

APPENDIX 2 – THEME C SERVICE DESIGN PROPOSALS

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Specialist social care support review
Reference:	C-35
Lead officer:	Sara Rahman
Ward/s affected	None
Cabinet portfolio	Cllr Chris Barnham, Children's Services and School Performance
Scrutiny committee/s	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee and Children and Young People Select Committee

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information

Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?

There are three different service areas in Families, Quality and Commissioning which are in scope of the savings proposal – Youth Offending Service, Family Thrive and CAMHS.

Proposal 1 – The funding for this post sits within the Youth Offending Service (YOS), it is a Remand Social Work post that would hold cases specifically where the young person has been remanded. As demand has been very low no permanent appointment has been made and currently the post is currently occupied by a locum Social Worker who has a caseload of 3. The impact on the cases will be minimal as they are already allocated to Social Workers in Children's Social Care

Proposal 2 – The Practice and Partnership post sits in the Family Thrive Service within Early Help. This post was designed following the insourcing and restructure of the Family Thrive service, however it has been vacant and with the wider developments across the service and the close working with the Principal Social Worker to support the Signs of Safety practice model for Family Thrive workers, the post is no longer required.

Proposal 3 – This is a CAMHS post that supports the social, emotional and mental health needs of pupils at New Woodlands School. The post holder provides assessment and treatment to young people attending New Woodlands and their networks while providing specialist advice to school colleagues to assist them in their work. Clinical supervision for this post is provided through South London and Maudsley. The proposal is to transfer the funding of this post to the health budget and funding for this has already been identified. The proposal does not involve any loss of capacity but transfers the funding of this post to the health budget and funding for this has already been identified.

What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund			6.682m
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL			£6.682m

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?

Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				

PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3	6	6		3
JNC	1	1		

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

Proposal 1 – Deletion of the vacant Remand Social Worker post in the Youth Offending Service.

Proposal 2 – Deletion of the vacant Practice in Partnership post in Family Thrive (Early Help) service.

Proposal 3 – Transfer of liability for the CAMHS post in Woodlands School to Health which is currently funded by the LA.

There are no redundancies as a result of the proposals below:

Proposal 1 – operational changes identified. This is a specific role where children who are remanded by Court are allocated to the Remand Social Worker. Most children who come through the Courts already have an existing SW allocated in the social care teams. If they do not have a Social Worker they will need one via the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and the numbers are very limited. Should the numbers increase, these referrals should be referred MASH for allocation within social care. Nationally the number of children remanded has reduced and in the last couple of years there have been very limited numbers for Lewisham YOS – at the moment there are none and the current worker Remand Social Worker who is locum has 3 cases.

Proposal 2 – the key functions of the Practice and Partnership post will be delivered through the other key roles in the Family Thrive service that are already identified to develop partnerships and practice for example, the Group Manager, the Early Help Coordinators and the Hub Managers. The practice element will be further with collaboration with social care and the extending of signs of safety training for early help staff. This post has not been recruited to and feedback from the staff consultation supported this change.

Proposal 3 – this is a CAMHS post that supports the social, emotional and mental health needs of pupils at New Woodlands School. The post holder provides assessment and treatment to young people attending New Woodlands and their networks while providing specialist advice to school colleagues to assist them in their work. Clinical supervision for this post is provided through South London and Maudsley. The proposal is to transfer the funding of this post to health.

Are there any specific staffing implications?	No			
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	TOTAL
Proposal 1	£57k			£57k
Proposal 2	£70k	0	0	£70k
Proposal 3	£50k	0	0	£50k
TOTAL	£177k	£0	£0	£177k
% Net Budget	2.6%			2.6%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N

If yes, please describe impact:	
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?	
<p>Proposal 1 – there may be a situation where we see an increase in children and young people who are remanded, however over the years there has been a decrease due to the focus around preventative work and good practice. The mitigations are that most children who do come to the notice of the courts are already known to social care and have an allocated worker. In the event that they do not have a worker they will be referred through the MASH and if remanded into LA care we are required to exercise our statutory duties therefore this cohort of children will be allocated within the social care teams. This is already happening via the MASH and there will be no change to this.</p> <p>Proposal 2 – the functions of this post in relation to practice and partnership will be delivered through the other management roles in the Family Thrive Service and this is outlined above. This post has not been recruited to therefore there are no redundancy risks.</p> <p>Proposal 3 – there will be no impact on the service delivery as the post will remain, only the funding arrangements are to change.</p>	
Are there any specific legal implications?	
Not identified	
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?	Not required

