

# Public Document Pack



## Governance & Civic Services

Town Hall  
Trinity Road  
Bootle  
L20 7AE

To: Members of the Cabinet

Date: 25 January 2013  
Our Ref:  
Your Ref:

**Please contact:** Steve Pearce

**Contact Number:** 0151 934 2046

**Fax No:** 0151 934 2034

**e-mail:**  
steve.pearce@sefton.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

### **CABINET - THURSDAY 31ST JANUARY, 2013**

I refer to the agenda for the above meeting and now enclose the following report which was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

<b>Agenda No.</b>	<b>Item</b>
4.	<b>Transformation Programme and Revenue Budget 2012 - 2015 (Pages 105 - 224)</b> Report of the Head of Transformation Services and Head of Corporate Finance and ICT

Yours sincerely,

G. BAYLISS

Director of Corporate Commissioning

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 4

**Report to:** Cabinet

**Date of Meeting:** 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013

**Subject:** Transformation Programme & Revenue Budget 2013 - 2015

**Report of:** Head of Transformation Services  
& Head of Finance & ICT

**Wards Affected:** All

**Is this a Key Decision?** Yes

**Is it included in the Forward Plan?** Yes

**Exempt/Confidential** No

---

## Executive Summary

The Council must legally set a balanced budget, one that is robust and sustainable. Over the last 8 months, Cabinet has been working towards this end. This report

- Updates Cabinet on the recently announced local government settlement and concludes that the Council now faces a budget gap of £50.8 million over the next two years. This compares to the previous forecast of £43.7million.
- Advises Cabinet that a number of grants have been notified after the Settlement announcement which helps to mitigate some of this increase.
- Updates Cabinet on the outcome of consultation on options previously approved for consultation and recommends what should now be included in the final two year Budget Plan.
- Identifies further new budget options and assumptions for consideration and consultation.
- Illustrates how the two year Budget Plan can be balanced within available resources assuming the options identified can be approved and implemented

This is a major milestone in the budget setting process. The resolutions made will form the basis of the report to Budget Council on 28<sup>th</sup> February which will enable the Council to set its budget. In reaching decisions the Cabinet and Council must take into account amongst other things the consultation and engagement activity to date and the impact and risk associated with each option.

**If Members need any further information prior to making final budget decisions then this will be made available on request.**

It should also be noted that final settlements have yet to be received from Government and therefore the situation may change. If necessary a report will be presented to the February Cabinet to consider any significant changes.

The options in this report represent a mixture of efficiencies and significant policy changes. They will require the implementation of major change programmes and appropriate capacity will need to be dedicated to ensure deliverability. Given the scale of the budget reductions any slippage or underachievement will have implications for the financial management of the Council and as such robust management and monitoring arrangements must continue to be operated.

# Agenda Item 4

The report is arranged in a number of parts with associated annexes as indicated below

		<b>Annexes</b>	<b>Potential Financial Impact</b>
			£m
Part 1	Provisional Local Government Settlement and impact on the funding gap.	A	7.100
Part 2	Consultation and Engagement Overview	B	0.000
Part 3	Options previously approved for Consultation	C & D	1.490
Part 4	New Options for Consideration by Cabinet	E	-13.791
Part 5	Two year Budget Plan	F	0.000
Part 6	Robustness and Risk		
Part 7	Next Steps and Conclusions		

## **Recommendations**

### **Cabinet is recommended to**

#### **Part 1 - Provisional Local Government Settlement and impact on the funding gap**

- a) note that the funding announcements for 2013/14 are subject to Parliamentary approval. 2014/15 funding is based on the announcement and the Autumn Statement of 5 December but is the best available information available and will be subject to change over the coming year
- b) note that figures and phasing in the annexes are working assumptions of options to be considered and the figures should not be seen as predetermining any decisions. Some of these options remain subject to consultation, engagement and Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) assessment, and any figures indicated are being used to facilitate outline budgetary forecasting only
- c) note that the report to Council on February 28<sup>th</sup> 2013 will include the estimated phasing of the budget options to ensure that the budget can be balanced in both years

#### **Part 2 & Annex B – Consultation & Engagement Overview**

- d) note and take account of the feedback outlined in Annex B

#### **Part 3 Options previously approved for consultation**

### **Public Sector Equality Duty**

- e) note and take account of the detail within the equality analysis report, the consultation feedback and the mitigating actions within each option in taking their decisions on the recommendations to Council

## **F1.3 - Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for organised junior sports activities**

- f) agree that this option is not progressed at this point

## **D1.26 Governance & Civic Services – Mayoral services - reduce the function of Mayor to the statutory minimum (that is to Chair the Council meeting)**

- g) agree that this option is not progressed at this point

## **Terms & Conditions**

- h) agree that the total savings from this option be reduced from £6m to £3m
- i) approve the following (subject to further consultation with all recognised trade unions) to achieve a £3m saving over the 2 year period:
  - (i) There will be no incremental progression for any employees of the Council (with the exception of any employees who are employed on statutory contracts, i.e. teachers who are centrally employed). All NJC, JNC – HAY, Red Book, Youth Workers - JNC and Soulbury will therefore not have any form of incremental progression in 2013/2014 or 2014/15. This measure will deliver a projected saving of £1.69m in 2013/14 and a further £1.5m 2014/15. This measure will not apply in schools whose Governing Body controls such matters.
  - (ii) The 4 day shutdown over the Christmas period continues on the current basis, i.e. deductions will continue to apply to employees and management reserves the right for the employee not to work over a shutdown period. This will become a permanent feature within employee contracts; however, the Council retains a discretion to make employees work over the period if needed. The concessionary day no longer applies in any form
- j) that authority be given to the Head of Corporate Personnel in consultation with the Trade Unions for the £190k be utilised to try and mitigate some of the effect of continuing incremental freezes on the lower paid workers

## **F1.1 Non Cancelling PCN for Incorrect Display, D1.31 Parking – Car Parking – On and Off street parking charge increases and the introduction of new on street parking charges**

- k) to agree that a strategic review of parking services is undertaken and the outcome reported to Cabinet by September 2013
- l) recommend to Council that the working assumption associated with the review for budget planning will have a positive impact on the budget gap of £300k. This will not be effective until 2014/15

# Agenda Item 4

## **Voluntary Community Faith Options**

- m) agree the approach outlined in para 3.5 and that the working assumption for budget planning will have a positive impact on the budget gap of £0.940k over the two year period

## **Double Rating**

- n) approve the commencement of consultation and recommend to Council that the budget plan includes a working assumption associated with this third option of £180k in (2014/15) i.e. the saving options original assumptions have been reduced.

## **Annex C**

- o) consider the options in Annex C and have due regard to the information contained, consider these options and recommend their approval to Council and authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately pending final decisions

## **Annex D Options previously approved for consultation - Adult Social Care**

- p) consider the options in Annex D and have due regard to the information contained, consider these options and recommend their approval to Council and authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately pending final decisions

## **Part 4 New Options for Consideration**

### **Financing Options**

- q) consider and approve the use of the Learning Disabilities and Health Reform and the Small business Rate relief grant to support the financing of the budget
- r) consider and approve the use of capital resources to fund the disabled facilities grant contribution of £1m for each of the two years. This use to be the first call on available capital resources in both years
- s) agree that officers continue to identify ways of reducing the expenditure relating to integrated transport and recycling and waste management, including a review of the levy mechanisms for the joint bodies.
- t) consider and approve the principle of the introduction of an opt in charge for Green Waste collections in 2014 subject to the changes in the levy mechanism in q) above
- u) recommend to Council an income assumption of £1m in respect of Green Waste collections

### **Other Adjustments**

- v) recommend to Council a budget planning adjustment of £70k to cover membership of LGA and NWE – 2013/14 and subsequent years.

## Service Options

- w) consider the options presented in Annex E and approve the recommendations as described
- x) consider and approve the introduction of a Community “Transition Fund” and to allow for “Invest to Save” initiatives initially for £1m
- y) agree the commencement of consultation with the community, partners, employees and Trade Unions with regard to the provision of the Local History service and the volunteer co-ordination activity in parks (dependent on recommendation u)
- z) approve the commencement of a conversation with schools regarding the School Crossing Service

## Part 6 Robustness and Risk

aa)note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in Annexes of this report in making its recommendations to Council

and

bb)requested to approve a general delegation of authority to the Head of Finance and ICT in consultation with the Head of Corporate Legal Services in appropriate cases to negotiate a settlement within the existing provision held within the accounts

cc)agree the budget proposals and the two year plan to be incorporated into the budget to be recommended to Council on February 28<sup>th</sup> 2013

## How does the decision contribute to the Council’s Corporate Objectives?

	<u>Corporate Objective</u>	<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community			√
2	Jobs and Prosperity			√
3	Environmental Sustainability			√
4	Health and Well-Being			√
5	Children and Young People			√
6	Creating Safe Communities			√
7	Creating Inclusive Communities			√
8	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening Local Democracy			√

## Reasons for the recommendations

The recommendations in this report, if approved, are significant step in agreeing the 2013/14 budget and a two year budget plan. Despite the increase in the forecast budget gap there are sufficient options and assumptions to meet the forecast budget gap

# Agenda Item 4

assuming the Cabinet approves the reports recommendations. However additional budget savings and options will need to be identified should the savings gap increase and/or those options currently identified are not approved or delivered. It is a legal requirement to set a balanced budget and to ensure the medium term financial position is robust.

## **FD2073 What will it cost and how will it be financed?**

### **(A) Revenue Costs**

The recent provisional Government announcement on the Revenue Settlement for 2013/14 and 2014/15 has identified a further reduction in resources for the Council. As a result, the previously identified budget gap of £43.7m has now increased to £50.8m.

### **(B) Capital Costs**

The Government has also announced that, unlike previous years, there will not be a process to allow capitalisation bids to help authorities spread the costs of equal pay claims. They have however agreed that local authorities can use the receipts from asset sales to meet such costs.

With regard to capitalisation directions for redundancy costs, no announcements have yet been made.

### **Implications:**

The following implications of this proposal have been considered and where there are specific implications, these are set out below:

#### **Legal LD 1389/2013**

There are no direct legal implications arising from the contents of this report. However in the course of each of the individual projects, consultations, options etc. to achieve the savings required detailed consideration should be given to the legal, human rights and equality implications. Such consideration will also need to be evidenced to ensure that the Council's decision making processes are defensible. Recommendations in this report contribute towards a legally balanced budget.

#### **Human Resources**

The proposals contained within this report have a potential impact upon employees and the potential for both voluntary and compulsory redundancies. It will be necessary for the Authority to comply with the duty to consult with recognised Trade Unions and employees and to complete as necessary a notification under Section 188 of the Trade Union Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992. Also form HR1 to the Department of Business Innovation and Skills notifying of redundancies has been filed. Full and meaningful consultation should continue to take place with the Trade Unions and employees on the matters contained within this report.



## Equality

1.	No Equality Implication	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Equality Implications identified and mitigated	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	Equality Implications identified and risk remains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Impact on Service Delivery:

Service implications as currently understood are described within the options and proposals in this report.

### What consultations have taken place on the proposals and when?

- a questionnaire available on the Councils website, in libraries, One Stop Shops and Town Halls
- Over 50 meetings and workshops with the public, voluntary, community and faith networks as part of the consultation on the Sefton Strategic Needs Assessment
- A telephone survey on setting a balanced budget
- The use of You Choose the budget simulator via the website
- Also bespoke consultations such as libraries

Regular and ongoing consultations have taken place with Directors, employees and Trade Unions.

Further information is contained in the annexes of this report.

### Are there any other options available for consideration?

Any new options identified by Members, Officers, public or partners will be assessed for feasibility and financial implications and will be reported to future meetings as appropriate.

### Implementation Date for the Decision

Can be as set out in the individual options, subject to call in or it will be the subject of a further report for consideration by Members in due course

### Contact Officers:

Margaret Rawding, Head of Corporate Finance & ICT

Tel: 0151 934 4082

Email: [Margaret.rawding@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:Margaret.rawding@sefton.gov.uk)

Jan McMahon, Head of Transformation Services

Tel: 0151 934 4431

Email: [jan.mcmahon@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:jan.mcmahon@sefton.gov.uk)

# Agenda Item 4

## Background Papers:

### Are available at

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13416&path=13193>

- Response to the Consultation on Payments in Connection with Local Retention of Non-Domestic Rates and Revenue Support Grant for 2013-14 and Related Matters.
- Developing the Budget Consultation Report
- Proposed Fees & Charges Booklet
- Feedback to Landscape Services Junior Sports Pitch Charges Consultation Charges – September to December 2012 (F1.2)
- Feedback to Landscape Services Cemeteries and Crematoria Consultation Charges – September 2012 to January 2013 (F1.4)

## Part 1

### **1) Government Provisional Settlement Announcement 19 December 2012**

- 1.1 On the 19 December, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government announced details of the provisional local government finance settlement for 2013/2014 with indicative figures for 2014/2015. Section 78 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 requires the Secretary of State to consult on the settlement proposals. Local authorities had until 15 January 2013 to make representations; Sefton's response to the Secretary of State is available as a background paper. A further consultation period was announced 24<sup>th</sup> January allowing representations until 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013.
- 1.2 There will be significant changes in local government funding in 2013/2014 as a result of the Government Finance Act 2012. The Act introduces a move to local business rates retention which will see councils retain a share of their local business rates. The local government finance settlement takes this change into account using a start-up funding calculation, a notional business rates baseline and a system of top-ups and tariffs.
- 1.3 The Government are continuing with the austerity measures announced in the Spending Review 2010, with additional funding reductions announced in the Chancellors subsequent Budget and Autumn Statements. This has had a significant negative impact on the Council's external funding.
- 1.4 The Annex A gives a detailed description of the government funding as announced in the provisional finance settlement. It also identifies the estimated level of Business Rates to be retained by the Council in 2013/2014 and the impact of the funding allocations on the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- 1.5 In summary the impact of the settlement announcement of 19 December 2012 is:-

Budget Gap for 2013/15 reported to Council in previous reports	£43.7m
Further reductions in funding announced*	<u>£7.1m</u>
Total Gap to be addressed	<b><u>£50.8m</u></b>

\*Members should note that the funding announcements for 2013/14 are subject to Parliamentary approval. 2014/15 funding is based on the announcement and the Autumn Statement of 5 December but is the best available information available and will be subject to change over the coming year.

To deliver a balanced financial plan for the two years Council will need to agree policy changes and budget for reduced net expenditure of £50.8m. The latest financial position is as follows;

# Agenda Item 4

	£m	£m
Adjusted Budget Gap		50.800
The November Council approved savings of	15.549	
Items previously approved by Cabinet, or subject to consultation	<u>22.950</u>	
Options progressed or out to consultation currently total		<u>38.499</u>
This leaves a remaining gap of		<u>12.301</u>

**It must be strongly emphasised that these figures anticipate that all the options already approved by Cabinet for consultation can be taken as savings. Should this prove not to be the case for whatever reason this will be reported to Cabinet as part of robust budget monitoring and implementation management.**

Cabinet is asked to note that figures and phasing in these annexes are working assumptions of options to be considered and the figures should not be seen as predetermining any decisions. **Some of these options remain subject to consultation, engagement and Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) assessment, and any figures indicated are being used to facilitate outline budgetary forecasting only.**

## **2. Part 2**

### **Consultation & Engagement Overview**

- 2.1 An initial package of potential budget options was approved by Cabinet, 13<sup>th</sup> September 2012, to commence consultation and engagement.
- 2.2 Formal consultation on setting a balanced budget commenced on the 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012 and closed on the 7<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The purpose of the consultation was to seek the views of the public on a set of principles to assist the Council in the development of policies in relation to service areas as described at 2.8 above. Methods included the use of a questionnaire via the website, e-consult and hard copy, interactive 'Planning For Real' workshops with groups and members of the community and the You Choose on-line budget simulator. In addition engagement on the thematic areas, such as changes to the way in which day care services are provided and from where, has been undertaken. The consultation and engagement plans were agreed at the meeting of the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel on the 21<sup>st</sup> September 2012.
- 2.3 Media briefings and media releases were also used to sign post interested parties to the full range of options being considered by the Council.
- 2.4 A Telephone survey has also been undertaken with a relevant sample group of residents to ensure impartial feedback.
- 2.5 Members will note from the detailed information in Annex B that respondents are in broad agreement with the principles that the Council should endeavour to prioritise services for the most vulnerable, that the Council should deliver value for money through efficiency and the buying of services before reducing or ceasing services. They also agreed that some services should be fully paid for by service users with no contribution from Council Tax Payers, for example planning applications, tourism and leisure. Respondents were also in broad agreement that the Council should simplify processes and procedures to support businesses, and should be open and transparent by keeping people informed and publishing customer standards so the public know what they can expect from the

Council. There was also agreement with the principle that the Council should help communities to reduce their reliance on public sector services through working with the private and voluntary sectors. The majority of respondents said they would be likely to volunteer in their community. The figures represent a collective snapshot of public opinion. However further analysis will be undertaken to identify any serious points of divergence linked to particular groups upon which the Council may have to have due regard when deciding future policies and practices.

- 2.6 The Council also received written communications from groups such as Sefton Partnership for Older Citizens and this feedback will be considered in progressing any options. The Council will continue to ensure that the public and other interested parties are aware of the next steps of the budget setting process and how they may engage in future processes - including the Full Council meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013. Cabinet is asked to note and take account of the feedback outlined in Annex B.
- 2.7 Weekly meetings continue with the Trade Unions. Proposals from departments are in different stages of consultation.

### **3. Part 3**

#### **Options previously approved for Consultation**

##### **Public Sector Equality Duty**

- a) As the Council continues to put actions into place to set a sustainable budget plan for 2013/14 and 2014/15 there is a need to be clear and precise about our processes to ensure that duties under the Equality Act 2010 are met. The Council constantly builds in to its thinking the equality implications to changes in services and mitigating risk as appropriately as possible. This research and subsequent findings are put before Members in the form of quality assurance statements or reports to ensure that Members make decisions in an open minded balanced way showing due regard to the impact of the recommendations being presented in compliance with the Equality Act 2010.
- b) The options outlined in Annexes B, C and D have been and continue to be subject to appropriate consultation, engagement and PSED analysis as part of the process of assessing impact in order to have due regard to the Council's obligations under the Equality Act 2010. Where appropriate a PSED analysis report or statement is provided which identifies any potential impact on those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions to be taken should any risks remain. Cabinet is requested to note and take account of the detail within the PSED analysis reports or statements, the consultation feedback and the mitigating actions within each option in taking their decisions on the recommendations to Council.
- c) Reducing budgets and activities is a difficult task, and one that the Council has to balance with the needs of the community. It is clear from our Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and feedback from our local population, that the people of Sefton recognise that some members of our community need more support and services than others. In reviewing the recommendations within the reports presented, Members need to endeavour to keep this in view and balance the needs of the few with the needs of the general population whilst showing due regard to all statutory duties.

