150	
Integrated intelligence Hub	120	
Environmental Enforcement	250	250
Waste Strategy and Delivery	120	
Environmental Operations - Street Cleansing	500k-1m Capital plus £25k one-off	

Note: figures shown are £000,000

4.2 This investment will need to be supplemented by a number of reviews and service changes of which the following 3 in particular are linked directly to the budget proposals and more detail is contained within specific proposals:

- Environmental Operations Review
- Commercial and Green Waste – Commercial Review and Marketing Strategy
- Lewisham Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan

## 5. Stage 2 - Implementation

5.1 Following the above work, and other reviews that will be undertaken in and across Public Realm, a fully evidenced and deliverable programme for service change with options will be available. This will then be able to provide a range of choices for members to consider.

## 6. Efficiencies for 2021/22 and beyond

6.1 Table B shows the efficiencies proposed for 2021/22 onwards in the first round of the 2021/22 budget cycle process.

**Table B – Savings proposed for 2020/21 to 2023/24**

Saving	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	RAG
Bin repairs and Deliveries		100			Green
Waste Minimisation			250		Yellow
Waste Diversion		789			Red
Cleansing Option 1 (5%)			330		Red

Cleansing Option 2 (10%)			650		
Cleansing Option 3 (15%)			970		
Climate Change – Parking Zones			*****		
Climate Change - Safety	***	***			
			1220		
		889 max.	Max.		

Note: figures shown are £000,000

6.2 In the main, these were straight forward basic cuts to services or radical changes to our approach around waste disposal: Expand a bit

- Bin replacement administration charge. This is based upon 9866 bins per annum, using 2019/20 figures, with an administration charge of £25. £100,000 as a sensible initial target although there is the potential of up to £246,000 in 2021/22.
- Waste minimisation – This would be linked to our new Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan and would look to reduce tonnages produced within the Borough. This requires a mix of extensive engagement and behaviour change, waste restriction on bins and longer frequencies for collections (towards 3 weeks) amongst others. As stated above in the report, this requires much more detailed work for a more detailed figure and to map out longer term gains such as direct savings as well as importantly providing necessary cost aversion.
- Waste Diversion – This was a radical, savings only proposals to divert tonnages from our recycling stream to SELCP for incineration. However this would undermine our recycling approach, put us into conflict with the Mayor for London and significantly and adversely impact our current recycling rate. This was estimated at £789k in 2021/22
- Street Cleansing cuts. These would be purely on-street reductions and although we would try to minimise the impact of these by being agile etc., none of the benefits of a full review and an alternative service model would be applicable if taken in advance, e.g. before 2022/23. Given the sensitive nature of street cleansing on the perception of the borough, it is recommended that the reviews mentioned above be undertaken before any decision is taken.
  - 5% - £330k
  - 10% - £650k
  - 15% - £970k

- Climate Change - Safety – To expand the current function within Parking, for the use of enforcement cameras for box junctions. This would primarily be targeted towards improving road safety and reducing injuries within the borough and meeting our and the Mayor for London’s targets.
- Climate Emergency – Parking Zones – One of our strongest tools to reduce car dependence and increase more sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling, is the use of parking controls. To meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency in Lewisham, extending our CPZs borough wide would be a key tool as part of the Councils approach to tackling the Climate Emergency and reducing the impact of the car on the environment and health.

DRAFT

### 1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Waste Minimisation for 2023 - 2024
Reference:	F-16
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Zahur Khan – Director, Public Realm
Service/Team area:	Commercial Operations
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Sophie McGeevor - Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

### 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution</a>		
	Yes	Yes	Yes

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

We have successfully submitted our Reduction and Recycling Plan (RRP) to the Mayor for London, setting out how we contribute to his targets as per the London Environment Strategy. What is absent, however, is a more detailed and specific Lewisham focussed approach. In particular, a comprehensive delivery plan that enables us to be able to fully understand the opportunities and challenges within the Borough to successfully reduce the environmental and financial cost of waste.