5. Impact & Outcomes	
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?	
Service Users	
<p>Proposal 1 – through effective resource deployment and collaborative working within the services, the outcome will continue to be delivered therefore the impact on service users would be limited.</p> <p>Proposal 2 – this post has not been recruited to therefore the impact will be minimal.</p> <p>Proposal 3 - there is no suggestion to alter the service therefore there will be no impact.</p>	
Staff	
<p>Proposal 1 – the post is occupied by a locum therefore the impact will be low. Any casework will be going via the MASH to the social care teams. This will streamline the work i.e. all children looked after and children on child protection and child in need plans will sit in one service and allow for better data collection. Should cases increase, support can be provided by the YOS teams as there are some YOS officers who are qualified SWs however this will not be desirable as the model does not support this.</p> <p>Proposal 2 – feedback from the staff consultation during the restructure raised that the structure felt ‘management heavy’ and as a result the Practice and Partnership role in scope for deletion. In comparison to the other management role, the post did not have any line management responsibilities therefore the impact would be low and the delivery of the partnership and practice development functions would be deployed via the remaining management roles.</p> <p>Proposal 3 – there is no change to the delivery model therefore minimal impact.</p>	
Other Council Services	

Proposal 1 – the teams within Children’s Social Care will see the allocation of all cases where children have been remanded, this is already happening and therefore there will be minimal negative impact.

Proposal 2 – no impact identified.

Proposal 3 – No impact identified.

Partners

Proposal 1 – partners will not see a change in the service response as this is a statutory duty already delivered.

Proposal 2 – Partners will not see a change to service delivery. Engagement with partners will still be part of the role for existing managers (Group Manager, Hub Managers, Early Help Leads) and training and support for partners will be accessed through the wider offer via workforce development and the social work academy.

Proposal 3 - There is an assumption that Health partners will agree to the transfer of liability of the post. This could have a financial impact on health partners.

Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X	
Disability			X	
Ethnicity			X	
Gender			X	
Gender reassignment			X	
Marriage and civil partnerships			X	
Pregnancy and maternity			X	
Religion and belief			X	
Sexual orientation			X	
Socio-economic inequality			X	

Is a full EAA required? No

How do the proposed changes align with the Council’s Corporate Strategy?

Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham	X			
Tackling the Housing crisis			X	
Giving children and young people	X		X	

CUTS PROPOSAL PROFORMA 2022/23

the best start in life				
Building an inclusive local economy	X			
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support	X		X	
Making Lewisham greener			X	
Building safer communities	X			
Good governance and operational effectiveness	X		X	

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Reduction of commissioned care leaver housing costs
Reference:	C-36
Lead officer:	Lucie Heyes – Director Children’s Social Care Pinaki Ghoshal – Exec Director CYP Services
Ward/s affected	N/A
Cabinet portfolio	Cllr Chris Barnham, Children’s Services and School Performance
Scrutiny committee/s	Children and Young People Select Committee

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
No	No	No

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
Children’s Social Care				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund CSC placement	28,000	0	28,000	
General Fund NRTPF	2,623		2,623	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	28,623	0	28,623	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	N/A			
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
<p>0) The Local Authority has a duty to provide ‘suitable accommodation’ to its Care Leaver population. Lewisham currently has c600 Care Leavers, in a range of different types of accommodation. It is estimated c50 Care Leavers are living in semi-independent accommodation that is spot purchased at an average cost of £1,500 per week. Through the work that is already being carried out, to strengthen our placements ‘Sufficiency Strategy’ we plan through improve commissioning arrangements and enter partnerships with providers to deliver accommodation at less cost. This will not involve a reduction in our support for care leavers, indeed, in line with our ongoing improvement plans the aim will be to improve the quality of support and stability of placements for care leavers.</p>