# Agenda Item 4

- 3.1 **F1.3 - Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for organised junior sports activities-** Following extensive consultation Cabinet is asked to agree that this option is not progressed at this point. As part of the consultation process the opportunity to undertake further work with the community, partners and other interested parties has been identified. This will enable the Council to explore whether or not there is any potential opportunity to reduce longer term financial impact on the users of these facilities and the Council.
- 3.2 **D1.26 Governance & Civic Services – Mayoral services - reduce the function of Mayor to the statutory minimum (that is to Chair the Council meeting).** Cabinet is asked to agree that this option is not progressed at this point.
- 3.3 **Terms & Conditions –** A lengthy and robust consultation has taken place with the trade unions in respect of terms and conditions. An initial package of £6 million was approved for consultation by Cabinet. During this consultation it became apparent that these proposals, in their entirety, would result in significant industrial relations issues and the necessity for the Council to leave the National Agreement.
- 3.3.1 Following further continued consultation with trade unions, they reaffirmed their existing position that they would not agree to changes to terms and conditions. Officers have attempted to reach a position which balances the need to achieve savings with the impact of changes on service delivery and the potential disruption caused by industrial action.
- 3.3.2 It is therefore recommended that the following is implemented (subject to further consultation with all recognised trade unions) to achieve a £3m saving over the 2 year period:
- (i) There will be no incremental progression for any employees of the Council (with the exception of any employees who are employed on statutory contracts, i.e. teachers who are centrally employed). All NJC, JNC – HAY, Red Book, Youth Workers - JNC and Soulbury will therefore not have any form of incremental progression in 2013/2014 or 2014/15. This measure will deliver a projected saving of £1.69m in 2013/14 and a further £1.5m 2014/15. This measure will not apply in schools whose Governing Body controls such matters.
  - (ii) The 4 day shutdown over the Christmas period continues on the current basis, i.e. deductions continue to apply to employees and management reserves the right for the employee not to work over a shutdown period. This will become a permanent feature within employee contracts, however, the Council retains a discretion to make employees work over the period if needed. The concessionary day no longer applies in any form.
- 3.3.3 Given that the freeze in increments will, it is anticipated, produce £190,000 more than the £3m figure, this figure be utilised to try and mitigate some of the effect to lower paid workers. It must be stressed that this mitigation cannot be a payment of £250 to those earning less than £21,000 (i.e. the level at which the Government suggested that such a payment should be made in the public sector and a figure requested by the trade unions) as this would cost in the region of £415,000, however, consultation will take place with trade unions as to possible mitigation using the figure of £190,000. Any consultation on

this matter, the trade unions have made clear, does not reflect an agreement in respect of the implementation detailed above.

- 3.3.4 It must be stressed that employees have not enjoyed incremental progression, up to and including 2013/14, of 5 years for HAY Management grades and 4 years for NJC and other grades.
- 3.3.5 Officers have also stressed that during and after the 2 year period, challenges remain in terms of issues concerning the workforce. There is a need for ongoing consultation considering terms and conditions options and the trade unions have made clear that in terms of such measures they have made no agreement but are committed in the future to a partnership approach. The trade unions (UNISON, GMB and UNITE) have expressed a view that to carry out this work there will need to be the continuation of current facility time arrangements. The Head of Corporate Personnel has agreed to keep these views in mind when reviewing and making recommendations within the 2 year period.
- 3.3.6 Implementation as necessary will utilise the Chief Executive's delegated authority to write in terms as appropriate. This involves a technical need to end current contracts and substitute the new contracts. This process is technically a dismissal and re-engagement, and requires form HR1 and Section 188 which will be appropriately served. This will preserve the existing position for employees Implementation will take place by letter at the end of February 2012.
- 3.4 **F1.1 Non Cancelling PCN for Incorrect Display, D1.31 Parking – Car Parking – On and Off street parking charge increases and the introduction of new on street parking charges.** Consultation is continuing and Officers have undertaken further analysis and risk assessment. It is now proposed that the Council prepares a strategic review of car parking policy across the borough and considers how new technologies could be deployed to transform the service. Cabinet is asked to agree that this review is undertaken and the outcome reported to Cabinet by September 2013 Cabinet is also asked to recommend to Council that the budget plan includes a working assumption associated with the review of £300k (2014/15) i.e. the saving options original assumptions have been reduced.
- 3.5 **F3.1 Decommission VCF Youth & Childhood services, F3.3 Reduced Adult Social Care VCF Commissioning, F4.2 Review VCF and D1.28 Reduce Funding to VCF organisations.** Within the last few years, considerable work has been undertaken with the Voluntary/Community and Faith sector to ensure that it remains a significant partner working with the Council to deliver Sefton's priorities.

The next year will see the consolidation of this work and in particular focus on effective commissioning of services from the VCF sector and building community capacity and resilience, especially through working with the unfunded sector. A one Council approach will be taken. At this stage, the overall saving proposed for the VCF sector from these options is £0.940m over the budget plan period.

In accordance with previous approvals by Cabinet a number of organisations have been given notice of decommissioning activity and or a reduction in funding. Details of these changes are listed below

# Agenda Item 4

Organisation	Value of saving/reduction	Reason
<b>Early Intervention Prevention Service:</b>		
Homestart Southport & Formby	£48,886	Early Intervention Service is being redesigned to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focus on targeted work, not universal</li> <li>• reduce duplication</li> <li>• provide robust evidence of impact on reducing risks of harm to our most vulnerable groups of children and young people</li> </ul>
Homestart West Lancashire	£26,480	
May Logan Healthy Living Centre	£40,850	
Sefton Play Council	£40,000	
Queen's Road Neighbourhood Centre	£73,150	
<b>Adult Social Care:</b>		
Sefton Carers Centre - Hospital Link worker-project	£64,550	Duplication with other services
Addaction Alcohol service	£6,525	Retender of service
Merseyside Partners	£7,000	Reduced need and value for money
Achieving People CVS	£37,500	Duplication with other providers

Lead officers have been in discussions with each of the organisations impacted to secure reductions in funding and or the decommissioning of activities. This will continue with clear engagement mechanisms being put in place through partnership arrangements. The Quality Assurance group has reviewed these proposals recognises that commissioning arrangements will ensure that PSED will be considered as part of the decommissioning and recommissioning process.

Cabinet is asked to agree this approach, the above decommissioning and or reductions, merge these options together into one and recommend to Council that a budget reduction of £0.940m be phased over the two year period.

3.6. **Double Rating** - two options have previously been included in previous Cabinet reports totalling £63k, As a result of the increased budget pressure a further option is now proposed which will remove all double rating from 2014/15. Parishes will be consulted over any residual impact and the timing of implementation will allow Parishes time to consider changes in their funding. Cabinet is asked to approve the commencement of consultation and recommend to Council that the budget plan includes a working assumption associated with this third option of £180k in (2014/15) i.e. the saving options original assumptions have been reduced.



# Agenda Item 4

3.7 **Annex C** contains a number of options for further consideration. Cabinet is asked to consider the change proposals in Annex C.

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Working Assumption</u> <u>£000</u>
Learning & Support	D1.16	Reduce School Targeted Intervention	260
Early Intervention & Prevention	D1.17	Healthy Schools – Transfer the function of co-ordination and consultant roles to schools	60
Children's Social Care	D1.18	Social Care – Central Management & Support Costs – A restructure and a re-alignment of duties to remaining posts.	100
Street Scene	D1.19	Building Cleaning – change of frequency in office cleaning	100
Environment	D1.20	Trading Standards – staffing restructure	50
Infrastructure & Investment Programme	C3.1	Re-integration, re-commission and restructuring of services – Built Environment	500
Corporate Commissioning	D1.21	Communications- Integration of Staff	40
C3.2	Home Improvements	Housing Improvement Agency service brought in house	37
F1.2	Grounds Maintenance	Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for adult football/sports users/bowlers	85
F1.4	Cemeteries and Crematoria	Increase burial and cremation charges	400
F4.3	Commissioning	Double Rating (* See Above)	33
D1.30	Environment	Pest Control Introduction of a charge	30
<b>Total</b>			1,695

3.8 These options have been updated in the light of the consultation and are now presented for Cabinet for consideration and to make the appropriate recommendation to Council, should further related opportunities and or significant issues arise between now and next Cabinet Officers will advise Members accordingly. Having due regard for the information contained in Annex C Cabinet is asked to consider these proposals and recommend their approval to Council and authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately, pending final decisions of Council including the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if appropriate to achieve change.

3.9 Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures and this will include regular HR monitoring reports to the Cabinet Member Corporate Services.

# Agenda Item 4

3.10 As Members are aware Adult Social Care, both nationally and locally, is going through a period of great change. The funding pressure on adult social care services, throughout the country, is increasing and will continue to do so as a consequence of demographic change, including an ageing population. This is happening at a time of reducing resources. There is a statutory requirement for local authorities to ensure services are provided to those with eligible need. The Council's challenge is to deliver assessed adult social care need and implement the transformation agenda in the face of increasing demand and reduced resources.

3.11 Annex D brings together the budget options associated with service delivery for Adult Social Care as detailed in the table below;

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Working Assumption £000</b>
D1.14	Assessment & Care Management Teams – Reconfiguring of teams and skill mix.	208
D1.15	Reconfiguration of the Supporting People Commissioning team	186
F1.6	Streamlined model for Community Meals	200
F3.2	Remodel Day Opportunities	5,990
D1.39	Remodel all current day care and transport	
D1.41	Respite – offer to be reduced from a range to up to a 14 days per year	
D1.35	Section 117 After Care funding – The Council will work with Health colleagues, to assess service users who receive 117 funding and conduct reviews based upon a model of care that promotes recovery.	200
D1.36	Continuing Health Care- prioritise and undertake reviews of service users currently in nursing care to ensure that they are supported via appropriate agencies.	400
D1.37	Assistive Technology– increase the use of equipment that enables service users (vulnerable people) to remain in their own homes with minimal outside support	200
D1.38	Increase charges for a range of services, these are an increase of charges to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of disposable income (currently 80%) - Currently Service users will contribute 80% of their disposable income toward their care or service costs and this option will mean a change in Council policy so that 100% of disposable income is considered in the financial assessment process.</li> <li>• Reduce disability related expenditure (DRE) which presently stands at £16.00 per user per week to £11.00 per week. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> <li>• Couples – disregard income buffer when assessing care needs. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> </ul>	564
D1.40	Recover surplus, unspent Direct Payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150.	752
D1.42	Revise Re-ablement model – To obtain, one year only, funding available from Health of £900,000 to enable more users to go through an improved re-ablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short & long term care.	1,200

# Agenda Item 4

D1.43	Further incremental reductions in housing related support	500
	<b>Total</b>	10,400

3.12 As mentioned earlier in the report it was anticipated that in developing options there would be options with multiple implications and potential cumulative effects that would increase their complexity.

3.13 Cabinet should be aware that the information in this annex in some instances in interim but will enable Cabinet to form a view in order to consider the impact and risks across the whole service. The approaches being taken to consultation are also described and feedback to date from the ongoing consultation exercise is provided where appropriate. In addition to this Members will be familiar with feedback from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Cabinet is asked to identify any further information, if any, required by Members for consideration at the next Cabinet meeting on 14th February 2013 in order to inform their recommendation to 28<sup>th</sup> February Council based on an understanding of need.

3.14 Cabinet will recall that the options identified in the table below are still subject to consultation plus the Libraries Review;

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Working Assumption £000</b>
D1.24	Street Scene	Cleansing – cease provision of free plastic sacks excluding those premises which are currently identified as ‘difficult to access’	60
D1.32		Closure of all public conveniences across the Borough	52
D1.25	Economy	Cease subscription arrangement to Mersey Forest Voluntary reduction of working hours	51
D1.27	Corporate Commissioning	Corporate Commissioning and Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service – rationalise service	200
		<b>Total</b>	363

# Agenda Item 4

3.15 The impact of changes identified in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.14 are identified below: -

	£m
<b>Remaining Gap (para. 1.5)</b>	12.301
Recharging Junior Sports Activities (para 3.1)	0.000
Mayoral Services (Para. 3.2)	0.000
Terms and Conditions (Para. 3.3)	3.000
Car Parking (Para. 3.4)	-0.300
VCF (Para. 3.5)	0.000
Double Rating (Para. 3.6)	-0.150
School Targeted Intervention (Para. 3.7)	-0.160
Adult Social Care (Para. 3.11)	-0.900
<b>Revised Gap</b>	<b>13.791</b>

## Part 4

### 4. New Options for Consideration by Cabinet

#### Financing Options

- a) Subsequent to the December 2012 announcement the Government has identified additional resources to fund the cost of Small Business relief (see para. 3.5) and has also made clear the conditions attached to the NHS support for Social Care.

These developments allow the Council to use the additional resources to bridge the funding gap by £1.2m and £1.7m respectively over the timescale of medium term financial plan.

- dd) This allows a transfer of resources to fund the Council's Disabled Facilities Grant contribution for up to four years from capital instead of revenue. It is stressed that this is a medium term option but will need major review from 2017 and the consequences will be built into future financial plans. This use to be the first call on available capital resources in both years

# Agenda Item 4

## ee) Levy Payments

The budget plan assumes the following levy payments for 2013/14.

	2012/13	2013/14	
	Levy	Estimated	Estimated
	£	Levy	Change
		£	£
Environment Agency	147,288	147,288	0
Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority	25,682,000	25,248,000	-434,000
Merseyside Recycling & Waste Authority	12,613,601	11,867,612	-745,989
North West Sea Fisheries	59,248	59,248	0
Port Health	79,500	79,500	0
	<u>38,581,637</u>	<u>37,401,648</u>	<u>-1,179,989</u>

- c) Integrated Transport and Recycling and Waste Management - the Council is a Member of joint bodies that provide Integrated Transport (Mersey Integrated Transport Authority and the Mersey recycling and Waste Authority). These responsibilities are paid for through a levy that each of these authorities raise each year. Sefton's reducing population and increasing recycling means that each of these levies is estimated to reduce in future years. The level of levy savings that can be utilised to fund other council services is restricted by the new requirements to hold a referendum if there is an "excessive" increase in Council tax, i.e. spending on non levy services increases by more than 2%. All Merseyside Local Authorities have made a commitment to review the levy mechanisms to maximise the levy savings which can be used to support other Council services. The financial plan includes a total target reduction in waste and integrated transport expenditure of £4m by 2014/15 in addition to the green waste proposal identified below.
- d) Subject to agreeing changes to how the Merseyside Recycling and Waste Authority and associated waste services are funded Cabinet is asked to consider and approve in principle the introduction of an opt-in charge for Green Waste collections from April 2014 onwards. It is recognised that this is likely to have an impact on the Council's overall recycling rate, however, it is forecast that the net potential impact on the budget gap will be in the region of £1m (2014/15). Should Cabinet approve this change standard Council procedures will be observed in respect of informing the public of the removal of the subsidy for providing this service and provide an opportunity to seek opinion on the level of charge that residents would be willing to pay to use the green waste collection service. Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council a budget planning adjustment of £1m in 2014/15, subject to appropriate levy arrangements with the Waste Disposal Authority at that time.

### **Other adjustments and assumptions**

- a) The Council is a member of both the Local Government Association and the North West Employers Association and determined to give each notice to withdraw notice from membership. The Council has benefitted from its ongoing membership of the LGA and in particular with respect to the joint legal action concerning the cost of local land searches. The council has also had support from the North West Employers during this financial year. The MTFP assumes cessation of both LGA and NWE membership further

# Agenda Item 4

evaluation of the cost benefits of membership of these two organisations identifies that the Council membership is a net economic benefit. Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council a budget planning adjustment of £70k to cover membership of LGA and NWE – 2013/14 and subsequent years.

- b) Council Tax – the financial plan assumes Council Tax freeze grant for 2013/14 would achieve £1.1m and is payable in both years. In 2014/15, following a review as described above, it is anticipated that to raise Council Tax to the maximum allowed without a referendum would achieve income of £1.4m in 2014/15. The Financial plan has been prepared on this basis. Clearly the Council meeting of 28th February will formally consider the level of Council tax in 2013/14.

## Service Options

- 4.1 A further package of potential budget options on which approval to commence consultation and engagement activity with the community and specific groups of service users is sought (Annex E). The potential impact and risks associated with these options have been assessed based on current knowledge and understanding.
- 4.2 Cabinet is asked to consider these options in the light of the new financial forecast. These options if approved will still be subject to appropriate consultation, engagement and information processes plus testing against PSED, notably and importantly, estimates of the financial impact to aid the budgetary planning process have been made but should not be seen as predetermining any policy decisions.
- 4.3 The Council will continue to work with and listen to the community and partners during the budget plan period and should alternative solutions be identified these will be considered by Cabinet.

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Working Assumption</u> <u>£000</u>
Learning & Support	To effect a further saving from the retained element of the Connexions Grant. This will include redefining the service provided in terms of information, advice and guidance to young people in context of required legislation.	400
Children's Services	To review the pathway of support for children with additional needs to ensure that it is more effective and efficient.	400
Health & Wellbeing	Management fee reduction - Formby Pool Contract-	50
Public Health Substance Misuse	Reduced service specification-	500
Investment & Infrastructure	Increase income coming from Network Management	50
Economy	Southport Theatre Complex	100
Economy & Neighbourhoods	Withdraw financial support from Southport's Christmas Lights and Christmas trees across the borough	30
Corporate Support	Further savings from Learning & Development (including departmental budgets)	50
	Further savings from public health integration	100
Democratic	Reduce the number of Area committees from 7 to 3	20

# Agenda Item 4

Services	Stop servicing all non-member meetings and those non-standing committees without decision-making powers. Reduce frequency of meetings and review of Overview and Scrutiny Committees.	51
Council Tax	Charge 100% on empty properties from month 2	400
		<b>2,151</b>

- 4.4 In developing and delivering the budget plan that the Council is aiming to work with partner organisations to facilitate community responsibility and capacity to reduce the reliance on public sector services and seek to implement efficient and effective support systems and processes, achieving efficiencies before service reduction or cessation. Members will note from the feedback from the consultation and engagement activities that have taken place that 74% of those surveyed via the telephone agreed with this approach, and 65% agreed through completing the on-line survey. It is recognised that to achieve success in this area the Council will need to, where resources allow, facilitate and enable this transition. Cabinet is asked to consider and approve the introduction of a Community “Transition Fund/Invest to Save” initially for £1m aimed at creating capacity within the community to reduce the reliance on Council resources and services. The creation of this fund being in part a reflection of the Council’s underlying financial position and it is anticipated that the fund will not be sufficient to meet all requirements and as such the usage of the fund will need to be prioritised.
- 4.5 Should Cabinet agree this approach Cabinet is asked to agree the commencement of consultation with the community, partners, employees and Trade Unions with regard to the provision of the Local History service (described in Annex E) and the volunteer co-ordination activity in parks. The aim of these consultations will be to seek practical solutions as to how the Council can support the creation of capacity within the community so reducing the reliance on Council resources. Any transitional arrangements may then be resourced through the proposed Transition Fund. For budget planning purposes Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council a budget adjustment (2014/15) of £40k in respect of Local History and £175k (2014/15) Parks & Green Spaces. The increased savings from Parks and Greenspaces budgets, on top of the substantial savings previously agreed, will be achieved by further re-engineering of the service, using the methodology adopted as part of this process. The impact will be a further significant reduction in standards of park management, with the aim of partly mitigating this by pro-actively supporting increased volunteer activity. If this level of volunteer activity is not forthcoming, there will be no mitigation and standards will decrease even further. Cabinet is also asked to approve the commencement of a conversation with schools regarding the School Crossing Service.