We now urgently need to start on a new Lewisham Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan. This will pick up on the need to reduce waste, to work towards a wider circular economy as well as the 3 Rs (Reduce, Recycle and Reuse). The Council has already recognised that this needs to be undertaken but we need to ensure that this is prioritised and supported corporately. A number of specific elements of this are considered urgent:

- Participation and Composition Surveys to understand the blockages and potential within waste streams and able to inform the direction of priority and necessary resource.
- Establishment of a Blocks resource to move on the estimated 40% of properties within the borough that are in blocks, regardless of tenure.
- To review and implement a clear policy and recommendation for new developments and build.
- To ensure that the above will all run in parallel with the main Strategy and Delivery Plan. The main strategy will identify further areas for improvement and



### 3. Description of service area and proposal

expansion by location, tenure and type. It is critical that that colleagues in Housing and RPs are fully involved in this process and that we co-produce any pilots, trials and fully implemented schemes.

- Commencement of the tonnage/financial model with corporate colleagues along with stronger governance of Lewisham as a unitary authority to recognise the impact that waste has on the Councils financial resource.
- The focus must be waste minimisation and reuse followed by recycling and look towards, wherever possible, a circular economy
- Work with other similar unitary authorities or waste authorities for partnership approach going forward from sharing procurement opportunities to a possible quasi/informal waste authority, to reduce costs or to provide alternative approaches, services, uses or disposal routes.
- Introduction of a corporate governance board mirroring the approach from other Waste Authorities and reflecting the importance and scale of the impacts and finances of waste streams and allowing the development robust plans to reduce costs and impact or cost aversion.
- Behaviour Change – This is one of the most important areas for influencing demand on services. The need for a comprehensive Education and Engagement approach around Waste minimisation and then recycling is critical in successfully meeting our ambitions and reducing costs and future cost aversion.

This saving is based upon our new Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan and would look to reduce tonnages produced within the Borough. This requires a mix of extensive engagement and behaviour change, waste restriction on bins and longer frequencies for collections (towards 3 weeks) amongst others.

#### Cuts proposal\*

- Currently the Council provides 180l wheelie bins to street-based properties for their residual waste.
  - Domestic waste to SELCHP for 19/20 was 84,125 tonnes.
  - 60% of properties are kerbside
  - Therefore 60% would be – 50,475 tonnes in 20/21
  - Change the capacity of bins from 180l to 110l would be around a 30% reduction
  - However, it would be sensible to assume some element of this transfer to recycling. If this was via Bywater's this would see this sum impacted. A trial would allow this level of transfer to be assessed and costed, along with evidence from other authorities.
  - The reduction in capacity would also need to be modelled in terms of impact on collection capacity and routing of vehicles and rounds and could see a reduction in resource required, with effective compaction.
- As part of a Waste minimisation campaign, there are 2 options for further investigation and potential implementation:
  - the possibility of extending fortnightly collections to a three-weekly

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

frequency. A full cost analysis and risk assessment to be undertaken. This could be done by targeting pilot projects. The use of pilot projects would provide tangible evidence as to the effect three weekly collections may have moving forward.

- Limiting the volume further with the introduction of 110L bins substituted for the current 180l ones. Areas that have done this have seen waste streams adapt and been able to make efficiencies
- We would need to consider the impact on larger families and other agreed needs and provide a clear criterion for any exemptions
- Recommend to trial this in late 2021/22 for evaluation and potential implementation in 2023/24.
- Requires capital investment to swap all bins.
- Potential reduction in size of fleet necessary.
- Other alternative measures to be developed to meet our environment aspirations and efficiencies
- Further work with Resource London

#### Mitigating Actions for 21/22 onwards

- It is proposed that a service review for environmental operations be undertaken, to provide a full operational and management model for the borough based looking at a menu of options and approaches, using best practice and industry standards. This review would inform the future shape of services and efficiencies including capital requirements
- Development of a Lewisham Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan to inform the shape of future services and approach to waste and recycling within the authority and shaping the proposals with this saving area.
- This is also linked to the growth proposals around an Integrated Intelligence Hub and Environmental Enforcement.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- Potential for fly tipping.
- There will be an increase in the number of complaints by residents.
- Potential for greater savings and cost aversion in future years.