- 1) This proposal is the next step, connected to existing savings proposals from last year (E-06, A-17 & F-05).
- The total budget for placements is £28m. The care leavers' budget is part of the overall placements budget. Overall the CSC budget is overspending by circa £3m and so this action is part of a wider programme which seeks to reduce the overspend. Initially these actions will include the expansion of a supported lodging scheme (11 places) and the addition of 9 units at a further site.
- 2) Through the overall improvement work in Children's Social Care and a focus on earlier support the NRPF budget is projected to underspend. This budget is part of the wider set of budgets used to support vulnerable families and children and the work set out in this proposal, together with work initiated last year as part of the previous budget savings collectively means we project that the spend will continue to be less than the budget that was previously allocated.

Are there any specific staffing implications? N

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	TOTAL
1) Care Leaver accommodation	£400k			£400k
2) NRPF	£200k			£200k
TOTAL	£600k			£600k
% Net Budget	2%			2%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N

If yes, please describe impact:

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?

Risk - Increasing population of Care Leavers for the next two years.

Mitigation - Other less expensive accommodation options are being developed through a revised Sufficiency Strategy

Wider changes in policy including Economic and Fiscal changes e.g inflation, increase in National Insurance Levy, London Living wage etc. Affecting the overall placements budget. For example staffing elements associated with overall placements will see an increase in costs pressure arising from 1.25% increase in staffing costs which is likely to be passported to the council.

Are there any specific legal implications?

No

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)? No

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Some young people in the existing accommodation may be required to move. This will be minimised and managed with the support of the young person's personal advisor. The

quality of semi-independent accommodation is variable and new arrangements are aim to provide higher quality support and stability.				
Staff				
N/A				
Other Council Services				
N/A				
Partners				
N/A				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				Neutral
Disability				Neutral
Ethnicity				Neutral
Gender				Neutral
Gender reassignment				Neutral
Marriage and civil partnerships				Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity				Neutral
Religion and belief				Neutral
Sexual orientation				Neutral
Socio-economic inequality				Neutral
Is a full EAA required?			Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				
Tackling the Housing crisis				
Giving children and young people the best start in life	Supporting the most vulnerable young people to live in stable and supported housing while transitioning to independence			

CUTS PROPOSAL PROFORMA 2022/23

Building an inclusive local economy				
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				
Making Lewisham greener				
Building safer communities				
Good governance and operational effectiveness				

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Strategic Development Team cost capitalisation
Reference:	C-38
Lead officer:	Patrick Dubeck
Ward/s affected	Strategic Development
Cabinet portfolio	Cllr Paul Bell, Housing and Planning
Scrutiny committee/s	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
The Council's Strategic Development team is responsible for overseeing the delivery of new housing within the Borough. This includes the strategic clienting of the Council's Building for Lewisham Programme, delivered by Lewisham Homes.				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	405			
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	405			
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5	8	8		1
PO6 – PO8	3	3		
SMG1 – SMG3	2	2	1	
JNC	1	1		

4. Cuts Proposal	
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?	
<p>The Strategic Development team's staffing costs are split across the General Fund and HRA, with a portion of costs recharged to capital. The team grew in 2020-21, funded in part by the GLA's Homebuilding capacity fund. These posts have been retained and the funding for them costed to general fund. The funding recharge to the capital programme in 20/21 was £272k, allowing for GLA grant. However, a review of staffing costs and time attributed to the Building for Lewisham Programme has established a higher recharge cost. It is anticipated that this level of recharge will be retained in 2022/23 as a one off cost of c£400K, delivering a saving to the general fund, anticipated to be £100K.</p> <p>It is not unusual to recharge these types of costs to the capital programme. This is a standard approach adopted by housebuilding/ developing Councils. Other London Councils adopt the same approach.</p>	
Are there any specific staffing implications?	N

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	TOTAL
	100			100
TOTAL	100			100
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	Y	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:	Proposal proposes a capitalisation of costs to HRA and a saving to the General Fund.			
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
<p>This proposal adds an additional cost burden to the HRA capital programme, with costs needing to be attributed to capital delivery to ensure they do not become a revenue cost liability.</p> <p>Strategic Development and Finance colleagues are working closely with Lewisham Homes to establish the principles and mechanism for attributing these costs to the HRA programme as part of the programme's development allowances. The mechanism should not unduly impact the viability of individual development schemes.</p>				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
To be completed with Legal input.				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?			N	

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

N/A

Staff

N/A

Other Council Services

N/A

Partners

The Lewisham Homes programme will need to accommodate this cost base and agree the principle for assuming them within development allowances.