The impact of changes identified in paragraphs are identified below: -

# Agenda Item 4

	<b>£m</b>
<b>Remaining Gap (para. 3.15)</b>	<b>13.791</b>
<u>Financing Adjustments</u>	
Small Business Rate Relief	-1.171
NHS Support for Social Care	-1.748
Reduction in levies (2013/14)	-1.180
Additional changes to charges from Waste / Transport Authorities	-2.820
Green Waste Collections	-1.000
Funding of Disabled Facility Grants	-1.000
Council Tax Freeze Grant (2013/14)	-1.180
Increased resources from Council Tax (2014/15)	-1.396
Local Government Association membership	0.045
North West Employers membership	0.025
<u>Service Reductions</u>	
Paragraphs (4.3 – 4.5)	-2.366
<b>Revised Gap</b>	<b>Nil</b>

## 5. Part 5

### Two Year Budget Plan

- 5.1 Cabinet and Council have endorsed the approach of developing a two year budget plan. This will enable a longer term view to be taken and will ensure a robust and deliverable financial plan. This is particularly important given the scale of the reductions and the need to release capacity of Members and Officers to plan the future shape of the Council.
- 5.2 All of the options presented to date have been expressed in the context of the two year plan. Attached at Annexe F is a summary of the plan and this will be refined prior to the Budget Council on 28<sup>th</sup> February to identify
- a) The implementation date of each option.
  - b) The financial consequences in each of the two years including the part year impact where appropriate.
  - c) The key assumptions.
  - d) The risk of underachievement particularly where there is a dependency on other organisations.
- 5.3 The summary at Annexe F indicates that if the recommendations included in this report are approved and the specified assumptions are delivered the Council could achieve a balanced budget for the next two years. This position will be reviewed further prior to the Budget Council to ensure it remains viable. In particular Overview and Scrutiny Committee will consider the budget plan on February 19<sup>th</sup>.



- 5.4 It will be obvious to Members that the plan carries significant risk. This is articulated in more detail in Part 6 of the report. However it is clear that the implementation of this plan will need to be carefully managed to ensure that policy changes are implemented in a timely and effective manner and that financial savings are delivered. To this end implementation plans are being drawn up to complement the overall financial plans.
- 5.5 As indicated above this initial two-year plan will be reviewed prior to the final version being presented to Budget Council on February 28<sup>th</sup>.

## **6. Part 6**

### **Robustness and Risk**

- 6.1 The Council continues to regularly review strategic and operational risks and put in place measures to manage those risks. However it must be stressed that reductions of the level required by Government cannot be achieved in a risk free environment. There will be significant risk associated with the budget options, which will be mitigated where possible. It must be recognised that it is no longer possible to mitigate all aspects of risk. In those circumstances steps will be taken to ensure they are identified and managed within the limited resources available.
- 6.2 All options contained in the annexes of this report have been risk assessed by the relevant senior officers with mitigating actions identified where possible. These risks have been assessed and will be managed in the light of new financial forecasts. Cabinet is asked to note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in making its recommendations to Council.
- 6.3 Officers continue to monitor risks and issues, escalating significant risks and issues to Cabinet as appropriate.
- 6.4 The Council has outstanding litigation. In some cases in order to minimise the impact a settlement may be the best course of action bearing in mind the Council's budget provision in future years. Cabinet is requested to approve a general delegation of authority to the Head of Finance and ICT in consultation with the Head of Corporate Legal Services in appropriate cases to negotiate a settlement within the existing provision held within the accounts. Any such settlement will be reported to the appropriate Cabinet Member.
- 6.5 **Key Budget Assumptions and Financial Risks**

The proposed budget makes assumptions about the level of demand for Children and Adult Services. The increasing demand faced by Sefton, and nationally, will be a key risk throughout the foreseeable future. Current overspends in the Adults Care budget has been supported by additional external funding received during the year. The budget for 2013/14 and 2014/15 will face similar pressures and although additional resources have been identified to support this demand it will require robust monitoring and management to minimise the risk to overspend.

The budget also assumes the continuation of the current low bank interest rates until at least 2015. This approach is supported by the Council's external advisors. The longer term view would be monitored closely.

# Agenda Item 4

The estimated level of uncommitted balances at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 is £4m. This assumes that the 2012/13 position is balanced. Current monitoring reports suggest that the 2012/13 budget will be on target, balancing net increased demand for social care with additional funding from the PCT. Any surplus would ordinarily be added to general balances. The planned contributions from general balances in 2012/13 within the MTFP have been reported to Cabinet as part of the 2012/13 monitoring reports.

General fund balances are amounts set aside to cushion the impact of unexpected events and emergencies. They should not ordinarily be used to underpin the budget unless it is part of a strategic plan.

The Council will be provided with a report detailing the budget risks to support it in determining the robustness and deliverability of the financial plan and its sustainability.

## 7. Part 7

### **Next Steps & Conclusion**

- 7.1 The Council is facing the greatest financial challenge in its history. A significant real terms reduction in Government funding coupled with a growing elderly population requires the Council to find further cuts of £50.8 million on top of the £64 million achieved in the last two years.
- 7.2 The options considered by Council and Cabinet have far reaching implications for our communities. Extensive consultation and engagement has attempted to identify alternatives and ways in which impact can be mitigated. Given the scale of the reductions there has been little opportunity to achieve this. However the Council continues to work productively with partners in order to shape services for the future and to ensure that pathway and processes are as streamlined as possible. The aim being to achieve the best outcome for our communities given the difficult circumstances.
- 7.3 In addition the Council is identifying ways in which it will work with the communities of Sefton in order to build capacity and find opportunities for more community involved services. This will be a major focus for the Council over the next two years and beyond. It is recognised that this will take time and facilitation across all partners but some dialogue has already started in areas such as libraries, football facilities, parks and economy. The Council is looking to establish a Community Resilience Transition Fund which will support this development. Further reports will be presented on the operation of this fund assuming the budget is approved.
- 7.4 A considerable amount of effort has been expended in developing the budget option and the two year plan contained in this report. It will be kept under review and following consideration by Overview and Scrutiny the final version will be considered by Council on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013.

## ANNEX A

### **Provisional Local Government Settlement and impact on the funding gap. Start-Up Funding Assessment**

In order to assess the level of formula grant that each authority receives under the Business Rates Retention Scheme, the Government has calculated a start-up funding assessment based on the 2012/2013 formula funding model. This model has been updated for data changes, changes to the methodology for calculating concessionary travel and rural services, and changes to the relative resources amount and central allocation. The formula funding level has then been reduced to take account of the transfer of funding for Central Education Functions to the Department for Education. A number of specific grants have also been included in the start-up funding assessment such as the Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2011/12.

Sefton's start-up funding assessment for 2013/2014 is shown in the table below:

<b>Start-Up Funding Assessment</b>	<b>2013/2014 £m</b>
<b>Formula Funding (before transfers)</b>	<b>110.881</b>
<b>Less Central Education Functions funding transfer</b>	<b>-5.506</b>
<b>Formula Funding (after transfers)</b>	<b>105.375</b>
<b>Council Tax Freeze Compensation</b>	<b>2.947</b>
<b>Council Tax Support Funding</b>	<b>20.673</b>
<b>Early Intervention Funding</b>	<b>8.348</b>
<b>Homelessness Prevention Funding</b>	<b>0.088</b>
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority Funding</b>	<b>0.121</b>
<b>Learning Disability and Public Health Reform Funding</b>	<b>4.453</b>
<b>Start-Up Funding Assessment</b>	<b>142.006</b>

Sefton's start-up funding assessment for 2014/2015 is shown in the table below:

<b>Start-Up Funding Assessment</b>	<b>2014/2015 £m</b>
<b>Formula Funding and Council Tax Support Funding</b>	<b>113.122</b>
<b>Council Tax Freeze Compensation</b>	<b>2.947</b>
<b>Early Intervention Funding</b>	<b>7.816</b>
<b>Homelessness Prevention Funding</b>	<b>0.088</b>
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority Funding</b>	<b>0.121</b>
<b>Learning Disability and Public Health Reform Funding</b>	<b>4.564</b>
<b>Start-Up Funding Assessment</b>	<b>128.658</b>

The bases of the Council's funding change from 2012/13 to 2013/14 and therefore like for like comparisons are not transparent. However, the key individual components that have changed are shown in this report.

### **Revenue Support Grant, Business Rates, Top-Ups and Tariffs**

The start-up funding assessment will be financed by a mixture of Revenue Support Grant, notional business rates and top-ups or tariffs. Where an authority does not raise

# Agenda Item 4

enough in notional business rates they will receive a Top-up grant. Those authorities that raise more notional business rates than their baseline will be required to pay a tariff.

Sefton's start-up funding assessment will be financed as follows:

	2013/2014 £m	2014/2015 £m
<b>Formula Grant</b>	<b>85.275</b>	<b>70.187</b>
<b>Top-Up Grant</b>	<b>23.353</b>	<b>24.069</b>
<b>Total Grant Allocation</b>	<b>108.628</b>	<b>94.256</b>
<b>Business Rates Baseline</b>	<b>33.378</b>	<b>34.402</b>
<b>Start-Up Funding Assessment</b>	<b>142.006</b>	<b>128.658</b>

The Revenue Support Grant and Top-up grant allocations for 2013/2014 are the actual amounts that will be received in the year. The allocations for 2014/2015 assume an increase in the September 2013 Retail Price Index of 3.067%. This is subject to change and could affect the funding received in 2014/2015.

The business rates baseline figure is a notional amount that the Government expects the Authority to be able to collect locally. It has been calculated at 49% of the Council's proportionate share of the national business rates aggregate. The reduction in business rate income will in future have a direct impact on the resources available in the MTFP. The calculation is shown below:

## ***Business Rates Baseline Calculation:***

<b>National Business Rates Aggregate 2013/14</b>		<b>£21,797,108,887</b>
<b>Multiply by Sefton's Proportionate Share</b>		<b>0.00312513459675</b>
<b>Forecast Business Rates</b>		<b>£68,118,899</b>
<b>Less Government's Share</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>-£34,059,450</b>
<b>Less Fire Authority Share</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>-£6,811,890</b>
<b>Sefton's Business Rates Baseline 2013/14</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>£33,378,261</b>
<b>Add Forecast Increase in RPI September 2013</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>£1,023,747</b>
<b>Sefton's Business Rates Baseline 2014/15</b>		<b>£34,402,008</b>

The actual level of business rates raised and retained locally is expected to vary from the Government's baseline figure. Each local authority is required to estimate the level of business rates it will collect and inform the Government via the National Non-Domestic Rates Return 1 (NNDR1). Sefton completed and returned a draft NNDR1 return on 7 January 2013. The draft return estimated that Sefton would retain business rates of £32,117,167 in 2013/2014. This is £1,261,094 lower than the business rates baseline. A large proportion of this gap is as a result of the extension of small business rate relief announced in the Autumn Statement. The additional cost of small business rate relief has been included in the NNDR1 return (per the DCLG guidance) but has not been taken account of in the business rates baseline. The DCLG have since indicated that the cost of the further extension of the Small Business Rate Relief scheme will be funded outside of the rate retention scheme.

Gross business rates yield has declined in the last two years and is continuing to decline in 2012/2013. The NNDR1 forecast assumes that yield will decline by 1% in 2013/2014.

# Agenda Item 4

If this trend continues in 2014/2015 the locally retained business rates forecast would reduce by a further £420,000 in 2014/2015.

There are some significant risks associated with localisation of business rates. Business rates income can be quite difficult to forecast due to the impact of changes in the value of reliefs, the level of non-payment, fluctuations in rateable value, and most significantly the value and timing of appeals.

During the past three years the value of payments due to appeals has ranged from £5.250m in 2009/2010 to £1.307m in 2011/2012. The Valuation Office Agency (VOA) has provided details of the number of appeals outstanding at the end of October 2012 and the total rateable value of the properties. There were 561 appeals outstanding on the 2010 rating list and 74 on the 2005 rating list. The rateable value of properties subject to appeals was £48.787m on the 2010 rating list and £7.253m on the 2005 rating list. However, the VOA has not provided any detail on how many of the outstanding appeals might be successful, the value of any potential refund that might be due or the timing of these payments. The draft NNDR1 return includes a provision for appeals of £3.571m for 2013/2014. This is based on 5% of the Gross Rate Yield after reliefs. The actual value of payments due to appeals could potentially be much higher.

## Specific and Special Grants

A number of specific and special grants have been announced as part of the local government finance settlement and in further announcements in January 2013. The grants announced are listed in the table below with the 2012/2013 figures provided for comparison:

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
	£	£	£
<b>Continuing Grants</b>			
<b>Council Tax Support New Burdens</b>	<b>84,000</b>	<b>190,296</b>	<b>163,416</b>
<b>Housing Benefit Subsidy Administration</b>	<b>2,351,281</b>	<b>2,235,024</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authorities</b>	<b>13,859</b>	<b>13,859</b>	<b>13,859</b>
<b>Lead Local Flood Authorities (LSSG)</b>	<b>37,546</b>	<b>37,546</b>	<b>37,546</b>
<b>New Homes Bonus</b>	<b>1,593,413</b>	<b>2,390,451</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Weekly Collection Support Scheme</b>	<b>64,553</b>	<b>230,212</b>	<b>172,659</b>
<b>New Grants</b>			
<b>Community Right to Bid</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>7,855</b>	<b>7,855</b>
<b>Community Right to Challenge</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>8,547</b>	<b>8,547</b>
<b>Local Reform and Community Voices DH</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>267,069</b>	<b>275,406</b>
<b>Public Health Funding</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>19,408,000</b>	<b>19,952,000</b>
<b>Social Fund - Programme Funding</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>955,455</b>	<b>955,455</b>
<b>Social Fund - Administration Funding</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>201,895</b>	<b>185,058</b>

The Government has yet to notify the Council of its funding for 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 for education support grant, and extended rights free travel grant (if continued).

# Agenda Item 4

## Impact on the Medium Term Financial Plan

An updated Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) was last reported to Cabinet on 21 June 2012. That report forecast a potential budget short fall of £21.7m in 2013/14 and a further gap of £22.0m in 2014/15. The external funding allocations announced in the provisional local government finance settlement are expected to increase the projected budget gap in both years to £25.0m and £25.8m (a total gap of £50.8m over both years) as summarised in the table below:

<b>Change in Projected Budget Gap</b>	<b><u>2013/2014</u></b> <b>£m</b>	<b><u>2014/2015</u></b> <b>£m</b>
<b><u>Start-Up Funding Assessment</u></b>		
<b>EIG: 2 Year Old Funding Transfer and £150m Top-Slice</b>	<b>2.205</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>EIG: Add Current Expenditure on 2 Year Olds</b>	<b>-0.494</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>EIG: Other EIG Reductions</b>	<b>1.244</b>	<b>0.532</b>
<b>Learning Disability and Health Reform Funding</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-0.111</b>
<b>Formula Funding Changes</b>	<b>-0.936</b>	<b>2.989</b>
<b><u>Business Rates Baseline</u></b>		
<b>Locally retained business rates lower than baseline</b>	<b>1.261</b>	<b>0.420</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.280</b>	<b>3.830</b>

## Annex B Consultation & Engagement Overview

### Developing the Council's Budget Plan Summary Findings

#### 1. You Choose – Summary

(this is a simulator of how people would make choices not their direct feedback on an option)

1.1 412 – started simulator and 149 completed the simulator

1.2 Responses to thematic areas

Thematic Areas	Average % reduction
Together empowering and supporting residents	26.27%
Together develop healthy & well supported communities	23.00%
Together develop attractive & sustainable places & communities	21.40%
Together develop access to opportunities for all	15.11%

1.3 A more in-depth picture indicates that Adult Social Care was the thematic area with the most average % reduction at 33.91%, followed closely by Personnel at 33.7% and Commissioning and Neighborhood Co-ordination at 32.83%. Economic Development, Tourism and Support for Children in Schools, received the lowest average % reduction at 12.26%, 14.85% and 16.59%.

Sub Thematic Area (Chart 3)	Average % reduction
Adult Social Care	33.91%
Personnel	33.70%
Commissioning and Neighbourhood Coordination	32.83%
Communications	28.91%
Technical Services and Asset Management Services	27.08%
Governance and Civic Services	25.48%
Insurances, levies and grants	24.99%
Direct Services	24.84%
Corporate Finance & ICT	24.73%
Environment	23.35%
Legal	21.89%

# Agenda Item 4

Children's Social Care	19.98%
Leisure & Tourism	19.93%
Planning Services	18.24%
Services for Children and Young People	18.17%
Landscape Services	17.65%
Business Intelligence and Performance	17.63%
Housing	17.25%
Support for Children with Special Educational Needs	16.73%
Support for Children in Schools	16.59%
Tourism	14.85%
Economic Development	12.26%

The results can provide an indication, but it is with the caveat that this is a snapshot and responses submitted on a daily basis can change the position at any time.

The 111 people who submitted their views gave in total 140 suggestions between them.

- 1.4 The top four suggestions made via You Choose were: reduce the number of staff, review services / working practices / reduce larger budgets and reduce pay and benefits.

## 2. Telephone Survey Results – Summary

- 2.1 Residents were asked about the extent to which they agreed with SMBC's Guiding Principles for setting budget options now and in the future.
- 2.2 More than four fifths (84%) of residents agreed with the Principle that SMBC should *target reducing resources at priorities*; one in ten (10%) disagreed.
- 2.3 Nearly nine in ten (87%) residents agreed with the Principle of *improving efficiency before reducing or ceasing services*; less than one in ten (8%) disagreed.
- 2.4 More than half of residents (54%) agreed with the Principle that *the Council should help communities to reduce their reliance on public sector services, for example, by removing subsidies from services other than those which meet the needs of the most vulnerable*. More than a third (35%) of residents disagreed with this Guiding Principle.
- 2.5 Around three quarters (74%) of residents agreed that *the Council needs to reduce the reliance of communities on public sector funding by working with the private and voluntary sectors to provide employment, retail and other opportunities*. A fifth (20%) of residents disagreed. Residents aged sixty-five or above were significantly more likely to agree.
- 2.6 Nearly all residents (97%) agreed with the Principle that *the Council should be open and transparent by speaking with and listening to people and communities, and by publishing*



# Agenda Item 4

*customer standards so that the public know what they can expect from the Council. Only 2% of residents disagreed with this Guiding Principle.*

- 2.7 Around nine in ten (91%) residents agreed that the that the Council's *main spending priority should be the most vulnerable*, for example, frail older people, young people in care and those with disabilities; 4% disagreed. Residents aged sixty-five or above were significantly more likely to agree.
- 2.8 All residents who did not disagree (i.e. all residents who agreed, or who neither agreed nor disagreed) that *the Council's main spending priority should be the most vulnerable*, were asked whether they would still hold the same view if *this meant spending less money on other services, for example, roads and street cleaning*. Four fifths (80%) of these residents indicated that their view would stay the same, and the remaining fifth (20%) said that their view would change if this were the case.
- 2.9 Residents were asked whether a variety of services *should be fully paid for by service users, with no contribution from council tax payers*.
- 2.10 Four fifths (80%) of residents agreed that Planning Applications should be fully paid for by service users; 15% disagreed. Residents who own their home with a mortgage or loan were significantly more likely to agree. More than half agreed that Leisure Services (58%) and Tourist Services (53%) should be paid for in this way.
- 2.11 Fewer residents agreed that Pest Control (34%), Garden Waste Collection (32%), Community Meals (25%) and Youth Centres (23%) should be fully paid for by service users and without any contribution from council tax payers. Around three fifths or more disagreed in each of these cases.
- 2.12 Nearly nine in ten (87%) residents agreed that *the Council should simplify processes and procedures to help local businesses to grow and thrive*; 7% disagreed.
- 2.13 Nearly three quarters (74%) of residents said they would be likely to volunteer *if someone in their street organised an activity to help the local community, such as litter picking or shopping for an older neighbour*. Nearly a fifth (17%) said they would be unlikely to volunteer for such an activity.