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

- Extensive Communications and engagement around the service changes
- Change in approach to complaints
- We would need to ensure joined up working with Environmental Enforcement.
- Capital investment is required for new bins
- Other alternative measures to be developed to meet our environmental aspirations and efficiencies

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,670	0	4,670	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
	0	0	250	250
Total	0	0	250	250
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact	
1. Making Lewisham greener	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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. Good governance and operational effectiveness	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	

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

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	M	Pregnancy / Maternity:	M
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A

### 8. Service equalities impact

Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	M	Overall:	M
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					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5	5	5			
Sc 6 – SO2	7	7		1 plus 1 grade NK	
PO1 – PO5	2	1.6			
PO6 – PO8	1	1			
SMG 1 – 3	1	1			
JNC					
Total	16	15.6		2	
Gender	Female	Male			
	7	9			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	3	13			
Disability	Yes	No	PNTS	Not known	
		7	3	6	
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	PNTS
	12	1			3

### 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

- Government targets for Waste including recycling and minimisation
- The Mayor for London's Environment Strategy and its Reduction and Recycling Plan (RRP) process

### 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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 – March 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of Waste Strategy</li> <li>• Review of Environmental Operations</li> <li>• Potential Pilots</li> </ul>
April 2023	Service Changes 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.

## **Appendix 1 Public Realm Budget and Delivery Approach 2020-2024**

### **3. Overview**

3.1 This appendix sets out:

- the approach to making more significant service changes and efficiencies over the next 3-year budget cycle, linking the current proposals for savings/cuts with complementary investment proposals
- current proposals including those that are deemed high risk

### **4. Strategy and Staging for change and improvement**

3.1 To move the Division forward to a point where it operates on the basis of agile, demand led and prioritised services, with the potential to deliver further efficiencies, a twin track approach is required.

3.2 This approach will comprise:

#### **Stage 1 – Development**

- A small element of initial investment to address fundamental flaws in the current operation, as already submitted as part of the 2021/22 budget process. This will provide a small strategic resource to develop the forward planning and delivery capacity required to address future growth and pressures as well as corporate and political priorities.
- Concurrent to this, a number of service reviews will be undertaken to look at the current situation, future pressures and demands and to assess alternative service delivery models.

#### **Stage 2 – Implementation**

- Following the above work, a fuller, evidenced picture of the nature and shape of services will be available as well as details of the challenges and opportunities facing them in coming years.
- In most areas, there will be options and associated outcomes identified that will provide a menu-based approach based on intelligence and priority and corresponding opportunities around cost.

### **4. Stage 1 – Development**

4.1 At this stage, a small element of initial investment required to move forward the necessary service development and change. Table A shows the investment put forward as growth within the 2021/22 budget process.

**Table A – Invest to Save/Develop**

Investment	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Commercial operations and Development	100	50	
Integrated intelligence Hub	60	60	
Environmental Enforcement	125	250	125
Waste Strategy and Delivery	60	60	
Environmental Operations - Street Cleansing	500k-1m Capital plus £25k one-off		

Note: figures shown are £000,000

4.2 This investment will need to be supplemented by a number of reviews and service changes of which the following 3 in particular are linked directly to the budget proposals and more detail is contained within specific proposals:

- Environmental Operations Review
- Commercial and Green Waste – Commercial Review and Marketing Strategy
- Lewisham Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan

## 5. Stage 2 - Implementation

5.1 Following the above work, and other reviews that will be undertaken in and across Public Realm, a fully evidenced and deliverable programme for service change with options will be available. This will then be able to provide a range of choices for members to consider.

## 7. Efficiencies for 2021/22 and beyond

6.1 Table B shows the efficiencies proposed for 2021/22 onwards in the first round of the 2021/22 budget cycle process.

**Table B – Savings proposed for 2020/21 to 2023/24**

Saving	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	RAG
Bin repairs and Deliveries		100			Green
Waste Minimisation			250		Yellow
Cleansing Option 1 (5%)			330		Red
Cleansing Option 2 (10%)			650		Red
Cleansing Option 3 (15%)			970		Red
Climate Change – Parking Zones			*****		Yellow
Climate Change - Safety	***	***			Green

			1220		
		889 max.	Max.		