Are there any specific equalities implications for service users?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				Y
Disability				Y
Ethnicity				Y
Gender				Y

CUTS PROPOSAL PROFORMA 2022/23

Gender reassignment				Y
Marriage and civil partnerships				Y
Pregnancy and maternity				Y
Religion and belief				Y
Sexual orientation				Y
Socio-economic inequality				Y
Is a full EAA required?			N	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				Y
Tackling the Housing crisis				Y
Giving children and young people the best start in life				Y
Building an inclusive local economy				Y
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				Y
Making Lewisham greener				Y
Building safer communities				Y
Good governance and operational effectiveness			Positive	

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Aligning the Kickstart scheme with Government plans
Reference:	C-39
Lead officer:	Patrick Dubeck
Ward/s affected	N/A
Cabinet portfolio	Cllr Kim Powell, Business and Community Wealth Building
Scrutiny committee/s	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>In response to the increase in youth unemployment, the Government created the Kickstart scheme. This provides unemployed young people aged 16-24 a six month paid work placement with an employer. The Government provides participating employers with funding to cover six months salary at National Minimum Wage for each Kickstart trainee (25 hours per week).</p> <p>In early 2021 EMT agreed that the council should participate in the scheme and take on at least 40 Kickstart trainees. Given our commitment to the Living Wage, it was agreed that the council would pay Kickstart trainees the London Living Wage (LLW). A £50k budget growth was allocated to the Economy, Jobs and Partnerships service to cover the funding gap between the Government funding and payment of LLW to the trainees.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	50	0	50	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
TOTAL	50	0	50	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	0			
Scale 6 – SO2	0			
PO1 – PO5	0			
PO6 – PO8	0			
SMG1 – SMG3	0			
JNC	0			

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
<p>The Kickstart programme is time limited. The Government have announced that they will not approve any additional Kickstart placements after 31 December, and all placements must have begun by 31 March 2022. The council has 45 placements approved by the Government. These placements will all be filled by January 2022.</p>

The six month placements will continue in to next year and therefore some budget will be required in 2022/23 to continue to ensure Kickstart trainees receive the LLW. It is estimated that this will be no more than £25k, and indeed may be less if some of the trainees move on to permanent employment before the end of their six month placement. Therefore it is possible to cut the Kickstart budget by £25k in 2022/23, with the remaining £25k being saved in 2023/24.

Training and employment support and opportunities will continue to be offered via other schemes within the Economy, Jobs and Partnerships team.

Are there any specific staffing implications?		No		
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	TOTAL
	£25	£25	£0	£50
TOTAL	£25	£25	£0	£50
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
The council has secured external funding to operate a youth employment hub which is supporting unemployed young people. Further external funding is expected to be secured by the end of 2021 (European Social Fund) which will allow the council to increase the capacity of the youth employment hub and also establish an all-age employment support service.				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
None				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?		No		

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
The Kickstart programme will end regardless of this savings proposal as it was a Government programme which is ending in March 2022. Ending the Kickstart programme will mean that there are no paid work placements available for unemployed young people.				
Staff				
None				
Other Council Services				
None				
Partners				
None				
Are there any specific equalities implications for service users?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				Neutral
Disability				Neutral