### **3. E-Consult feedback – Summary**

- 3.1 More people agreed with the guiding principles and behaviours than did not
- 3.2 Between 76% and 84% agreed with keeping the fair access to care criteria, focus on early intervention, strengthen re-enablement and assess needs early
- 3.3 56% supported developing personal budgets as mandatory part of care plans
- 3.4 81% agreed with working with residential care providers to deliver quality and value for money with 875 saying continue to protect vulnerable adults and children
- 3.5 67% supported transforming day care and 74% supported providing early help through targeted support

# Agenda Item 4

- 3.6 57% supported increasing access through new technology, 83% supported co-located services and pooled resources with 71% supported developing staff with multi-purpose roles
- 3.7 74% supported shared services and 90% agreed the Council should deliver value for money through efficient buying of services
- 3.8 86% supported focusing on the most vulnerable, 69% supported removing subsidies from where possible from services and 64% supported continuing subsidies where the Council is legally obliged to
- 3.9 In terms of removing subsidies 65% supported removing from leisure, 87% from planning, 74 % from Tourism. With regard to pest control, garden waste, youth centres and community meals - these were evenly split between agreeing and disagreeing
- 3.10 The majority of people agreed with simplifying processes to support local business (81%) business start ups (87%) and working with business to assist the Council to meet challenges ahead (81%)
- 3.11 The majority of people (65%) supported working the voluntary sector to identify how they can assist communities and 65% supporting a reduction in the reliance on public sector funding by the voluntary sector
- 3.12 54% disagreed that the Council should only consult when decisions can be influenced, 74% supported the use of technology for consultation and 87% supported the need to feedback results on consultation and how this has influenced decision making
- 3.13 90% supported encouraging people to take responsibility for their actions and behaviours and 66% supported encouraging people to do things for themselves

# Agenda Item 4

## Annex C Options previously approved for Consultation

<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Early Intervention and Prevention	D1.16	Healthy Schools – transfer the function of co-ordination and consultant role to schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £60.2k</li> </ul>
Children’s Social Care	D1.17	Social Care – Central Management & Support Costs – A restructure and a re-alignment of duties to remaining posts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £100k</li> </ul>
Learning & Support	D1.18	Reduce the School Targeted Intervention team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £260k</li> </ul>
Street Scene	D1.19	Building Cleaning – change of frequency in office cleaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £100k</li> </ul>
Environment	D1.20	Trading Standards – staffing restructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £50k</li> </ul>
Investment & Infrastructure	C3.1	Re-integration, recommission and restructuring of services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £500k</li> </ul>
Communications	D1.21	Communications – staffing restructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £40k</li> </ul>
Home Improvements	C3.2	Housing Improvement Agency service brought in house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £37k</li> </ul>
Grounds Maintenance	F1.2	Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for adult football/sports users/bowlers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to consider, note and agree the contents of the Equality Analysis report</li> <li>• approve that all users of paid-for facilities (except juniors) fund the full actual costs of</li> </ul>

# Agenda Item 4

			<p>grounds maintenance and utilities associated with their use of the facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that formal facilities would be withdrawn if costs are not met</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £85k</li> </ul>
Cemeteries and Crematoria	F1.4	Increase burial and cremation charges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to consider, note and agree the contents of the Equality Analysis report</li> <li>• approve the increase the charge for burials, cremations and associated services as described</li> <li>• recommend to Council an budget re-alignment of £400k</li> </ul>
Commissioning	F4.3	Double Rating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to consider, note and agree the contents of the Equality Analysis report</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £33k</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
Built Environment	D1.30	Pest Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider and note the consultation feedback</li> <li>• agree the introduction of a charge</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget adjustment of £30k</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

D1.16

<p><b>Service Description</b> Healthy Schools                  This function ensures the on-going improvement, development and promotion of physical and emotional health by providing accessible and relevant information and equipping pupils with the understanding, skills and attitudes to make informed decisions about their health.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –</b>                  Transfer the function of co-ordination and consultant roles to schools</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> This is not a statutory function and because of successful initiative launches and monitoring this is now embedded within schools to take forward without coordination by the Council</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Co-ordination, monitoring and promotion of healthy schools and Personal, Social and Health Education agenda in accordance with national policies. Schools will be expected to provide this service themselves.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users</b> none schools will be expected to provide this function to pupils  <b>Partners –</b> None  <b>Council –</b> None</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A series of staff consultations have been held, on the following dates: 30/11/2012, 04/12/2012, 06/12/2012                  There is a full team and Personnel meeting on 22/01/2013. The Trade Unions have been engaged throughout the process.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to staffing and process and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> None</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Schools may not carry forward the Healthy Schools agenda. Public Health may continue to provide some support through a re-negotiated service level agreement for school health services</p>	
<p>2012/13 Service Budget: £60,200</p> <p>Staffing: 2</p>	<p>Saving 2013/14 (#): £35,100      Year                  Saving 2014/15 £25,100</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: up to 2</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>

# Agenda Item 4

D1.17

<p><b>Service Description</b>  <b>Children's Social Care Central Management &amp; Support Costs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment</li> <li>- Independent Reviewing Officers</li> <li>- Child Protection Plans and Children in Need</li> <li>- Children in Care</li> <li>- Support costs</li> <li>- Legal costs</li> </ul>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –</b>  A restructure and a re-alignment of duties to remaining posts.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b>  Re-engineering of Children's Social Care Management will produce efficiencies</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b>  Shape and design of Children's Social Care will change. The role of assistant team manager will cease as will the role of children's policy officer. These posts will be replaced by advanced and lead practitioner and a quality assurance officer.  The role of resource manager will cease and the post will contribute to savings.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users – None Partners – None Council – None</b></p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>  Type Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Workshops with all staff held on 5/6 September and 19<sup>th</sup> September. To date two newsletters (October &amp; December 2012) have been issued. Assistant Team Managers with TU representation met on 8/01/2013, team managers on 14/01/2013 and social workers on 8/09 January 2013.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that there will be little change to service delivery for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> Children Act 1989</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> The Council will need to maximise leadership for remaining staff in order to deliver the significant social care change agenda whilst reducing cost. Capacity to support inspections and improve quality - All statutory responsibilities will continue to be met. Restructure may identify skills gap which will be addressed through an agreed training programme. Pressure on case supervision and quality assurance will be mitigated by prioritisation of caseloads and implementation of the new Integrated Childrens System.</p>	
	<p><b>Saving 2014/15: £100,000 Year</b>  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: up to 3</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>

D1.18

<p><b>Service Description School Targeted Intervention</b>                  LAs are responsible for taking a strategic role in supporting schools to improve and for monitoring schools' progress in responding to the challenges that are raised by School Improvement Partners and Ofsted in their evaluation of schools. The LA is responsible for designing, commissioning and brokering an appropriate support package for the school. The LA should also monitor the progress and success of this intervention.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –</b>                  Reduced support to Schools or to deliver service in a different way, i.e. increased brokerage</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> This element of the service is non-statutory. Schools are able to build on the current successes of supporting less successful schools.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Reduced monitoring by Intervention Officers. There will be increased resilience in schools utilising existing networks.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users</b> - Schools could be required to find alternative provision in place of for intervention officers  <b>Partners</b> – None  <b>Council</b> – None</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is reduced Council intervention and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users as schools will be required to source this support. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> Education and Inspections Act 2006</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>                  Less resource to support schools in special measure category (OFSTED).                  Mitigated by schools support network and brokerage service for schools as necessary                  The funding for this service will come via the Education Services Grant with effect from April 2013 and schools may feel that if the Council can not provide a service they will seek to become academies which mean that they will receive the grant directly. In this event there would be a direct reduction in Council funding of £116 per pupil (or £25k for each one form entry primary school which becomes an academy) - this will then impact on other Council services.</p>	
	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £260,000</b>      Year  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: up to 5</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>

# Agenda Item 4

D1.19

**Service Description: Building Cleaning – Reduction in Cleaning Schedules**

The Building Cleaning Section currently operates across a number of contract areas. The 'core' contracts relate to the cleaning functions undertaken at a range of Council owned and operated buildings, facilities and services. In addition, cleaning contracts are operated at a large number of schools and work premises.

This proposal only relates to 'core' contracts at Council buildings and facilities as described above, which also include Town Halls and Civic Buildings with effect from 2011/12.

This 'core' contract currently employs some 83 staff operating at 46 sites.

The cost of providing this service is currently £648k per annum (includes £114k from Civic Building cleansing service transferred to Building Cleaning Section during 2011/12).

**It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –**

It is proposed to reduce the cleaning operation across all sites to make an additional saving of £100,000.

Cleaning will be undertaken in areas where there are health & safety implications, such as toilets, kitchen/mess facilities, stairs, entrances/exits, etc. However, cleaning operations will be greatly reduced in areas which are deemed 'non essential'. This does not mean that cleaning will stop in these areas, but frequencies will be greatly reduced in order to reduce the overall time spent cleaning in any given facility.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** The regular cleaning of any workplace is obviously a very important function, and in addition to providing a pleasant environment, it also provides safeguards against a number of potential hazards including slips and trips and infection and bacteria control.

However, there are also a number of functions which can be further reduced such as wiping, polishing, emptying waste bins, hoovering, etc.

By reducing the time spent on some of the non-essential tasks it is envisaged that there will be a further reduction in the amount of hours spent cleaning at each location.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** The type of functions that would be further reduced would be those considered non-essential. All contracts are being reviewed to establish where such reductions can take place whilst keeping any Health & Safety related risks to an absolute minimum. There will be a significant and noticeable reduction in the levels of perceived cleanliness at all sites, whilst maintaining minimum standards in those areas deemed to pose a potential Health & Safety risk.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** - There will be less cleaning in offices, corridors and other non-essential areas.

**Partners** - N/A

**Council** – There will be a perceived and noticeable decline in general cleanliness in certain areas. High risk areas will be targeted in order to maintain high standards of risk control. A previous savings proposal has seen the reduction in frequency of cleaning operations at sites up to some 40%. At sites or facilities where there is only one or a small number of cleaners this may necessitate a negotiated reduction in working hours. At sites or facilities with larger numbers of cleaners this may result in the deletion of one or more posts and subsequent redundancy.

A previous savings proposal has seen the amount of cleaning undertaken at 'core' facilities



# Agenda Item 4

reduce by and average of 30%. This has proved difficult to quantify as the Building Cleaning Service raises a Journal Transfer against a budget code provided by the budget holder for that particular service area. Therefore, the saving remains at the budget source and needs to be vired accordingly from a wide range of cost centres.

In order for this proposal to be effective it is proposed to transfer ALL remaining building cleaning budgets from their current location to be managed by the Building Cleaning Section. Cleaning rotas and functions will then be devised across all service areas and facilities to exactly reflect the 'corporate' budget available, taking into account the need to meet minimum Health & Safety standards.

### Communications, Consultations & Engagement –

Type Inform  Consult

Proposed Timeline Implement in April 2013 following appropriate consultation with affected staff.

Staff consultation is continuing

**Public Sector Equality Duty –** The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to working practices. This will result in longer gaps between cleaning and removal of office rubbish. We have to ensure that all passage ways and appropriate office equipment is kept clear for use for all staff including those with disability or mobility problems. The rescheduling of the rotas will be mindful so to ensure that employees with disabilities or mobility problems do not suffer any detriment.

**Legislation Considered -** Health & Safety issues related to cleaning operations.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions–** If workplaces are not regularly cleaned there is a risk that germs and bacteria could pose a threat to employees. In addition, cleansing of stairs, rails, corridors, etc, reduce the risk of accident from trips and falls. Cleaning also reduces dust and other irritants which can cause respiratory problems for employees. Work schedules will be prioritised to reduce the risk.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**

£648,000

**Staffing:** 83

**Other Resources used:**

**Saving 2013/14:** £50,000

Full Year

**Saving 2014/15:** £50,000

Full Year

**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk:** TBC note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option. This option may require reduction in hours of some posts as opposed to redundancy

# Agenda Item 4

D1.20

<p><b>Service Description: Environment-Trading Standards</b>          Improve integration of service delivery within Trading Standards and Licensing Section</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b>          Restructure and reallocation of roles and responsibilities.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Opportunity for greater service efficiency</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Change to licence application process and multi role enforcement duties for officers</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users –</b> None    <b>Partners –</b> None</p> <p><b>Council –</b> Internal operations, restructure, reallocation of duties and deployment of staff, reduction in established posts.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type    Consult (Internal)    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline <i>12 months</i> Implementation: complete by <i>2014/15</i>          Staff consultation is ongoing</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to team structures and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered -</b> Licensing Act 2003, Trading Standards legislation</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>          Limit to integration due to legislative constraints on use of fee income and discharge of related regulatory activities.          New legislation around Licensing Act awaited – detail may bring constraints.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget: £</b></p> <p><b>Staffing:</b></p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>                    £    30k    Part Year</p> <p><b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £    20k    Full year</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 2</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>

## C3.1

<p><b>Service Description: Re-integration, re-commission and restructuring of externalised services-Built Environment</b>          Restructure of Investment Programmes and Infrastructure Division and services following the termination of Capita Symonds contract and the reintegration/ recommissioning of services from October 2013.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b>          Unless otherwise agreed the services within the Capita Symonds contract return in October 2013. The time then required for the restructuring/recommissioning exercise and any statutory consultation and notice periods required suggest that it is unlikely that any significant saving could be achieved during the 2013/14 financial year. Implementation of saving would be 2014/15.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Discussions on the basis for the reintegration of Capita Symonds’ staff into the Council and/or recommissioning of services are still in their infancy, however an assessment of the likely workload in 2013/14 has indicated that an overall saving is likely to be in region of £500,000, but this could alter following detailed review.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Discussions on the basis for the reintegration of Capita Symonds’ staff into the Council and/or recommissioning of services are still in their infancy. Implications in relation to services and staff will be assessed should members agree the proposed option be taken forward.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users –</b> The Council will continue to meet statutory requirements, the recommissioning of services will seek to ensure value for money is obtained. As the work commissioned is variable services users will be considered as part of any potential change  <b>Partners –</b> see above  <b>Council –</b> Reorganised team</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>          Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/>          Partnership <input type="checkbox"/>          Proposed Timeline <i>complete Sept 2013</i> Implementation: <i>complete March 2014</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular team meetings have taken place with Sefton Council staff</li> <li>• Regular meetings have taken place with Capita senior management teams</li> <li>• Direct Consultation between Sefton Council staff and Capita staff is due to take place at its first meeting 25<sup>th</sup> January 2013, with a view to implementation in October 2013.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to team structures and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will comply with procurement and HR policies and procedures. This will include regular monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> N/A</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Discussions on the basis for the reintegration of Capita Symonds’ staff into the Council and/or recommissioning of services are still in their infancy, however an assessment of the likely workload in 2013/14 has indicated that an overall saving is likely to be in region of £500,000, but this could alter following detailed review. Risk implications will be assessed should members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget: £</b>  <b>£ 1,919,000 (Capita Core Fee)</b>  <b>£ 613,000 (SMBC)</b>  <b>Staffing: 120 approx (Capita)</b>  <b>14 approx (SMBC)</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>£500k</b> Full Year</span></p> <p>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: TBC note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>

# Agenda Item 4

D1.21

**Service Description: Communications (Integration of Communications Staff)**

All communications/marketing officers within the authority are currently being integrated under one management structure to create a core function to service the entire Council.

**It is proposed to continue with consultation with a view to implementing the following change** – That the agreed reduction of the number of staff working under the new integrated service could achieve further savings of around £40k in 2014/15 given the agreed structure and absence of pay protection after that period.

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

As the new Communications Strategy will deliver a comprehensive and targeted communications, marketing and advertising function for the entire council. Activity will be co-ordinated in such a way which will lead to a reduction in the number of people currently delivering activity in service-areas.

As the integration is not yet complete it has been difficult for the true efficiencies to be revealed but the previous estimate of £100k could produce a further £40k should the revised draft structure drive further savings in year two of implementation.

The structure has been drawn up to reflect a reduction in staffing costs and initial figures show that the additional £40k could be achieved in 2014/15 without further staff reductions. This structure has been shared with the unions and the communications staff involved in the process and any potential for VR/VER or changes to working practices is being explored ahead of compulsory redundancies. The true achievable savings will not be confirmed until the structure is populated.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** – Reduced capacity to market and advertise some council services – although potential mitigation through new working methods and tighter co-ordination and prioritisation of activity.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – Potential reduction in the amount of information available about council services.

**Partners** – Potential reduction in the amount of information available about Council services. Potential loss of co-promotion/management of joint projects.

**Council** – Potential reduction in the amount of information available about council services, potential impact on income streams because of reduced marketing activity.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (Internal)   
Partnership

**Proposed Timeline:** 6 months Consultation is ongoing in accordance with HR procedures.

Implementation: (April 1, 2013)

Updates on the integration process have been ongoing with staff and there have been several meetings with service-managers and direct face-to-face updates on the process with the staff concerned. Several updates have been provided at the regular union update meetings and individual union and employee issues have been responded to. Frequent email updates have also been sent to staff and any queries responded to. The job descriptions have been finalised and circulated and assimilations, where appropriate, have been completed. Interviews are being arranged for the remaining posts. Detailed discussions with HR colleagues have taken place and they are supporting the process.

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this option is satisfied that there is no impact on service users. Officers continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.

**Legislation Considered** – Statutory guidance on public/legal notices etc. The 2011 Government Guidelines for Local Authority Publicity.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – Loss of information streams for residents, partners etc – mitigated by looking at delivering comms activity in a different way – e.g. digital by default.

# Agenda Item 4

Risk of under achieving potential saving as further work is needed to identify all funding streams for existing staff. Saving may already be identified elsewhere in service areas. Potential loss of income for some service areas due to any reduction in marketing activity, however such income generators would be a prioritised area of activity within the new arrangements. The £40k is in addition to the £100k already approved by November 2012 Council; however it will not put further staff at risk. The true achievable savings will not be confirmed until the structure is populated and therefore the £40k is an estimate.

	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>                      £ 40,000      Full / Part Year</p> <p><b>Potential Staff at Risk: TBC</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal</p> <p>Net posts 0 but posts may need to be changed from treatment officers to enforcement officers in order to address failure to treat amongst those unwilling to pay.</p>	
--	---	--

# Agenda Item 4

## **C3.2-**

### **Service Description: Home Improvement Agency Services, reorganisation & internalisation**

The Home Improvement Agency Services have been out-sourced and are currently provided by Mears Ltd, and CVS for part of the handyperson service in the north. The Agency provides 3 services on behalf of the Council;

- implementation of Disabled Facility Grants for clients, Major Adaptations (statutory service)
- management of Minor Adaptations (statutory service)
- Handyperson services (complementary service)

DFG Services are CAPITAL funded, while Minor Adaptations and Handyperson services are Revenue funded from Adult Social Care.