Note: figures shown are £000,000

6.2 In the main, these were straight forward basic cuts to services or radical changes to our approach around waste disposal: Expand a bit

- Bin replacement administration charge. This is based upon 9866 bins per annum, using 2019/20 figures, with an administration charge of £25. £100,000 as a sensible initial target although there is the potential of up to £246,000 in 2021/22.
- Waste minimisation – This would be linked to our new Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan and would look to reduce tonnages produced within the Borough. This requires a mix of extensive engagement and behaviour change, waste restriction on bins and longer frequencies for collections (towards 3 weeks) amongst others. As stated above in the report, this requires much more detailed work for a more detailed figure and to map out longer term gains such as direct savings as well as importantly providing necessary cost aversion.
- Street Cleansing cuts. These would be purely on-street reductions and although we would try to minimise the impact of these by being agile etc., none of the benefits of a full review and an alternative service model would be applicable if taken in advance, e.g. before 2022/23. Given the sensitive nature of street cleansing on the perception of the borough, it is recommended that the reviews mentioned above be undertaken before any decision is taken.
  - 5% - £330k
  - 10% - £650k
  - 15% - £970k
- Climate Change - Safety – To expand the current function within Parking, for the use of enforcement cameras for box junctions. This would primarily be targeted towards improving road safety and reducing injuries within the borough and meeting our and the Mayor for London’s targets.
- Climate Emergency – Parking Zones – One of our strongest tools to reduce car dependence and increase more sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling, is the use of parking controls. To meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency in Lewisham, extending our CPZs borough wide would be a key tool as part of the Councils approach to tackling the Climate Emergency and reducing the impact of the car on the environment and health.



### 1. Cuts proposal

Proposal title:	Climate Emergency – Parking
Reference:	F-17 and F-18
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Zahur Khan – Director, Public Realm
Service/Team area:	Parking
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Sophie McGeevor - Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Sustainable Development Select Committee

### 2. Decision Route

Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution <a href="https://lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/how-council-is-run/our-constitution">https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/ our-constitution</a>		
	Y	Y	N

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Air pollution is a major public health issue in London and in February 2019, a motion to declare a 'climate emergency' was agreed asking the Mayor and Cabinet to agree a new action to make the borough carbon neutral by 2030.

There are two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) declared within the London Borough of Lewisham and eight Air Quality Focus Areas (AQFAs), which are areas with some of the poorest air quality in Lewisham.

Road based transport is responsible for a large proportion of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter emissions and is one of the largest single contributors in areas where national air quality objectives have failed. It is therefore essential to implement actions that will result in reductions in air pollution on the borough's roads.

The Council can influence residents' and visitors' choice of vehicle by promoting more efficient and less polluting vehicles through variations in parking charges and the management of parking space.

There is a greater demand for parking than there is space available. Parking Zones (PZs) help prevent commuter parking, discourage unnecessary car use and can help contribute to road safety objectives by preventing unsafe parking. Most of the Victorian road network was not built to accommodate widespread car ownership and use which means the Council must carefully manage the supply of on- and off street parking space according to need.

The main purpose of a Parking Zone is to effectively manage the supply and demand for on-street parking in an area. In doing so, the Council helps to improve road safety,

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

reduce congestion, improve the local environment, reduce carbon dioxide emissions and improve local air quality.

Liveable neighbourhoods can only be achieved by reducing the dominance of the private vehicle primarily through the management of on-street parking.

#### Cuts proposal\*

This proposal falls in 2 parts:

- Climate Emergency – Parking - One of our strongest tools to reduce car dependence and increase more sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling, is the use of parking controls. To meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency in Lewisham, extending our CPZs borough wide would be a key tool as part of the Councils approach to tackling the Climate Emergency and reducing the impact of the car on the environment and health. Given the need for development, design and engagement, it is proposed that this would have to be year 3 of the budget cycle, in 2023/24

It would seem sensible to develop this proposal in parallel with an updated Parking and Enforcement Plan (PEP) for Lewisham allowing convergence of relevant climate, environment and transport policy and ambitions.

Currently there are 163 kms of uncontrolled parking within the Borough or 77% of the available public highway. If CPZ's were introduced into these half of these streets, based upon the above policy, over a 2 year period, a by-product of this approach would be annual net income in the region of £4m.

The initial estimated costs have been identified:

- engagement, design and implementation £1 million
- Additional on-going costs enforcement, IT, maintenance back office staff etc. £2 million per annum.

Income has been estimated extrapolating information from our current CPZs and applied to a number of scenarios of coverage.