CUTS PROPOSAL PROFORMA 2022/23

Ethnicity				Neutral
Gender				Neutral
Gender reassignment				Neutral
Marriage and civil partnerships				Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity				Neutral
Religion and belief				Neutral
Sexual orientation				Neutral
Socio-economic inequality				Neutral
Is a full EAA required?			No	
How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?				
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				Neutral
Tackling the Housing crisis				Neutral
Giving children and young people the best start in life			Negative	
Building an inclusive local economy			Negative	
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				Neutral
Making Lewisham greener				Neutral
Building safer communities				Neutral
Good governance and operational effectiveness				Neutral

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Substance misuse - contract review and staffing
Reference:	C-40
Lead officer:	Dee Carlin & Catherine Mbema
Ward/s affected	All wards
Cabinet portfolio	Cllr Chris Best, Health and Adult Social Care
Scrutiny committee/s	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
1.1 The London Borough of Lewisham commissions a range of services to create a system to meet the treatment needs of those with drug and alcohol problems.				
1.2 The treatment system provides medical treatment and rehabilitation programmes as well as intensive support services that promote recovery and encourage individuals to maintain their recovery through engagement in positive activities such as employment, training or volunteering. The system also delivers support through arrangements known as 'shared care' with GPs in the borough and work with community pharmacies on harm minimisation projects.				
1.3 The system consists of four main contracted services:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core contract • Community based / shared care service for people with drug and alcohol problems • Drug and alcohol treatment service for young people under 25 • Detox and rehabilitation services 				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund				
HRA				
DSG				
Health		£3,412,000		
MOPAC grant		£353,000		
TOTAL	£3,765,000	£3,765,000	0	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5				
Scale 6 – SO2				
PO1 – PO5				
PO6 – PO8				
SMG1 – SMG3				
JNC				

4. Cuts Proposal
What changes are proposed to the service area/s?
The 'core contract' for substance misuse was recommissioned through an open tender process for April 2022. This was agreed through M & C on Nov 3rd 2021.

The new contract value is £112,236 lower than the current value. £20,000 of this has substituted prescribing savings not made. This proposal identifies the remainder (£92,236) as a potential area that could be used to fund other services that benefit Public Health and thus reduce general fund costs.				
Are there any specific staffing implications?				N
What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)				
Proposal strand	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	TOTAL
TOTAL	£92,236			
% Net Budget	n/a (net budget 0)			
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	N	N	N	Y
If yes, please describe impact:	This service is funded entirely through external grant income. So this cut is a reduction in spend against the Public Health grant, which will require reallocation to another area of the Council delivering Public Health outcomes			
What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?				
This cut is delivered through an open tender process, and the successful tenderers submission is legally binding, so officers do not anticipate risk to delivery				
Are there any specific legal implications?				
No specific legal implications, confirmed by legal colleagues 1/12/21 (MA)				
Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?				N

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

This cut will impact on the overall capacity of the service, but officers believe the proposed overall service model in the tender submission is robust. This reduction will mostly be in the non-opiate engagement team reducing overall activity and hospital inreach targeting alcohol users in particular. Some mitigation is presented in the planned introduction of an alcohol care team within University Hospital Lewisham

Staff

This is not a reduction in Council staffing, but in a commissioned service. Officers will work with the provider, with the intention of avoiding compulsory redundancies. This cut will impact on the overall capacity of the service, but officers believe the proposed overall service model in the tender submission is robust.

Other Council Services

Substance misuse services work particularly closely with Public Health, Adults & Children's Social Care and Housing. This cut will impact on the overall capacity of the service, but officers believe the proposed overall service model in the tender submission is robust.

Partners

This reduction will particularly impact work with Lewisham & Greenwich Trust. This cut will impact on the overall capacity of the service, but officers believe the proposed overall service model in the tender submission is robust. Some mitigation is presented in the planned introduction of an alcohol care team within University Hospital Lewisham

The service works to reduce drug and alcohol related offending as it is well demonstrated that cessation of drug use reduces re-offending significantly and reduces harm in local communities. This cut will impact on the overall capacity of the service, but officers believe the proposed overall service model in the tender submission is robust.

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X

Is a full EAA required?

N

How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?

Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				X
Tackling the Housing crisis				X
Giving children and young people the best start in life				X
Building an inclusive local economy				X
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support			X	
Making Lewisham greener				X

CUTS PROPOSAL PROFORMA 2022/23

Building safer communities			X	
Good governance and operational effectiveness				X

1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Removal of graffiti from private property
Reference:	C-44
Lead officer:	Zahur Khan
Ward/s affected	Wards identified in the priority list, based on where there is evidence and justification for new measures
Cabinet portfolio	Cllr Patrick Codd, Environment and Transport
Scrutiny committee/s	Sustainable Development Select Committee

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
Y	N	N

3. Contextual Information				
Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?				
<p>Lewisham has a statutory duty to remove graffiti from public property. There is no requirement for the Council to remove graffiti from private property and privately-owned surfaces which include: shops (incl. shuttered shops, bus stops, phone boxes, utility boxes) etc.</p> <p>A review of statutory and non-statutory services has identified that the service, on instruction from previous Executive Director, was expected to remove graffiti from private property free of charge.</p> <p>The council employs only one team (2 people) for the removal of graffiti. Reducing the service to a core statutory component will only save on material and chemical costs.</p> <p>There is a potential income stream from removing graffiti on a commercial footing, but this cannot at this time.</p> <p>It is possible to enforce graffiti removal against owners of private buildings and private land by the issuance of a graffiti removal notice. The owner has 28 days to remove the graffiti. Failure to comply can result in the Council removing the graffiti and recovering costs.</p>				
What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?				
Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)	
General Fund	180	0	180	
HRA	0	0	0	
DSG	0	0	0	
Health	0	0	0	
TOTAL	180	0	0	
What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?				
Grades	Number Of Posts	FTE	Vacant Posts	
			Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered
Scale 1 – Scale 5	0	0	0	0
Scale 6 – SO2	0	0	0	0
PO1 – PO5	0	0	0	0
PO6 – PO8	0	0	0	0
SMG1 – SMG3	0	0	0	0
JNC	0	0	0	0

4. Cuts Proposal**What changes are proposed to the service area/s?**

The proposal is to stop removing graffiti from private property. This is a policy decision and is easily deliverable as activity to remove graffiti from private land and privately owned building will stop.

The saving will be derived from savings from reduced procurement of materials and chemicals needed for graffiti removal. There is only one graffiti removal beat and is considered to be staffed at a minimally viable level.

	2022/23
Capital Investment	0
First year Rate of Return	£5k

Are there any specific staffing implications?

No

What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	TOTAL
If funded from capital				
If funded from revenue	5			5
TOTAL	5			5
% Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please describe impact:				

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?

There are no delivery risks operationally in implementing the change. Identification of private and public land and property is simple.

Graffiti on private land will remain on surfaces for longer. A consequential impact will be that graffiti on public land and publicly owned surfaces will be removed quicker.

One of the main surfaces that the council removes graffiti from are the metal shutters in front of shops. Although these are usually 'rolled up' during trading hours there are again visible as premises close later in the evening.

General communications messages and updated information on the corporate website will be required to communicate the Council's position on graffiti.

The council can charge for this service and a price for service for entry to the Council's fees and charges is being established should the proposal be approved for implementation.

Are there any specific legal implications?

None related to the removal of graffiti from non-public land.

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?	N
---	---

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Businesses (shops, restaurants etc) that would have previously had this service free of charge will now have to pay either a private company if they want graffiti removed, or the Council. The initiation of removal will be through the services of a Graffiti Removal Notice.

Staff

None.

Other Council Services

None

Partners

None

Are there any specific equalities implications for service users?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				N
Disability				N
Ethnicity				N
Gender				N
Gender reassignment				N
Marriage and civil partnerships				N
Pregnancy and maternity				N
Religion and belief				N
Sexual orientation				N
Socio-economic inequality				N

Is a full EAA required?

N

How do the proposed changes align with the Council's Corporate Strategy?

Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				Neutral
Tackling the Housing crisis				Neutral
Giving children and young people				Neutral

CUTS PROPOSAL PROFORMA 2022/23

the best start in life				
Building an inclusive local economy				Neutral
Delivering and defending: health, social care & support				Neutral
Making Lewisham greener			Negative	
Building safer communities				Neutral
Good governance and operational effectiveness				Neutral