### **It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –**

To consider the option of ceasing the Handyperson services and bringing the remaining Home Improvement agency services [major and minor adaptations services] in-house.

### **Rationale for service change proposal –**

We have recently been through a (OJEU) procurement exercise, and received tenders from 4 companies. In terms of minor adaptations and handyperson services the tender costs exceed available budgets. Consequently, it is necessary to consider ceasing the funding for the Handyperson service, which is not a mandatory service. Upon receipt of tender information it became apparent that there may be a more effective and less costly way of providing the statutory services in-house.

The major benefit to the Council in this option is to reduce the overall costs in providing its statutory services and it will also allow greater flexibility to review these services without being bound by a three year contract term. In the event of a reduction in funding in any area the Council would be better placed to review and reduce services as and when required.

Synergies with existing internal services may reduce overall operating costs for the retained agency services.

### **The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –**

There should be no change in activity levels, or service to DFG clients, or Minor Adaptations clients. In fact if the higher level of cash savings can be achieved, the savings will allow the council more of its resources to spend on providing major and minor adaptations works

Given the budget position compared to the costs of running all of the existing services, it is felt likely that funding for the Handyperson service will need to cease, as this is a non-statutory service.

### **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – Should see little change in the range and scale of DFG service. In fact dealing with one organisation rather than 2, as at present would be far simpler.

Services to deliver minor adaptations will be kept to the same level, though customers would deal with a Council service rather than external one.

The Handyperson service may reduce or cease in the absence of any Council budget provision

### **Partners – NA**

**Council** – Mears provide a combined service, managing DFGs (core service) for the Built Environment Department, along with minor adaptations and handy person services (complimentary services) for Adult Social Care. CVS provide part of the handyperson service in the north. Major and Minor adaptations services would be managed within the Council, within the Built Environment Dept.

### **Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage   
 Partnership

Providers have been fully engaged in this process. TUPE provisions would need to be applied to bring external staff in-house, and mobilise services.

**Public Sector Equality Duty-** The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change to team structures and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will comply with procurement and HR policies and procedures. This will include regular monitoring reports to Corporate Services.

**Legislation Considered -**

Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 [for DFGs],  
 Transfer of Undertaking (Protection of Employment Regulations 2996TUPE.  
 Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act, 1970

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Unfortunately, it is apparent that any option to retain the non-statutory Handyperson service (by either awarding the contract or opting for an in-house provision) is unaffordable within existing budgets, as costs associated with the other two statutory elements of the service exceed available budgets. This is likely to result in the cessation of the Handyperson service, which has been in operation for a considerable number of years.

There will be staffing liabilities and possibly redundancy implications if the council pursues this option, due to TUPE arrangements.

Existing staff may prefer not to transfer under TUPE rights. –the Council would benefit from key staff coming in-house to set up and run the services.

The Council will encounter contractual issues and risks associated with managing the agencies current nominated contractor list. Whilst there is no direct contractual link with the Council, additional demands for assistance and advice may be generated via clients of the service if things go wrong. The risks are not significant but can incur considerable officer time in order to resolve.

Given DFGs and Minor Adaptations are mandatory services, there is little risk that the council could cease to provide a service in future, reducing risks of further redundancies. However, if a service review led to the need for fewer staff, then there may be a need for some redundancies during 2013-14.

Loss of the Handyperson service may cost the Council more money in the long term, where people suffer from falls etc, which may have been avoided through this preventative service, this is however extremely difficult to quantify in actual terms.

**Cost analysis of Service Lots against most advantageous tender, current budget position and internalization costs / savings**

**Table 1A – Major Adaptations (mainly Capital Funded)**

	Budget (over 3 years)	Tendered Cost (over 3 years)	(Cost) over budget (3 years)
Lot 1 (Major Adaptations DFGs)	£547,500 Capital / Revenue	£670,500	(£123,000)

# Agenda Item 4

**Table 1B – Minor Adaptations (Revenue Funded)**

	Budget (over 3 years)	Tendered Cost (over 3 years)	(Cost) / Saving over budget (3 years)
Lot 2 (Minor Adaptations)	£204,300	£546,381	(£342,081)
Lot 3 (Handyperson)	£144,000	£99,375	£44,675
Total Budget shortfall (capital & revenue) if contract awarded			(£420,406)

Upon receipt of tender information it became apparent that a £420,406 gap existed between the actual tender costs and the combined capital and revenue budget resources available. Following on from this, officers then explored if it would be more effective and less costly to provide these services in-house.

Officers estimated the costs associated with bringing all 3 services in house. It became clear that even by internalising these services we could not sustain them all, as the actual budget gap for all 3 Lots equated to £73,475. The majority of this stems from a revenue funding shortfall.

Unfortunately, it is now apparent that any option to retain the non-statutory Handyperson service (by either awarding the contract or opting for an in-house provision) is unaffordable within existing budgets, as costs associated with the other two statutory elements of the service exceed available budgets. This is likely to result in the cessation of the Handyperson service, which has been in operation for a considerable number of years. Loss of this service may cost the Council more money in the long term where people suffer from falls etc, which may have been avoided through this preventative service, this is however extremely difficult to quantify in actual terms. The Handyperson service is also currently part funded by £19,000 Public Health funding, on the basis it supports the falls prevention agenda, this funding would not be available for delivery of the statutory services.

Notwithstanding the above fact, internalising the other two services and discontinuing the Handyperson service, could save the Council an estimated £230,723 (comprising £117,124 capital and £113,599 revenue) over the 3 year contract period as shown in the table below. This option represents a total saving of £651,179 against the actual tendered costs for all three services which were shown in Table 1A and 1B. In ceasing the Handyperson service the Council would be able to fully fund the Minor Adaptation service and also generate a revenue saving.

**Table 2A – Major Adaptations (mainly Capital Funded)**

<b>3 years</b>	Budget (over 3 years)	Internal Cost (including on-costs and redundancy) over 3 years	In-house <b>Capital Saving</b> over budget (3 years)
Lot 1 (Major Adaptations DFGs)	£547,500 Capital / Revenue	£430,376	<b>£117,124</b>

**Table 2B – Minor Adaptations (Revenue Funded)**

<b>3 years</b>	Budget (over 3 years)	Internal Cost (including on-costs) over 3 years	In-house <b>Revenue Saving</b> over budget (3 years)
Lot 2 (Minor Adapts)	£348,300 Revenue	£234,701	<b>£113,599</b>

The above revenue budget funds all staffing and installation costs of the minor adaptations service, whilst the material and equipment costs are funded from a separate Adult Social Care budget.

**NB.** The Internal cost calculations are based on delivering the services as they are currently configured, and at existing staff levels.

It is relatively clear that an overall saving can be achieved through internalising the major and minor adaptations service rather than awarding the contract, provided that the handypersons service is discontinued. It is acknowledged that the estimated achievable savings are broadly equally apportioned between capital and revenue budgets.



# Agenda Item 4

<p><b>Progress</b></p>	<p>The decision was taken by Cabinet on the 8<sup>th</sup> of November. A meeting was held with Mears management on the 9<sup>th</sup> of November, to explain the Councils position and way forward. Similar meeting was later held with CVS.</p> <p>Letters were served on both Mears and CVS on the 29<sup>th</sup> of November, to formally notify them of our intention to internalise the Major Adaptations and Minor Adaptations services , and to cease the Handyperson services.</p> <p>There has been an ongoing dialogue and exchange of information with Mears, regarding staff TUPE since December, which is still ongoing.</p> <p>Officers have been to visit and meet the Mears TUPE staff on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January. Plans are progressing to bring the staff and Adaptations services in house, with effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2013.</p> <p>The Handyperson services will cease from 28<sup>th</sup> of February 2013.</p>
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> External staff would TUPE in-house</p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b> Accommodation, IT, telephones and central support services would be required. In-house Budget estimates include a 57% on-cost to reflect this.</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>    <b>£76,000</b> (£39k capital, £37k revenue) Full Year</p> <p><b>Investment Required:</b> <b>£0</b>                      <b>Year?: n-a</b></p> <p><b>Staff at Risk:</b> <b>0</b></p>

# Agenda Item 4

## F1.2

### **Service Description: Parks and Greenspaces Service: Sports users fees and charges**

As part of its wider integrated responsibilities, the Parks and Greenspaces Service manages several 'paid-for' facilities which are managed for the individual use of certain users or groups of users. This is effectively providing facilities for people's exclusive use, unlike the wider park facilities, which are open to everyone.

The 'paid-for' facilities include:

- Formal football pitches (adult and Junior)
- Cricket wickets
- Formal Rugby pitches (adult and Junior)
- Bowling greens
- Croquet lawns

The income in 11/12 to the Council from fees and charges for these services was £64K (for all sport, including juniors). As part of the 12/13 savings this was to be increased by 65k in 12/13 and a further 20k in 13/14 (for adult sport and allotments only).

The current costs incurred for providing these facilities are circa £290K (for all sport, including juniors).

**It is proposed to implement the following change** – All users of paid-for facilities except juniors, to fund the full actual costs of grounds maintenance and utilities associated with their use of the facilities (in place of existing fees and charges and utility costs).

**Rationale for service change proposal** – To achieve the savings overall, and try to minimise the effect on the wider Sefton community as much as possible.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** –

Maintenance of adult sports pitches will cease, unless the users / user groups fund the full costs of grounds maintenance (and utilities) associated with their use of the facilities.

Costs will be calculated from the costed bill of quantities in the Grounds Maintenance contract and from the actual bills from utility companies.

Any pitches / greens which are taken out of use will be returned to general park use and maintained to the appropriate grass standard.

The table below summarises the anticipated average cost to the users (in place of existing fees and charges and utilities costs 12/13).

	No of (adult) facilities  (n.b. this varies each season)	Approx. number of (adult) users (2012/13)  (n.b. this varies each season)	Current actual costs for providing facility (adults only)  (This is a <b>guide only</b> based on averages, each user group will be consulted about their specific charges, which vary depending on facilities used at each site)
			<b>See note 1</b>
Baseball	1	20	Total: £2k Grounds maintenance: £2,000 per diamond
Bowling greens:	17	1,000	Total: £82k (across the borough) Grounds maintenance: £4,200 average per green Utilities: average £600 per pavilion (where applicable)
Cricket wickets	1	40	Total: £1,800 (across the borough) Grounds maintenance: £1,800 Pavilion cleansing: (not applicable – provided by others) Utilities: (not applicable – provided by others)
Croquet lawns:	2 (9	100	n/a

# Agenda Item 4

	courts)		the club now maintain their own facilities
Football pitches	50	2,500	Total: £95k (across the borough) Grounds maintenance: £1,650 per pitch Pavilion cleansing: £1,550 per pavilion (where applicable) Utilities: average £1,250 per pavilion (where applicable)
Rugby pitches	2	35	Total: £2,000 at these facilities Grounds maintenance: £1,000 per pitch Pavilion cleansing: (not applicable – provided by others) Utilities: (not applicable – provided by others)

## Note 1.

In most instances, individual users, teams and pitch lettings are not managed by the Council, but via management agreements with sports leagues/ associations. Therefore it is difficult to predict accurately what the cost implications will be to the individual or team. However, as a guide only, based on averages and with caveats stated:

**Baseball:** This increase would result in a charge per player of £100 per year (about £2 per week for a 26 week playing season)

**Bowling:** For a bowler who plays in a club with 50 players, this would increase the charge to £96 per year (under £3 per week) for a 34 week playing season

**Cricket:** this increase would result in a charge per player of £45 per year (under £2 per week over a 24 week playing season)

**Football:** assuming a team use a pitch which is used about half of the time (i.e. 4 out of 8 sessions each weekend); who share use of the pavilion, and book one half pitch, this would mean a charge of £1,100 per team per year (about £30 per week spread across a 38 week season availability, and therefore about £2 per week per player for a team with 15 players).

**Rugby:** This increase would result in a charge of about £55 per player per year, about £1.50 per week based on a 38 week playing season

## Note 2.

The fees/charges levied on individual users by sports leagues/ associations may be higher than this to cover their other costs and aspirations.

## Note 3.

It is likely that an open book approach will need to be adopted in the future where actual costs are passed on, with the addition of an agreed management fee for the league/ association

## Impact of Service Change –

**Service Users** – Previously use of facilities was heavily subsidised by the Council and users generally paid only a small proportion of the actual costs associated with their activity. The 12/13 savings round has already increased their costs. The proposed further increases in income will mean that users will have to pay more for their sports / hobbies.

**Partners** – Income from facilities is in many cases obtained via management agreements with Leagues, Bowling Clubs etc. These partners would need to be involved in the agreements and management of the increased charges.

NB It may be that the leagues/ associations in question will wish to raise fees and charges to users above and beyond those described above in order to continue generating their own income

**Council** – New agreements are already being drawn up with users/ user groups to ensure that the payment of the increased charges are formally agreed. Should this further increase be agreed, a further amendment of legal agreements would be required.

## Communications, Consultations & Engagement –

Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

# Agenda Item 4

There is was no requirement for consultation on this option as the 2012/13 budget options consultation has taken place. At the Council meeting on 22nd November agreed to the deferral of Option F1.2 (Grounds Maintenance – Recharging grounds maintenance / utility costs for adult football/sports users / bowlers) until the consultation process on Option F1.3 (Grounds Maintenance - Recharging grounds maintenance / utility costs for organised junior sports activities) is concluded and a report is submitted to the Council on the progress made by the Sefton Sports Connect Group.

10 meetings have also been held with organisations such as New Victoria Cricket Club, Southport Croquet Club and Bootle Stadium Community Group.

**Public Sector Equality Duties – See assessment below**

**Legislation Considered – N/A**

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Risk: Users may refuse to pay for grounds maintenance charges

Mitigating Action: Formal agreements to be put in place

Risk: Significant number of users may stop using the facilities

Mitigating Action: Sports facilities to be rationalised accordingly. Working group already set up with the Sports Council, CVS and other departments to help clubs mitigate impacts/ seek alternatives

Risk: The managing agents who currently administer activities may fold

Mitigation: a further charge may need to be levied to fund additional officer time to administer the remaining sports.

<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £290k	<b>Saving 2013/14:</b>	£ 85,000	Full Year
<b>Staffing: n/a</b>			
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 0</b>		

## Equality Analysis Report Reference:F1.2 Sports Ground Maintenance (Adults)

**Details of proposal:**

As part of its wider integrated responsibilities, the Parks and Greenspaces Service manages several ‘paid-for’ facilities which are managed for the individual use of certain users or groups of users. This is effectively providing facilities for people’s exclusive use, unlike the wider park facilities, which are open to everyone.

The ‘paid-for’ facilities include:

- Formal football pitches (adult and Junior)
- Cricket wickets
- Formal Rugby pitches (adult and Junior)
- Bowling greens
- Croquet lawns

The income in 11/12 to the Council from fees and charges for these services was £64K (for all sport,

including juniors). As part of the 12/13 savings this was to be increased by 65k in 12/13 and a further 20k in 13/14 (for adult sport and allotments only).

The current costs incurred for providing these facilities are circa £290K (for all sport, including juniors).

All users of paid-for facilities to fund the full actual costs of grounds maintenance and utilities associated with their use of the facilities (in place of existing fees and charges and utility costs). Formal facilities would be withdrawn if costs are not met.

## **Ramifications of Proposal:**

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

The cost of ground maintenance and utilities will be passed on to facility users thus increasing the cost of using these facilities.

Equality Analysis report was submitted to cabinet in February 2012 in relation to previous cost increases on sport facilities. This analysis report draws on that and comments on the above proposal.

The previous Equality Analysis report identified community concerns but correctly assessed there to be no discrimination at play.

The Council notes that the increase in charges may mean people giving up their sports activities on purely financial grounds, and regrets that it cannot continue to subsidise the cost when there are other urgent budget requirements.

## **Are there any protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected in comparison to others?**

Previous Equality Analysis recognised trends in service use such as Older People using bowling greens, Croquet lawns and young adults playing football and rugby etc.

The cost increase goes across all sports facilities, whilst it is unfortunate that groups are facing higher fees to keep using the facilities, it's not discriminatory to increase the fees.

## **Consultation**

Extensive consultation took place during the period October 2011- January 2012 on the changes to charges and was reported to Cabinet and Council in February 2012 and this proposal draws on previous findings and links to that consultation.

### *Sefton Sports Connect*

A new group called Sefton Sports Connect has been developed, led by the Parks and Greenspace Service, to assist clubs and offer alternatives to simply paying more or folding. This group includes partners from Sefton Sports Council, Council for Voluntary Services (CVS), and other council depts (Sports Development, Energy team, and Education). This group has met eight times to date since Feb 2012.

The Sports Connect group has developed a package of options open to sports clubs and leagues in order to help them to become more sustainable and to continue operating after the cost increases. The options include:

- Lowering maintenance specifications
- Reducing utility costs

# Agenda Item 4

- Seeking external funding
- Rationalising / sharing facilities
- Self management / contribution to management etc.

Two workshop sessions were arranged to discuss this information with sports users, clubs etc (4<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> Sept). Both were well attended (circa 120 representatives in total).

## *Further Discussions with Stakeholders*

Running alongside the 'Sefton Sports Connect' development work, several meetings have been held with individual Clubs, Leagues etc to discuss their own arrangements and potential ways forward.

Football: a total of 11 meetings have been held with the following stakeholders, either individually or in different combinations:

- Southport and District Football League
- Crosby and District Football League
- Liverpool County FA,
- Football Association,
- Sports England
- Hesketh Casuals

Bowling: a total of 18 meetings have been held with the following clubs / organisations:

- Kings Gardens Bowling Club
- Botanic Gardens Bowling Club
- Promenade Bowling Club
- Duke St Park Bowling Club
- Moorside Park Bowling Club
- Derby Park Bowling Club
- The Crescent Bowlers
- Hatton Hill Bowling Club
- Sefton CVS

Others: 10 meetings have been held with organisations such as New Victoria Cricket Club, Southport Croquet Club and Bootle Stadium Community Group.

## *Results of Pro-Active Work (To date)*

As a result of the extensive work done to try to mitigate the impacts of increased charges, several user groups are considering different options:

Football:

- Southport and Formby Amateur Football League are considering different options, including pitch rationalisation and potential for future self management of buildings
- Crosby and District Football League are considering self management of Buckley Hill pavilion, reducing number of pitches and sites they play from
- Hesketh Casuals Football club are developing a model whereby volunteers undertake the extra over works relating to football provision
- The County Football Association, Sports England etc are offering to work pro-actively with the Council and the leagues, clubs and teams, to try and manage the changes, using examples of best practice from other Local Authorities, with the aim of making the sport more sustainable and self-sufficient.

It has been reported that 6 teams / clubs have disbanded as a result of the increased charges in

2012/13.

## Bowling:

The following clubs are considering taking on self management of their greens/ offering volunteer support to maintain standards

- Moorside Park Bowling Club,
- Crescent Bowling Club,
- Kings Gardens Bowling Club,
- Promenade Bowling club
- Botanic Gardens Bowling Club

Other Clubs, including Hatton Hill Bowling Club are looking at reduced standards.

Sefton CVS are investigating the feasibility of running a project to share maintenance equipment (e.g. mowers) between Clubs who are interested in self-management.