**Table A - Parking income projections**

	<b>P&amp;D Net Income</b>	<b>Permit Net Income</b>	<b>Net PCN Income</b>
<b>19/20 Income (23%)</b>	£2,334,541.42	£2,387,585.18	£5,290,380.85
<b>100%</b>	£10,150,180.09	£10,380,805.12	£23,001,655.87
<b>38%</b>	£3,857,068.44	£3,944,705.94	£8,740,629.23
<b>20% or 40%</b>	£771,413.69	£1,577,882.38	£1,748,125.85
<b>Estimated Income</b>	<b>£3,105,955.11</b>	<b>£3,965,467.55</b>	<b>£7,038,506.70</b>

At this stage these are global estimates and it is proposed that further work be undertaken to provide firm figures around implementation and operation. At this stage a placeholder of £1m has been identified for 2023/24.

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

This proposal could be implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023.

- Parking – Safety and Congestion – To help manage safety and congestion on the boroughs main roads, a recent study identified 19 sites where box junction enforcement would ensure access at these locations. The study looked at 19 sites over a 5 day period which highlighted in excess of 16,000 contraventions. It is proposed to review all 19 junctions and install a network of 12 mobile cameras at these locations, using capital investment, and rotate them as required, to help manage congestion and emergency access and help towards improving road safety and reducing injuries within the borough and meeting our and the Mayor for London's targets.

This proposal could be implemented in 2021/22

Start-up costs are estimated in the region of £60k in terms of staffing, Traffic Order making and necessary remarking and amendment of the sites.

A conservative estimate of 5 Parking Charge Notices (PCNs) per day has been used for modelling and then multiplying that figure by 360 operational days a year and then by 12 CCTV cameras. This figure is then multiplied by the average gross income per ticket of £52 which equates to £1,123,200.00. The processing cost of £6.40 per ticket and maintenance cost of £3.61 is then subtracted resulting in a potential surplus in the region £907,000 surplus. At this stage this an estimated cost and potential surplus and a full analysis will be set out in the business case. The business case will be ready in November 2020 with an implementation date of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021I estimate that we will submit the business case next month with an insulation date of 4 months.

Given the above it is sensible to consider the financial by-product of adopting this approach would be annual net income in the region of £500,000, subject to the further detailed business case, based on an increased level of compliance.

Once implemented and reviewed, the potential of expanding this function to use enforcement cameras for all of moving traffic offences from banned turns, one ways, no entry's would seem sensible.

Any net income will be used in line with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which means it is to be spent making good to the general fund where the parking account was in deficit (up to 4 years), meeting all or any part of the cost of provision and maintenance by the local authority of off and on street parking, meeting cost of public passenger transport services, highway or road improvements, maintenance of the public highway, environmental improvements and implementation of London transport strategy.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- A wide range of positive impacts around environment, from local streetscape to air quality.
- Perceived impact on personal access and business

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

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

- Not popular with residents and businesses
- Make sure that an effective engagement process that place with communities explain the challenge around climate and the effective actions that local authorities can take
- Make the services as accessible as possible and ensure that local needs and demands are met, where possible
- Reinvestment into local environmental improvements and transport and accessibility initiatives and services
- Provide travel planning and guidance

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,042	10,347	-6,305	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Climate – Safety	250	250		500
Climate – Parking			1000	1000
<b>Total</b>	250	250	1000	1500
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	3.9%	3.9%	15.8%	23.7%
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. Building safer communities	Corporate priorities
2. Making Lewisham greener	1. Open Lewisham
3. Good governance and operational effectiveness	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	
	All	
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?	
	All	

### 8. 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:	
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			Y

### 9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No
Workforce profile: Both of these proposals would see a funded increase in staffing both within the Council and with the contractor.					
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:

## 10. Legal implications

Use of surplus income from parking charges and penalty charges is governed by section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations</b> )
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	Commence implementation of Safety and Congestion project
September 2021	Review of Safer Lewisham and potential development of the next stage
December 2021	Commence engagement strategy and design process for Climate Change – Parking
January 2022 – January 2023	Engagement, design and decision process
April 2023	Commence implementation of Climate Change – Parking project

\*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

## **Appendix 1 Public Realm Budget and Delivery Approach 2020-2024**

### **5. Overview**

5.1 This paper sets out:

- the approach to making more significant service changes and efficiencies over the next 3-year budget cycle, linking the current proposals for savings/cuts with complementary investment proposals
- current proposals including those that are deemed high risk

### **6. Strategy and Staging for change and improvement**

3.1 To move the Division forward to a point where it operates on the basis of agile, demand led and prioritised services, with the potential to deliver further efficiencies, a twin track approach is required.