Derby Park and Bedford Park Bowling Clubs have stated that they may disband and no longer use the facilities.

## Cricket:

New Victoria Cricket Club are developing a model whereby the Council retains land ownership, and undertake day to day maintenance and management, but volunteers undertake the extra over works relating to cricket provision.

## Croquet

- Southport Croquet Club took on full management of their site from 1.4.12.

## Multi sport:

- Bootle Stadium Community Sports Group/ Crosby Stuarts Football Club/ Trojans baseball club are developing a model and ongoing discussions about self management/ developing built facilities.
- If the proposed increased are agreed, all sports users groups will be informed of their proposed fee increase for 13/14 this will be followed by more detailed information is it becomes available (as utilities costs are clarified based on actual bills for 12/13)

Standard Council procedures will be observed in the instances where the Council is required to inform the public

### **Is there evidence that the Public Sector Equality Duties will continue to be met?**

Yes – this service will be delivered in line with the Equality Act 2010 by ensuring facilities are usable and accessible.

### **What actions will follow if proposal accepted by Cabinet & Council?**

- Notify users of increased charges
- Monitor any reduction or difficult with service use.

## **F1.4**

<b>Service Description: Increase charges for burial and cremation service</b>
Regulatory -£1.367m

# Agenda Item 4

Frontline (contracted) £0.427  
**-£0.94m**

The section manages the burial and cremation service in Sefton, which is delivered at four cemeteries and two crematoria.

**It is proposed to implement the following change –**

- To increase the charge for burials, cremations and associated services. The increase in charges would be above the rate of inflation and will generate £400,000.
- The current charges for the main services are:
  - Cremation £600
  - Interment (1/ 2 coffins deep) £600
  - Interment (3/4 coffins deep) £675 and £715 (respectively)
  - Purchase of a grave (resident) £750

Current fees charged locally by similar burial and cremation authorities:

	Sefton 2012/3	Liverpool 2012/3	Wirral 2012/3	St. Helens 2012/3
Cremation	£600	£674	£575	£479
Interment (1/2)	£600	£662	£575	£583
Interment (3/4)	£675 & £715	£662	£575	£583
Grave purchase	£750	£811	£865	£751

(The table includes some calculated or averaged charges)

- Charges could be raised by approximately 17 to 25%, with smaller increases for the interments of 3 and 4 coffins deep, to give new charges of:
  - Cremation £750
  - Interment (all depths) £750
  - Purchase of a grave (resident) £900

**Rationale for service change proposal –** To cover the forecast level of required capital investment

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Burial, cremation and related service charges will increase.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** will have to pay more for burials and cremations.

**Partners –** funeral directors may pass on the increases to their clients so there would be no impact on them.

**Council –**

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult   gage  Partnership

**Proposed Timeline:** April 2013

Consultation and engagement took place during October 2011-January 2012 on the changes to



charges which were reported to Cabinet and Council in February 2012. At the Council meeting on 22 <sup>nd</sup> November, it was agreed that further consultation on this proposal takes place from 6th December until 7 <sup>th</sup> January 2013.		
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – See assessment below		
<b>Legislation Considered</b> - N/A		
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> –There will be a risk that some customers may use services offered by neighbouring authorities. This has been allowed for in the income estimate.		
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> - £0.94m	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £400,000	Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b> 15	<b>Investment Required:</b> £0	
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk:</b> none	

## Equality Analysis Report

Reference: F1.4 Cremations and Burials

### Details of proposal:

To increase the charge for burials, cremations and associated services. The increase in charges would be above the rate of inflation and generate an additional income in the region of £400,000.

The current charges for the main services are:

- Cremation - £600
- Interment (1/ 2 coffins deep) - £600
- Interment (3/4 coffins deep) - £675 and £715 (respectively)
- Purchase of a grave (resident) - £750

Currently Sefton's prices are in the upper quartile of those charged locally but are not the most expensive on Merseyside.

The proposed increase could lead to charges which would equal the current most expensive on Merseyside.

An Equality Analysis report was submitted to Cabinet in February 2012 in relation to previous cost increases for burial, cremations and associated services. This analysis report draws on previous findings and is commenting on the above proposal.

### Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

The threshold will change as costs to all residents will increase if the proposal to increase the charges to clients of the Cemeteries and Crematoria service is accepted.

### Are there any protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected in comparison to others?

Although there are concerns expressed by particular groups and faith groups coming from the consultation, there is no evidence of a disproportionate effect on any one protected characteristics

# Agenda Item 4

above and beyond the others.

The Council recognises that the concerns raised from the consultation relate to poverty and low income at the time of death - but this in itself is not definitively linked to having a particular protected characteristic.

The Council notes that currently there is 'social fund' available to cover basic funeral expenses and regrets that it can no longer subsidise costs related to burial to the level it has in the past.

## Consultation

Consultation and engagement took place during October 2011-January 2012 on the changes to charges which were reported to Cabinet and Council in February 2012. At the Council meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November, Landscape Services was asked run a more extensive consultation on these increases, and this ran from 6<sup>th</sup> December until 7<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

Comments were received from the Funeral Director's Forum, The Southport Hebrew Congregation, and one member of the public. A report titled: "Struggling to live, not being able to afford to die" was received from the Area Dean of Bootle.

Some attendees at the Funeral Directors' Forum felt the proposed price increases were too high and the general consensus was against a large increase.

The Southport Hebrew Congregation, which represents 105 members of the public, was also against the increases, saying:

- The average age of their congregation is 73, and therefore of limited income
- They are tied in to using the Jewish burial area and cannot move to another, cheaper site
- They believe it is morally repugnant to make profit from funerals and cremations
- Such high charges will mean that their burial fund would be unable to pay, leading to them having to use reserves and ultimately sell their synagogue
- They also believe that each sector of society should pay their fair share, such as the "absurdly low charges for football pitches (\*compared with other parts of the country)."
- They suggested:
  - "Sefton Council should ensure that all charges made (parking etc.) should at least be set at a rate to cover the cost of those services and reflect the market rate"

The Area Dean of Bootle said that:

- 17% of people struggle to afford a funeral
- Some funeral directors now demand 100% payment up front
- The length of time it takes to settle probate means that the estate of the deceased cannot be used to pay for funerals
- The requirement for older people to pay for their long term care means that there is reduced funds available to pay for funerals in their estate
- The Social Fund does not fully cover funeral costs
- 9% of people have to sell belongings to be able to pay for a funeral
- Local authorities may be forced to pick up the cost of more funerals under public health funeral arrangements.

Feedback from sole member of the public who responded also reflected the concerns stated by the Southport Hebrew Congregation and the Dean of Bootle.

Feedback received by the council from Sefton Partnership for Older Citizens (SPOC) did not specifically address the proposed increase in burial and cremation charges. They did say that:

- Consideration should [also] be given to those least able to afford the higher costs (some of

whom will be older citizens) who may then be much more likely to require services in the longer run which are more expensive to provide.”

The staff have been made aware and kept informed of the proposals to raise the charges.

Standard Council procedures will be observed in the instances where the Council is required to inform the public.

## **Is there evidence that the Public Sector Equality Duties will continue to be met?**

Yes: The service will continue to be delivered in line with the Equality Act.

Mitigation action is in place connected to those who are too poor to pay.

## **What actions will follow if proposal accepted by Cabinet & Council?**

Notify communities & funeral providers of new pricing policy.

Letters to individual funeral directors

- Letters to the Southport Hebrew Congregation, and the Southport Mosque and Cultural Centre
- Notices displayed at all cemeteries and crematoria, cremation service offices, waiting rooms and the offices of the Registrar for Births, Deaths and Marriages
- An updated fees and charges list that accompanies application forms

These will all be issued by the end of March 2013.

Monitor progress

# Agenda Item 4

## D1.30

### **Service Description: Pest Control**

The Council has a duty under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 to take such steps as necessary to make sure, so far as is practicable, that the district is kept free from rats and mice. In order to carry out this duty the Council has powers to enforce owners and occupiers of land to keep their land free from rats and mice. Currently discharged by free public health pest treatment service (circa 5000 pa). There is the option to charge for treatment.

### **It is proposed to introduce a free service for households on benefit and charged service for others**

A treatment service would be available to all, there would still be significant take up of treatment requiring some cost contribution (for those not on benefits). Assuming a £20 charge with 20% drop off rate of those required to pay.

Assume 4.5 pest control officers and 0.5 enforcement officers.

**Estimated net cost £149,000) (assuming £20 charge) (Net Saving £35,000)**

It is important to note that as the need to identify further opportunities for savings increases it may be necessary to consider developing a model for the service based upon full cost recovery, thus rendering the service 'cost neutral', by reducing the subsidy.

**Rationale for service change proposal** – Local authorities can and do subsidise services. A significant number of councils have closed pest control departments over the past two years. The Council can no longer afford to provide the current level of subsidy to this discretionary service.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** – Change to the policy for subsidising services as detailed above.

This option would change the dynamics and balance between treatment demand and enforcement requirement and costs cannot be predicted with any certainty at this stage.

### **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – Residents may be requested to pay for treatment or be subject to enforcement action. Residents may choose not to use the Council service and would have access to locally advertised Pest Control companies.

**Partners** – Sewer baiting programme funded by United Utilities (UU) may be affected.

**Council** – Estate management may need to provide alternative commercial pest control treatment contracts. Fees would be collected on line and via normal banking processes.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement** – the current budget plan consultation included principles relating to the introduction of charges, including Pest Control

Type Inform  Consult (Internal)

### **Pest Control Charging Feedback from Consultation**

Consultation was carried out with pest control treatment service users when they made an appointment for treatment via the Sefton Contact Centre. At the end of the service request call the customer was asked:-

“Sefton Council are faced with budget cuts and are considering charging for this service in the future. Can you advise what you would be willing to pay in the future”.

From those willing to give a response, the contact centre recorded an amount if stated, or if not, read through a list of amounts starting at 0 and increasing in £5 increments.

The survey ran from 11<sup>th</sup> September to 4<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

	£0	£5	£10	£15	£20	£25	Stated	
--	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--------	--

# Agenda Item 4

Rats	11	1	2	1	3	3	£18 x1	
Mice	9	1	6	2	2	1		
Cockroaches	1							
Bedbugs								
Fleas	3	2	5	1	2	4		
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>57</b>

In addition to the above the public were also consulted as part of the budget setting surveys. Of those responding through e-consult 49% agreed that this service should be fully funded by those people using the service without any contribution from council tax payers, 33% disagreed and 17% neither agreed or disagreed. For those responding to the telephone survey 34% agreed that this service should be fully funded by those people using the service without any contribution from council tax payers, 59% disagreed and 7% neither agreed or disagreed.

### Public Sector Equality Duty – See below

**Legislation Considered** – Prevention of Damage by Pest Act 1949 – Duty to keep borough free of rats and mice. Duty to keep own land free of vermin.

### Risks & Mitigating Actions –

There is a risk that pest control becomes less effective and the borough may see a rise in vermin and public health pests with consequent public health implications. The Council's statutory pest control duties, such as the use of enforcement powers to deal with infestation issues, are not affected by this option. The Council would also continue to provide advice and information to the public on pest control matters.

The impact will be highest in the most deprived areas where currently over 50% of service users live. 43% of service users are on Council administered benefits.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
£184,000  
**Staffing: 5**  
**Other Resources used:** UU  
Sewer baiting contribution

**Saving 2013/14 (#):** £ 20,000 Part Year  
**Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):** £ 10,000 Full Year  
**Staff at Risk: TBC** note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal  
Net posts 0 but posts may need to be changed from treatment officers to enforcement officers in order to address failure to treat amongst those unwilling to pay.

# Agenda Item 4

## Equality Analysis Report

### **Details of proposal: Charging fees for Pest control.**

The Council has a duty under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 to take such steps as necessary to make sure, so far as is practicable, that the district is kept free from rats and mice. In order to carry out this duty the Council has powers to enforce owners and occupiers of land to keep their land free from rats and mice.

Currently it offers a free service and now it wishes to charge a basic call out fee.

### **Ramifications of Proposal:**

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

If 'Yes' give details

A treatment service would be available to all, there would still be significant take up of treatment requiring some cost contribution (for those not on benefits) of a £20 charge with 20% drop off rate of those required to pay.

### **Are there any protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected in comparison to others?**

The charging of a call out fee is targeted at all – however the fee would be linked to income/benefit levels.

As such individuals on low incomes (people dependent on disability benefits, income support such as single parents, pensioners in receipt of pension allowance, and those on job seekers allowance) would not be charged.

Therefore there is no disproportionate impact on any particular protected characteristic as mitigation is in place

### **Consultation.**

As part of public consultation on budget planning it was noted that:

Residents agreed that Pest Control (34%) should be fully paid for by service users and without any contribution from council tax payers.

### **Is there evidence that the Public Sector Equality Duties will continue to be met?**

The service will be delivering in line with the Equality Act 2010. Charges will be based on ability to pay linked to welfare benefits. The PSED will continue to be met.

### **What actions will follow if proposal accepted by Cabinet & Council?**

1. Inform public
2. Identify process for income testing

Monitor take up and efficiency of service

## Annex D – Options previously approved for Consultation Adult Social Care

### Introduction/Background

- 1.1 As Members are aware Adult Social Care, both nationally and locally, is going through a period of great change. The funding pressure on adult social care services, throughout the country, is increasing and will continue to do so as a consequence of demographic change, including an ageing population. This is happening at a time of reducing resources. There is a statutory requirement for local authorities to ensure services are provided to those with eligible and assessed need. The Council's challenge is to deliver assessed adult social care need and implement the transformation agenda in the face of increasing demand and reduced resources.

Information from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment shows Sefton already has a sizeable population of older people and as this grows, it will have a large impact on services and our ability to cope. Sefton has the highest proportion of residents aged 65+ and 75+ than both its neighbouring and demographically similar PCTs – 21% are currently aged 65+ - and Sefton's population is growing older. Information released by Office of National Statistics shows a population projectio for older people from 2010-2021 as follows:

- Residents aged 60 – 69 make up 12.2% of Sefton's total population (a 7.3% increase comparing Census 2011 to the previous Census in 2001) and according to the 2010 regional population projects the number of 60 – 69 year old residents within Sefton could rise to approximately 36,000 in 2021;
- Residents aged 70 – 79 make up 9.3% of Sefton's total population (a 3.8% increase comparing Census 2011 to the previous Census in 2001) and regional population projections show the number of 70 – 79 year old residents within Sefton could rise to approximately 29,100 in 2021;
- Residents aged 80 – 89 make up 5.0% of Sefton's total population (a 18.9% increase comparing Census 2011 to the previous Census in 2001) and regional population projections show the number of 80 – 89 year old residents within Sefton could rise to approximately 16,400 in 2021; and
- Residents aged over 90 make up 0.9% of Sefton's total population (a 16.6% increase comparing Census 2011 to the previous Census in 2001) and regional population projections show the number of over 90s year old residents within Sefton could rise to approximately 4,000 in 2021.

An increasingly elderly population are likely to attend A&E and be admitted to hospital as a result of falls – an estimated 28% increase of attendances by 2030. The number of people receiving direct payments is increasing, as is the rate of households receiving intensive homecare, and it is estimated that there are some 6,600 carers in Sefton aged over 65, with the numbers receiving a needs assessment or review rising.

# Agenda Item 4

The areas of highest income deprivation affecting older people are concentrated in the south of the Borough, and in central Southport, however there are some pockets of income deprived older people in Ainsdale, Norwood and Manor Wards of the Borough. It is understood that Sefton's Older Population is more affected by deprivation than similar groups within Merseyside

- 1.2 This annex brings together the options approved for consultation by September and December Cabinet associated with Adult Social Care as detailed in the table below;

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Option</b>
D1.14	Assessment & Care Management Teams – Reconfiguring of teams and skill mix.
D1.15	Reconfiguration of the Supporting People Commissioning team
F1.6	Streamlined model for Community Meals
F3.2	Remodel Day Opportunities
D1.39	Remodel all current day care and transport
D1.41	Respite – offer to be reduced from a range to up to a 14 days per year subject to ongoing assessment processes
D1.35	Section 117 After Care funding – The Council will work with Health colleagues, to assess service users who receive 117 funding and conduct reviews based upon a model of care that promotes recovery.
D1.36	Continuing Health Care- prioritise and undertake reviews of service users currently in nursing care to ensure that they are supported via appropriate agencies.
D1.37	Assistive Technology– increase the use of equipment that enables service users (vulnerable people) to remain in their own homes with minimal outside support
D1.38	Increase charges for a range of services, these are an increase of charges to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of disposable income (currently 80%) - Currently Service users will contribute 80% of their disposable income toward their care or service costs and this option will mean a change in Council policy so that 100% of disposable income is considered in the financial assessment process.</li> <li>• Reduce disability related expenditure (DRE) which presently stands at £16.00 per user per week to £11.00 per week. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> <li>• Couples – disregard income buffer when assessing care needs. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> </ul>
D1.40	Recover surplus, unspent Direct Payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150.
D1.42	Revise Re-ablement model – To obtain, one year only, funding available from Health of £900,000 to enable more users to go through an improved re-ablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short & long term care.
D1.43	Further incremental reductions in housing related support

- 1.2 Within the options there are a number which may impact on the provision of short term breaks to service users and their carers within a variety of settings. These include day facilities, overnight care, emergency care provision and other facilities for short breaks plus the associated transport. The common factor for these options (F3.2, D1.39 and D1.41) is not which service is being provided or where, but that their purpose and



Service outcomes are effective, and services continue to be provided to those with assessed needs.

- 1.3 In September 2012 Cabinet approved the commencement of a pilot that would seek to establish the feasibility of providing day opportunities through alternative methods other than the traditional day centre model. Building on this Cabinet in December 2012 approved consultation on further options associated with day care and respite. Considering these options in the round the Council has the opportunity to shape services to meet need and is seeking to develop holistic solutions to health and wellbeing which embrace the full range of local services, including voluntary, community and faith sector, health, social care, arts and culture, wellbeing, parks and green spaces, education, assistive technology and employment. Future solutions to need will be designed with the explicit intent of making best use of existing and developing community offers, universal services, reducing reliance on outdated services and of building individual and community resilience whilst continuing to support those with the most complex need.
- 1.4 The approach to the pilot was to utilise existing Council facilities and services, in this case leisure centres, in conjunction with our partner, Sefton New Directions. The pilot has demonstrated the suitability of an alternative model and has achieved most of its objectives including demonstrating that it is possible for service users to have access to and benefit from a wide range of inclusive activities at modern, stimulating and motivating settings. An analysis of the consultation that took place is available in section (i) of this annex; in summary over 90% of service users viewed use of the leisure centres as being a positive experience. Service users were motivated and encouraged by their change in environment and wider range of activities. In addition to proving a meaningful alternative to traditional day care, very encouraging feedback has been received on the impact of the pilot upon day service users' physical and mental wellbeing.
- 1.5 Further evidence to assist in considering this option is the feedback from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment consultation. This demonstrated that it is clear that access to universal services and enabling self care is a key element to improving the health and wellbeing of our community especially those with learning and physical disabilities. This consultation has also confirmed that independent travel is valued and greater access to independent travel training would be welcomed.
- 1.6 In addition the pilot consultation feedback indicated that the use of alternative venues is preferable to the current day care models and that there is the potential to make alternative use of community and Council assets to improve outcomes and reduce longer term financial impact on the Council.
- 1.7 Whilst service user feedback was positive the sustainability of operating the pilot model would not deliver the ongoing savings projected without significant change to transport and financial models, workforce development and infrastructure investment. Any reduction in commissioning of transport for adults will not attract the level of savings previously described due the continuing requirement to provide home to school transport. The staffing required to support any potential roll out of the pilot within Leisure Centres would need to be tailored to and trained for the activities and safeguarding issues associated with this kind of provision. Options F3.2, D1.39 and D1.41 should now be considered as one option and updated information is described in section (ii) of this annex.

# Agenda Item 4

- 1.8 The Council will change the approach to short break planning, shifting the balance towards preventative support, independent travel where suitable and personalised support to improve outcomes both for carers and those with assessed care needs so developing a sustainable model for short term breaks. The Council will continue to provide services for adults who have been assessed as requiring the service. Service users, where possible, will be supported to be self reliant and access a wider range of universal services in the community.
- 1.9 The Council will look at the current service users over a period of time and as part of the annual review process. In so doing, the Council anticipates that some existing service users assessed against the Fair Access to Care criteria needs may have changed. Whichever is the case then conversations will take place with those service users accordingly. When looking at client current provision to meet assessed needs conversations will also take place as part of the review of the care plan and/or assessed need to discern where and how needs can be best met. In essence there a range of choices for service users that will need to be considered on a case by case basis.
- 1.10 Cabinet is asked to
- a) note and take into account the key messages identified from the results of the consultation
  - b) consider the impact of the option
  - c) agree the approach and policy
  - d) note that should further related opportunities and or significant issues arise between now and next Cabinet Officers will advise Members accordingly and
  - e) recommend to Council a budget reduction of £5.99m.
- 1.11 Further options relating to Adult Social Care are detailed in section (iii) of this annex have been and will continue to be subject to appropriate consultation and engagement as part of the process of assessing impact in order to have due regard to the Council's obligations under the Equality Act 2010. Where appropriate an equality analysis report is provided which identifies any potential impact on those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions to be taken should any risks remain.
- 1.12 In developing these options the Officers have regularly reviewed strategic and operational risks and put in place measures to manage those risks. However it must be stressed that reductions of the level required by Government cannot be achieved in a risk free environment. There will be significant risk associated with these budget options.
- 1.13 The options have been risk assessed by the relevant senior officers with mitigating actions identified where possible. These risks have been assessed and will be managed in the light of new financial forecasts.
- 1.14 Cabinet is asked to
- a) note and take account of the detail within the equality analysis report, the consultation approach, feedback (where available) and the mitigating actions within each option in taking their decisions on the recommendations to Council
  - b) note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in making its recommendations to Council

# Agenda Item 4

- c) note that should further related opportunities and or significant issues arise between now and next Cabinet Officers will advise Members accordingly.
- d) consider the information provided in section (iii) of this annex and approve the associated recommendations
- e) authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately, pending final decisions of Council including the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if appropriate to achieve change

1.15 The scale and pace of change associated with the options in this part of the report will not be delivered through changes to ways of working, structural and organisational arrangements alone. To achieve significant and sustainable change there will be a need to effect large scale behavioural change within the Council, key partners and the wider community. Robust workforce planning arrangements are being put in place to ensure that as functions and roles change, the workforce have the skills required ensuring effective service delivery. Alongside this client and community expectations will need to shift to a more preventative and realistic approach reflecting resource levels

# Agenda Item 4

## **Section (i) – Day Care Pilot Consultation Summary**

### **Key Facts**

Numbers of people who visited leisure centres—(some people visited more than one centre).

Crosby Lakeside Activity Centre 48

Netherton Activity Centre 54

Meadows 8

Dunes 10

93 people were interviewed in total over a ten day period.

131 people took part in the pilot project.

Groups of 8-10 people were supported by minimum of two staff.

### **Activities people took part in**

Some activities of the pilot activities are already enjoyed in the traditional day centres, such as arts craft and jewellery making. 67 (72%) people fed back that the change in environment was a good thing and they liked being in the leisure centre because of the modern facilities and quieter environment. 24 (26%) people did not mention as it was in free text section. 2 (2%) people specifically mentioned they did not like, wanted to stay in Bootle Day Centre.

### **How did people feel about trying the new approach?**

85 (91%) people reported to be happy about trying new activities at the leisure centres. Only 5 (5.3%) people said they were a little worried about the prospect.

### **Responses to questions:**

#### **Have you enjoyed the activities?**

Yes 90% No 6% Some 2% Did not try 2%

#### **Did you have a choice in what you wanted to do?**

Yes 85% No 15%

#### **What activities would you do again?**

83 (89%) people wanted to do more activities at the leisure centres. The view of the lake and location at CLAC was a highly valued feature.

#### **Would you like to do more activities in the future?**

Yes 87% Maybe 3% No 5% Blank 5%

#### **What other activities would you like to do?**

What we are doing already plus – football, dvd /film, keep fit, cycling, yoga, swimming, pool, tennis and line dancing.

#### **Where would you like to do them?**

People named the leisure centre that they had been to. They also said they would like

to see the other venues available.

## **Anything you would change?**

Transport issues—only two wheelchair users at a time and reliability.

52 (56%) people said they were happy and wouldn't change anything.

Those that would said kitchen facilities (8 - 9% ) Transport (2 - 2.1%) Cafe in the NAC (2 - 2.1%)

Accessibility NAC (11 - 12%) blank (17 -18%)

## **Have you been more active since starting the project?**

Yes 67% No 33%

## **What would you change about the leisure centre? Comments included**

- Transport to be more reliable (2 mentioned specifically one day whole session cancelled due to transport Bootle Day Centre) Also an observation and talking to staff.
- Kitchen facilities in all the rooms so we can be more independent
- Heavy doors at the NAC
- Uneven floors at the NAC
- We have everything we need here - Its lovely!

## **Other Comments**

- 8 people in Bootle Day Centre are reluctant to get involved as they are fearful of the centre closing.
- 2 people with profound learning disabilities and complex needs were reported by support staff to be much happier and settled.
- By those who accessed more than one centre Crosby Lakeside Activity Centre - was considered to be the most suitable facility, mainly because it is on one level. Although there was some concern that during peak summer months they would lose access to the rooms.
- Netherton Activity Centre - Some issues around accessibility for wheelchair users - the two storey building and the use of the lift. Dunes - even though the base room was not the best, it was regarded as a fantastic location. The use of the kitchen at Dunes was a positive.
- Of those who accessed services at Meadows the feedback was generally good with no complaints or issues raised

# Agenda Item 4

## **Section (ii) Day Care and Respite provision**

### **Service Description : Day Care and Respite provision**

This option is an amalgamation of option F3.2 (September 2012 cabinet Day Care pilot) and option D1.39 remodel day care and D1.41 reduce respite offer (both December 2012 Cabinet)

Day Care and respite provision provides care for a person away from the person's home. The purpose of day care and respite - as part of Community Care – is to tackle that social isolation and assistance with personal care and support. Day care and respite care offers benefits both to the people who receive it and to any carers who look after them. The Council also provides a specialist transport service for service users.

Activities based at Day Centres are currently based on the traditional model. Such provision will not necessarily suit/meet the needs of today's aging population and is unlikely to meet the aspirations of future service users. In September 2012, Cabinet authorised a pilot in day care services where different locations and activities were offered to current service users. This resulted in increased use of existing Council facilities. Building on this Cabinet in December 2012 approved consultation on further options associated with day care and also respite provision. Considering these options in the round the Council has the opportunity to shape services to meet need and is seeking to develop holistic solutions to health and wellbeing which embrace the full range of local services, including voluntary, community and faith sector, health, social care, arts and culture, wellbeing, parks and green spaces, education, assistive technology and employment.

Future solutions will have the explicit intent of making best use of existing and developing community offers, universal services, reducing reliance on outdated services and of building individual and community resilience whilst continuing to support those with the greatest need.

### **It is proposed to continue with consultation on the following change option –**

- Remodelled day opportunities and respite (including proposal to close day centres)
- The service will be focussed on maximising usage of available resources

### **Rationale for service change proposal – Day Care**

In the future day opportunities will be shaped by how best to meet assessed needs and made more appropriate to people who use them. It is anticipated that demand for more traditional day services, which are often provided from a day centre, will reduce as a greater number of people choose from a wider range of activities and services. New day opportunities will enable service users to re-learn skills they may have lost through illness or disability or to learn new skills they need to cope with changing circumstances.

The pilot sought to establish the feasibility of providing day opportunities through alternative methods other than the traditional day centre model. The pilot has demonstrated the suitability of an alternative model and has achieved most of its objectives including demonstrating that it is possible for service users to have access to and benefit from a wide range of inclusive activities at modern, stimulating and motivating settings.

A remodelled service could include opportunities such as those provided under the pilot project and more. This will result in the utilisation of an alternative approach to all day opportunities and any associated transport provided by the Council. This may also mean the closure of a number of day centres. Before any decisions are made to close day centres, the Council will need to satisfy itself that the current service users needs

can be met by any new/proposed arrangements.

Further evidence to assist in considering this option is the feedback from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment consultation. This demonstrated that it is clear that access to universal services and enabling self care is a key element to improving the health and wellbeing of our community especially those with learning and physical disabilities. This consultation has also confirmed that independent travel is valued and greater access to independent travel training would be welcomed.

In addition the pilot consultation feedback indicated that the use of alternative venues is preferable to the current day care and respite models and that there is the potential to make alternative use of community and Council assets to improve outcomes and reduce longer term financial impact on the Council. The Council now intends to build on this approach to improve short break planning, shift the balance towards preventative support, independent travel where suitable and to personalise support to improve outcomes for service users and carers. Future assessments for care will focus on enabling service users without high levels of care and support needs to be more self reliant. Service Users and their carers will be signposted to alternative universal services in the community.

The approach to the pilot was to utilise existing Council facilities and services, in this case leisure centres, in conjunction with an existing partner, Sefton New Directions. The pilot has demonstrated the suitability of an alternative model and has achieved most of its objectives including demonstrating that it is possible for service users to have access to and benefit from a wide range of inclusive activities at modern, stimulating and motivating settings. An analysis of the consultation that took place is available in section (i) of this annex; over 90% of service users viewed use of the leisure centres as being a positive experience. Service users were motivated and encouraged by their change in environment and wider range of activities. In addition to proving a meaningful alternative to traditional day care, encouraging feedback has been received on the impact of the pilot upon day service users' physical and mental wellbeing.

Whilst service user feedback was positive, the sustainability of operating the pilot model would not deliver the ongoing savings projected without significant change to transport and financial models, workforce development and infrastructural investment.

At present respite provision provides day and overnight relief to carers based on a traditional model of care within traditional settings of care. The Council is seeking to move service users towards greater independence by transforming day opportunities and its provision of respite.

The common factor of these options is not which service is being provided but their purpose and effective outcomes. In other words, the determining factor is not where a service is provided but that what is provided has the most beneficial effect on assessed needs.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –**

- The use traditional day care facilities, that may include the closure of a number

# Agenda Item 4

of day centres

- Use of existing and developing community offers, universal services, reducing reliance on outdated services and of building individual and community resilience whilst continuing to support those with the greatest need.
- A change in transport and routes. Further details will emerge following the completion of an adult transport remodelling exercise.
- Depending on the alternative solution, current day care facilities and property will be reviewed regarding future use.

## **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – Alternative opportunities for current day care service users and a possible reduction in available days for short break respite.

**Partners** – Care providers will need to review their provision and new provision will be commissioned. This will impact on all existing partners

**Council** – Specialist Transport - The impact of any reduction in adult transport needs to be considered against any potential additional cost to the remaining service for children and young people. Further information will be available following the remodelling exercise currently being undertaken. Evidence suggests that the numbers attending traditional day centres will fall and the Council will, therefore, need to consider its estate.

## **Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

The pilot consultation feedback indicated that the use of alternative venues is preferable to the current day care and respite models and that there is the potential to make alternative use of community and Council assets to improve outcomes and reduce longer term financial impact on the Council. The Council now intends to build on this approach to improve short break planning, shift the balance towards preventative support, independent travel where suitable and to personalise support to improve outcomes both for carers and those with assessed care needs so developing a sustainable model for short term breaks.

This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:

- Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,
- To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.
- Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.
- To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.

To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision

**Legislation Considered** – National Assistance Act 1948, Local Authority Circular



<p>(93)10          There is no statutory duty to provide care in a day centre.          Case law is helpful in this regard in that it emphasises that the Authority should conduct assessments of current future service users to help determine provision to meet those assessed needs.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b></p> <p>Any material change to a person’s care package should follow a reassessment or review and revised care/support plans which should be confirmed in writing.</p> <p>Increasing dependency of service users currently accessing day care – the Council will signpost service users to universal services which will enable more accessible and inclusive opportunities. Analysis from pilot has shown this to be a preferable solution.</p> <p>Risk to the operation of the Specialist Transport Unit – the Council would remodel this service          Challenge from service users and carers, mitigated by individual assessments and reviews</p>	
	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 = £750K</b>  <b>Saving 2014/15 = £5.24m</b>  <b>Investment Required: £ Nil</b>  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: tbc (transport)</b>          note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal</p>

# Agenda Item 4

## Section (iii) Adult Social Care Options where first stage internal consultation is complete

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
D1.14	Assessment Teams – Reconfiguring of teams and skill mix. Care Management teams consist of social work and occupational therapy assessment, review and organise care and support for vulnerable adults.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>recommend to Council a budget reduction of £208k</li> </ul>
D1.15	Reconfiguration of the Supporting People Commissioning team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>recommend to Council a budget reduction of £186k</li> </ul>
F1.6	Community meals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>note that Officers will continue consultation and engagement processes with partners, employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>note that Officers will continue the conversation with current service users as to how the service will change including support for the transition period between the subsidised to the non subsidised model</li> <li>consider and take account of the impact assessment</li> <li>recommend to Council a budget reduction of £200k</li> </ul>

# Agenda Item 4

D1.35	Section 117 After Care funding – The Council will pursue, with our Health colleagues, the identification of service users who receive 117 funding and request reviews to see if they still require this provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that the realisation of this option is dependent upon information and support from Health Colleagues</li> <li>• note that consultation will take place as part of ongoing care package reviews which will be conducted by Health colleagues</li> <li>• consider and take account of the impact assessment</li> <li>• note that reviews will be undertaken of all people with a section 117 to ensure the needs still fall within the Council’s eligibility criteria</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £200k</li> </ul>
D1.36	Continuing Health Care - prioritise and undertake reviews of service users currently in nursing care to ensure that they are supported appropriately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £400k</li> </ul>
D1.37	Assistive Technology– increase the use of equipment that enables service users (vulnerable people) to remain in their own homes with minimal outside support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that consultation will take place as part of ongoing care package reviews and assessments</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £200k</li> </ul>

# Agenda Item 4

D1.38	<p>Increase charges for a range of services, these are an increase of charges to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of disposable income (currently 80%) - Currently Service users will contribute 80% of their disposable income toward their care or service costs and this option will mean a change in Council policy so that 100% of disposable income is considered in the financial assessment process.</li> <li>• Reduce disability related expenditure (DRE) which presently stands at £16.00 per user per week to £11.00 per week. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> <li>• Couples - disregard income buffer when assessing care needs. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consider the changes in policy</li> <li>• note that consultation about this approach has commenced and should any significant issues be raised during this consultation they will be reported to Cabinet</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget plan assumed reduction of £564k</li> </ul>
D1.40	<p>Recover surplus, unspent Direct Payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• approve the cessation of the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150</li> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of the assessment and review process</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £752k</li> </ul>
D1.42	<p>Revise Re-ablement model - To obtain new funding available from Health of £900,000, one year only, to enable more users to go through a re-ablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short &amp; long term care.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> <li>• recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £1.2m</li> </ul>

# Agenda Item 4

D1.43	Housing Related Support incremental reductions in housing related funding have reduced the requirement for commissioning/ contractual functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</li><li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li><li>• recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £500k</li></ul>
-------	---	---

# Agenda Item 4

D1.14

<b>Service Description Care Management Teams (Adults)</b> Care Management teams consist of social work, occupational therapy and unqualified staff who review and organise care and support for vulnerable adults.
<b>It is proposed to continue with consultation on the following change option –</b> A reconfiguration of frontline adult social care teams to a model of larger generic assessment and review teams
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> To create a more effective, efficient and integrated social care process. To move away from a specialism model of delivery to a multi-disciplinary model. Also to utilise the benefits of a new and improved service database (Integrated Adults System).
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> A reduction in the size of current teams and a review of skill mix.
<b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users –</b> Generic teams would provide multi-disciplinary support for all service user groups. co-locating and joining up teams will achieve service improvements and efficiencies in terms of minimising duplication and confusion in customer contact points.  <b>Partners –</b> Change will require updating of process and contact information  <b>Council –</b> This is a significant culture shift for Adult Services Social Work Teams. Training for IAS to continue throughout the reconfiguration period. Reduction in current leased accommodation
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>  Type Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Meetings with staff commenced in October 2012. Two workshops have been held to explore new structures and processes. Issues regarding reconfiguration are discussed with staff at regular Leadership meetings and regular reconfigurations meetings continue to take place with Team Managers and Care Management staff. Meetings with staff - 9/10/12, 10/10/12, 6/11/12, 7/12/12, 20/12/12, 8/1/13 Workshops - 25/10/12 & 11/12/12
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that the changes to service delivery seek to improve processes for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures.
<b>Legislation Considered –</b> None

# Agenda Item 4

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – If staffing reductions are outweighed by increasing demographic pressures, resource will be prioritised for those people with greatest and most complex need.

The employee mix in the proposed care management model will ensure that there is a core specialist group to deal with sensitive cases.

Increase in Social Work supervision and monitoring. Mitigated by prioritisation of cases.

The implementation of the new Integrated Adults System (IAS) database will assist to streamline current processes and procedures, enabling a more efficient and effective way of working.

Potential for inconsistency of case workers as integrated teams will be multi disciplinary; this may have a potential impact on users who wish to maintain their current social worker. Better shared information via IAS will enable more effective caseload management and the distribution of case sharing will continue to be sensitive to the needs of the user.

	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £208,000</b> Year <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: Up to 10</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>
--	---

# Agenda Item 4

D1.15

<p><b>Service Description Housing Related Support</b> (Supporting People Commissioning team)          The Supporting People currently team commission and monitor services providing low level housing related support to vulnerable adults.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option</b> – To reconfigure the commissioning of housing related support services with other commissioning activity and reduce the number of staff /posts employed for this purpose.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – Funding for the commissioning of housing related support services was provided through the ring fenced Supporting People grant. This funding is no longer a ring-fenced budget. Incremental reductions in housing related funding and integration of commissioning activities have reduced the requirement for commissioning/contractual functions.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – Bespoke Supporting People commissioning function.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users</b> – None</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Probation Service – the team work closely with this service to provide housing related support to ex offenders. This function will continue via the wider commissioning team.</p> <p><b>Council</b> – A reduction in human resources for the commissioning and contracting function</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>5/12/2012 – Union Consultation Meeting          5/12/2012- Briefing with Supporting People Team          16/01/2013 – Trade Union Consultation Meeting</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that the changes to service delivery seek to improve processes for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – None</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – A reconfiguration of duties and activity within an integrated commissioning and contracts function will assist in mitigating the loss of staff.</p>	
<p><b>Staffing: 9 posts</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#): £125,000</b>  <b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#): £61,000</b>  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 9</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>



## F1.6 Community Meals: Migrating users to alternate providers

### Service Description Community Meals

The provision of Community Meals Service to 332 vulnerable adults (as at November 2012). This service is provided by Sefton New Directions, Women's Royal Voluntary Services (WRVS) and in partnership with the Place and People Directorates.