3.2 This approach will comprise:

#### **Stage 1 – Development**

- A small element of initial investment to address fundamental flaws in the current operation, as already submitted as part of the 2021/22 budget process. This will provide a small strategic resource to develop the forward planning and delivery capacity required to address future growth and pressures as well as corporate and political priorities.
- Concurrent to this, a number of service reviews will be undertaken to look at the current situation, future pressures and demands and to assess alternative service delivery models.

#### **Stage 2 – Implementation**

- Following the above work, a fuller, evidenced picture of the nature and shape of services will be available as well as details of the challenges and opportunities facing them in coming years.
- In most areas, there will be options and associated outcomes identified that will provide a menu-based approach based on intelligence and priority and corresponding opportunities around cost.

### **4. Stage 1 – Development**

4.1 At this stage, a small element of initial investment required to move forward the necessary service development and change. Table A shows the investment put forward as growth within the 2021/22 budget process.

<b>Investment</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Commercial operations and Development	100	50	
Integrated intelligence Hub	60	60	
Environmental Enforcement	125	250	125
Waste Strategy and Delivery	60	60	
Environmental Operations - Street Cleansing	500k-1m Capital plus		

	£25k one-off		
--	-----------------	--	--

**Table A – Invest to Save/Develop**

Note: figures shown are £000,000

4.2 This investment will need to be supplemented by a number of reviews and service changes of which the following 3 in particular are linked directly to the budget proposals and more detail is contained within specific proposals:

- Environmental Operations Review
- Commercial and Green Waste – Commercial Review and Marketing Strategy
- Lewisham Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan

**5. Stage 2 - Implementation**

5.1 Following the above work, and other reviews that will be undertaken in and across Public Realm, a fully evidenced and deliverable programme for service change with options will be available. This will then be able to provide a range of choices for members to consider.

**8. Efficiencies for 2021/22 and beyond**

6.1 Table B shows the efficiencies proposed for 2021/22 onwards in the first round of the 2021/22 budget cycle process.

**Table B – Savings proposed for 2020/21 to 2023/24**

Saving	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	RAG
Bin repairs and Deliveries		100			
Waste Minimisation			250		
Cleansing Option 1 (5%)			330		
Cleansing Option 2 (10%)			650		
Cleansing Option 3 (15%)			970		
Climate Change – Parking Zones			*****		
Climate Change - Safety	***	***			
			1220		
		889 max.	Max.		

Note: figures shown are £000,000

6.2 In the main, these were straight forward basic cuts to services or radical changes to our approach around waste disposal: Expand a bit



- Bin replacement administration charge. This is based upon 9866 bins per annum, using 2019/20 figures, with an administration charge of £25. £100,000 as a sensible initial target although there is the potential of up to £246,000 in 2021/22.
- Waste minimisation – This would be linked to our new Waste Strategy and Delivery Plan and would look to reduce tonnages produced within the Borough. This requires a mix of extensive engagement and behaviour change, waste restriction on bins and longer frequencies for collections (towards 3 weeks) amongst others. As stated above in the report, this requires much more detailed work for a more detailed figure and to map out longer term gains such as direct savings as well as importantly providing necessary cost aversion.
- Street Cleansing cuts. These would be purely on-street reductions and although we would try to minimise the impact of these by being agile etc., none of the benefits of a full review and an alternative service model would be applicable if taken in advance, e.g. before 2022/23. Given the sensitive nature of street cleansing on the perception of the borough, it is recommended that the reviews mentioned above be undertaken before any decision is taken.
  - 5% - £330k
  - 10% - £650k
  - 15% - £970k
- Climate Change - Safety – To expand the current function within Parking, for the use of enforcement cameras for box junctions. This would primarily be targeted towards improving road safety and reducing injuries within the borough and meeting our and the Mayor for London's targets.
- Climate Emergency – Parking Zones – One of our strongest tools to reduce car dependence and increase more sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling, is the use of parking controls. To meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency in Lewisham, extending our CPZs borough wide would be a key tool as part of the Council's approach to tackling the Climate Emergency and reducing the impact of the car on the environment and health.