**It is proposed to liaise with current service users on the following change** – To introduce a more cost effective, streamlined model for Community Meals which will enable Sefton residents to access a range of meal options.

**Rationale for service change proposal** – There has been a fall in demand for the service in recent years and it is anticipated that this trend will continue. Sefton saw a 21% reduction in the number of clients having meals delivered between the end of year 2009/10 and end of year 2011/12 figures. Nationally there was an average fall of 45.5% in the number of clients having meals delivered between over the same period. The majority of Local Authorities have moved away from a direct meals service and towards arrangements with external providers for the supply of hot and re-heatable meals.

In recent years the market associated with this area of service delivery has expanded to include major supermarket and specialist meal delivery. These types of solutions are available widely at reasonable cost and can be accessed on-line and via the telephone.

**The following activity will change** – Sefton residents will be signposted to a variety of alternative solutions. The Council will no longer co-ordinate or commission this activity. Current services users (332 as at November 2012) will be assisted in sourcing alternative solutions.

### Impact of Service Change –

**Service Users** – The assessment of need of an individual who is eligible under Fair Access to Care must take account of their need for nutrition and meal provision and in line with current procedures this will be included in their care/support plan. The Council will ensure that the range of available choices is discussed with the individual and a suitable arrangement put in place for them to access community meals from a variety of providers. The current service users will be supported in the transition arrangements, for those who qualify under the Chronically Sick & Disabled Persons Act 1970 or the National Assistance Act 1948 the Council will ensure that an appropriate solution is sourced. For all other service users they will have the opportunity to select the best arrangement for their individual circumstances.

**Partners** – Changes to the service currently provided through Sefton New Directions would be managed through the appropriate contractual arrangements. The alternative approach may impact upon the current Service Level Agreement that Sefton New Directions have with Women's Royal Voluntary Service, who assist in the delivery of meals.

**Council** – The alternative approach will have an impact on the Council's Catering and Vehicle Management services (including the termination of lease arrangements). The Council will ensure that comprehensive information is available to the public on the range of providers through, for example local press, Sefton website, One Stop Shops and Contact Centre.

### Communications, Consultations & Engagement –

Type Inform (Partners)  Consult (Internal)  Engage (Clients)

This new approach was agreed by Cabinet in December 2012. Since December 2012

# Agenda Item 4

Officers have plans in place to ensure that services users are engaged with about the change in approach and the Council will also ensure it continues to meet service users needs in accordance with any legal care planning processes. Plans also include operational tasks such as client letters informing of change, updating the Council website, Contact Centre and Social Care processes.

This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:

- Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,
- To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.
- Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.
- To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.
- To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.

## **Public Sector Equality Duty – See below**

**Legislation Considered** – A number of pieces of legislation need to be considered in this issue. Section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948, Section 2 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and Section 45 of the Health Services and Public Health Act 1968.

The Council has a duty to provide welfare services for the disabled etc where they have an assessed need. This can include access to a meals service. How the service should be provided is entirely a matter for the Council, provided that the service meets the Service Users assessed needs.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – Any alternative service model will still be required to meet service user needs and comply with care/support plans. There is now greater choice available for people to access affordable meals, including supermarkets who deliver ready meals to the door and specialist companies who deliver affordable meals that meet all dietary requirements, such as the nationally advertised Wiltshire Farm Foods providing meals from £2.95 with free delivery. It is to be noted that this alternative model may result in a reduction in cost for the service users. No subsidy is provided for these alternatives to the home delivered hot meal service. The Council will ensure that comprehensive information is available to the public on the range of providers of this service.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
**(see saving breakdown)**

**Staffing: 3**

**Other Resources used:**  
**leased vehicles**

**Saving 2013/14 (#): £200,000** Year

**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 3** note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option

The saving breakdown is as follows:

Adult Social Care Saving	-£247,000
Vehicle Maintenance Loss of Income	+£18,000
Catering Net Loss of Income	<u>+£29,000</u>
<b>Net Saving</b>	<b>-£200,000</b>

## Equality Analysis Report Community Meals.

**Details of proposal:** The Council has a statutory duty and a power to provide access to meals. There is no duty or power to subsidise the cost of those meals. Nor is there a duty or power for the Council to directly provide those meals.

Currently the recipient of the meal **and** the Council jointly pay for each meal delivered (Council is paying for the current 'meals on wheels' infrastructure and delivery services).

The recipient pays between £3-4 per meal.

Alternate suppliers have been found due to the growing market in this sector (led by leading supermarkets) which means meals can be provided and delivered to the door for the cost that the recipient pays. This would allow the Council to make a saving by not having pay for the infrastructure.

Officers will contact current recipients and help them to explore and utilise the alternatives.

### Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

Those in receipt of 'meals on wheels' fall in to two broad groups. (1) Those that have been assessed under FACS and have an identified need which must be met. And (2) those that have been 'referred' to meals on wheels via family/ friends/ advisory services etc.

Those recipients that are covered by a FACS assessment will continue to have their needs met (via an alternative supplier) and be monitored as part of their assessment.

Those in receipt of meals on wheels (via referral) will be able to continue with an alternate supplier of equal quality without additional costs should they choose to do so.

### Are there any protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected in comparison to others?

Sefton data (see below) shows that 'meals on wheels' type services are used by the elderly (71 years of age+) with a high proportion of disability and mobility issues. As such they are a very vulnerable group.

Any withdrawal of service will affect these groups disproportionately. Council has only the duty to 'signpost' to meal on wheels type services (unless the recipient is assessed under FACS as a need)

Alternate operators would provide a service, but officers need to ensure that the current recipients fully understand what is happening and can access the new service. Officers need to allow for people's age and levels of understand when putting the new proposals forward to recipients.

Gender	Proportion
Female	61.9%
Male	38.1%
Grand Total	100.0%

Ethnicity	Proportion
White - British	99.7%
White - Irish	0.3%

Client Category	Proportion
Dementia	4.3%
Frailty/temporary illness	34.0%
Learning disability	0.3%
Mental health	3.4%
Other vulnerable person	4.9%
Physical disability	44.8%
Sensory Disability-Deafblind	0.9%
Sensory	0.9%

# Agenda Item 4

		Disability-Dual sensory loss	
		Sensory Disability-Hearing impairment	1.5%
		Sensory Disability-Visual impairment	4.6%
Grand Total	100.0%	Grand Total	100.0%

  

Age Group	Proportion
31-40	0.3%
41-50	0.3%
51-60	1.5%
61-70	5.2%
71-80	19.5%
80+	73.2%

**Consultation & Information** Each recipient's situation (with their carer if appropriate) will be reviewed, informed of and assisted with their choices.

**Is there evidence that the Public Sector Equality Duties will continue to be met?**

Ensuring that there are 'meals on wheels' type providers enables older people and people with disabilities/mobility problems to stay in their own home and reduces the need for hospitalisation and residential care.

As such it is advancing the opportunities of this group.

Sefton data shows that the recipients are reflective of the older community demography.

The fact that the new service providers will provide to anyone (without the need of a referral), may mean we see a widening of usage to different age ranges.

The Council in making this change continues to meet PSED

**What actions will follow if proposal accepted by Cabinet & Council?**

1. Inform and support current service users as to the choices on offer.
2. Contact Centre and Social Care processes and website processes will be updated
3. Monitor performance and feedback.

<p><b>Service Description: Section 117 Funding</b> Everyone with mental health needs is entitled to a community care assessment to establish what services they might need. However, section 117 goes much further than this and imposes a duty on health and social services to provide aftercare services to certain patients who have been detained under the Act.</p> <p>Health Services are required to fund the nursing element of care associated with diagnosed mental illness and Social Care are required to fund social care and community needs for example domiciliary care or support.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change</b> – To work with Health colleagues to undertake reviews of (currently) 240 service users who are subject to Section 117 aftercare funding.</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – At present service users who are subject to Section 117 aftercare do not have a financial assessment if they are in receipt of care following a Court ruling. This means that once a service user qualifies for Section 117 funding, the funding is rarely reduced or removed. This option will introduce a methodology for process to review each case on an individual basis.</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – The Council will pursue, with our Health colleagues, the identification of service users who receive 117 funding and request reviews to see if they still require this provision.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change</b> –</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> – Possible financial impact to the service user if reduced. However a full review would dictate the appropriateness of the continued funding e.g. mental health assessment advocates. Some service users may be impacted by the accumulative affect of the removal of subsidies and this option.</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Increased assessments and reviews carried out by partners in Merseycare Mental Health Trust.</p> <p><b>Council</b> – Assessments and reviews carried out by staff seconded to Merseycare</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> –</p> <p>Partner – Initial discussions with Merseycare have taken place and will continue. Officers have plans in place to ensure that services users are engaged with about the change in approach and the Council will also ensure it continues to meet service users needs in accordance with any legal care planning processes.</p> <p>This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,</li> <li>• To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.</li> <li>• Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.</li> <li>• To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.</li> <li>• To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – <i>See Equality Analysis Report below</i></p>
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Section 117 of the Mental Health Act 1983 - obliges councils and the NHS to provide aftercare services, including a care home place if that is needed,</p>

# Agenda Item 4

for people who have been discharged from hospital having been detained for treatment under the Mental Health Act 1983.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – Service users may present legal challenge if funding withdrawn. This is mitigated by following policy and procedures for re-assessment

	<b>Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £200,000	Full Year
	<b>Investment Required:</b> £ Nil	
	<b>Staff at Risk:</b> Nil	

## Equality Analysis Report

**Details of proposal:** To work with the NHS to reassess those currently in receipt of funding under Section 117 with a view to seeing if their initial need is still relevant. The Council wishes to establish a process with the NHS.

### Section 117 of **What is Section 117?**

the Mental Health Act 1983 (MHA) puts a legal duty on the NHS and social services to provide aftercare services free of charge to people who have been detained under certain sections of the MHA. The purpose of section 117 aftercare is to try to **prevent someone** needing to go back into hospital again. This means that services should meet someone's **immediate needs**, as well as supporting them to **gain skills to help them cope** with life outside of hospital. Aftercare services can be put in place to meet the following needs:

- Psychological needs
- Physical healthcare
- Daytime activities or employment
- Appropriate accommodation
- Needs arising from drug, alcohol or substance misuse
- Parenting needs
- Crisis planning
- Help with welfare benefits and managing money

The legal duty is on the Primary Care Trust (PCT) and the local social services authority, in the area where the person normally lived when they are admitted to hospital, to provide services under section 117 and to meet the cost of the aftercare.

The **service-user should be directly involved** in planning their aftercare. Any **carers** should also be involved as long as the service-user consents.

### **Discharge of section 117 aftercare**

The duty to provide aftercare lasts **as long as someone is in need** of these services because of their mental health condition.

Aftercare should **not** be stopped just because:

- Of a discharged from specialist mental health services, such as a community mental health team
- a certain length of time has passed since leaving hospital
- recipient returns to hospital voluntarily or under section 2
- recipient is deprived of their liberty under the Mental Capacity Act 2005
- recipient is no longer on supervised community treatment or section 17 leave

Section 117 services only end when the section is formally discharged. The recipient has to be included in this process, along with anyone they would like to be involved (their GP or Specialist).

**Ramifications of Proposal:**

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

Reviews of need under section 117 are part of the process. Recipients deemed to be still in need will continue to receive support.

The review process has to take account of the client's view and specialist evidence from advocates or medical officers overseeing the client's case.

**Are there any protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected in comparison to others?**

S.117 and decisions to discharge patients from it should apply irrespective of ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation. However, it is acknowledged that patients from BME communities are more likely to be detained, and thus to be on S.117.

This is a national phenomenon.

**Consultation.** As this is current process and provision no additional consultation needs to take place with service providers over the process.

Partners to decide time frame.

**Is there evidence that the Public Sector Equality Duties will continue to be met?**

The case review process is already established. Officer will follow good practice and ensure that recipients fully understand the process and ramifications of the process. Officers will have full regard to the wishes of the recipient and their professional staff/support team.

The PSED will continue to be met by adopting this proposal.

**What actions will follow if proposal accepted by Cabinet & Council?**

1. Establish process and parameter for review with partners
2. Monitor outcomes and performance.

# Agenda Item 4

**Service Description: NHS Continuing Health Care Funding** NHS continuing healthcare is a package of continuing care provided outside hospital, arranged and funded solely by the NHS, for people with ongoing healthcare needs.

**It is proposed to** prioritise and undertake reviews of service users currently in nursing care to ensure that they are supported appropriately.

**Rationale for service change proposal** – To be eligible for NHS continuing healthcare, the main or primary need for care must relate to the service users health.

For example, people who are eligible are likely to:

- have a complex medical condition that requires a lot of care and support
- need highly specialised nursing support

Someone nearing the end of their life is also likely to be eligible if they have a condition that is rapidly getting worse and may be terminal.

Eligibility for NHS continuing healthcare does not depend on:

- a specific health condition, illness or diagnosis
- who provides the care, or
- where the care is provided

If the service user has a disability, or is diagnosed with a long-term illness or condition, this doesn't necessarily mean that they will be eligible for NHS continuing healthcare.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** – It is forecast that some of these reviews will mean a number of LA funded cases will meet the eligibility criteria for CHC.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – The impact on service users will be minimal, health professionals are required to undertake such reviews now and in doing so would seek to provide the most appropriate care where someone is eligible for care they are not required to make a contribution.

**Partners** – Increased costs for Health

**Council** – None

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Partner – Initial discussions with Health took place in November and indications are of a positive nature. Further meetings to discuss methodology and process continued through December and will continue over the coming months.

This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:

- Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,
- To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.
- Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.
- To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.



# Agenda Item 4

- To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – The Quality Assurance Group (QAG) in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change in the funding source; the policy and activity of supporting people with assessed need has not changed.

**Legislation Considered** –

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – The Council and Health may not have the capacity to review CHC cases.

<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>	<b>Saving 2014/15</b>	<b>£400,000</b>
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Investment Required: £</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b>	

# Agenda Item 4

**Service Description Assistive Technology** Assistive Technology (AT) is the use of IT equipment that enables service users (vulnerable people) to remain in their own homes with minimal outside support for e.g. Lifeline pendants that are connected to the Careline service. This also includes waking nights and sleepovers: care staff visit service users' homes for the night hours and remain awake to provide monitoring and assistance if required.

**It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –** Review all services where assistive technology can be utilised as an alternative. This may result in increased use of assistive technology for example

- bed occupancy sensors that switch on a lamp when the person gets up, to reduce risk of falls (These sensors can also alert a carer that the person has got out of bed, and can trigger an alarm that they have not returned to bed.)
- clocks which give the period of day as well as the time, to tell the person it is afternoon, for example, and not early morning
- sensors to prevent floods from overflowing baths
- smoke and carbon monoxide detectors
- falls detectors, e.g. worn on a belt
- epilepsy sensors on the mattress or chair to detect an episode
- video phones
- computer-based communication aids such as Type Talk

**Rationale for service change proposal –** There is potential to further utilise assistive technology, thereby reducing the need for staff to be present throughout the night. It is important to note that the range of assistive technologies is wide and developing rapidly and the Council should seek to make best use of tested and robust solutions over the coming years. Such solutions are successfully deployed across the country with positive outcomes achieved for many service users and their families.

***What the Department of Health Use of Resources guide (DH 2009b) says on assistive technology***

“Following the Department of Health’s guidance Building Telecare in England and the Preventative Technology Grant arrangements (2006–08), local authorities are beginning to make wider use of assistive technologies to support people to remain in their own homes. This varies from simple call systems to alert a central point when a person has had an emergency, to using sensors to track key activities that may then trigger an alarm. Assistive technologies are widely used among older people. However, there are examples of local authorities using them to provide additional support for people living in the community who may receive floating support rather than have staff available 24 hours a day. Examples include people recovering from mental health problems, drugs or alcohol abuse and adults with moderate levels of learning disabilities living in the community.”

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Although this may mean the reduced physical presence on site throughout the night for some service users within supported living schemes receiving domiciliary care and support the Department of Health has identified

“Assistive technology can provide efficiencies across the wider health and social care system arising from:

- better targeted timing and sizing of care packages and support
- greater choice of care and support options
- reduction in residential placements
- crisis avoidance, meaning fewer A&E and hospital admissions

**Impact of Service Change – Service Users –** Some service users and care support

staff will require additional and further training in the use of various solutions.

**Partners** – Potential changes and reductions to the current contracts for night care

**Council** – The social care workforce will increasingly cut across many sectors and roles and may well see the development of further new ways of working, new types of workers and new roles. There will be a requirement to expand the range of equipment and services supplied by the Council's Careline Teams. This will also require some investment in new technologies. The recent software and hardware upgrades have resulted in the Council not being tied to a single equipment supplier. As such, the Council can now test the market for the best solution to a variety of scenarios from a number of different suppliers. It is expected that any such investment required in new technologies will be undertaken on an 'invest to save' basis, with the income generated from the delivery of new services generating sufficient surpluses to cover the cost of purchase.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement** – Cabinet agreed the approach to this change option in December 2012. Since December 2012 Officers have plans in place to ensure that services users are engaged with about the change in approach and the Council will also ensure it continues to meet service users needs in accordance with any legal care planning processes. Plans also include operational tasks such as updating the Council website, Contact Centre and Social Care processes.

This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:

- Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,
- To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.
- Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.
- To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.
- To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – The Quality Assurance Group (QAG) in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change in practice; the policy of supporting people with assessed need has not changed. However, the change means that recipients of services will be reviewed to see if there is a more cost effective technological solution to their support needs. The key component will be ensuring that assessed needs continue to be met. The QAG recognises that not all recipients will be suitable for assistive technology; in those cases where it is not suitable, the most efficient way of supporting their need will be maintained. The QAG recognises that the needs assessment process applied to the individual meets the Equality Act 2010 requirements. The QAG asks that the progress of this proposal is monitored and any issues that come from consultation are reported back.

**Legislation Considered** – NHS and Community Care Act 1990

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** –

- Care staff may not be onsite (depending on individual need), therefore not immediately available, however, support will still be readily accessible. The mitigation associated with this risk is described above i.e. service users will be given full training and quality assurance processes will be put in place.
- Potential to include new clauses in contracts regarding overnight emergencies.

# Agenda Item 4

- For many service users AT will be one element of their support package, which may also include regular visits by care staff and other workers
- Understanding the range of AT options available and communicating the benefits either to those who assess potential users of the service, or directly to the potential users and their families.

	<b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £200,000    Year Investment Required: £    TBC Staff at Risk: Nil</b>
--	--

**Service Description Social Care Subsidies** - Many clients currently contribute towards their care costs (where appropriate).

**It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –**

Increase client charges for a range of non-residential services as follows:

- Currently clients contribute 80% of their disposable income toward their cost of care, this option will mean a change in Council policy so that 100% of disposable income is considered in the financial assessment process.
- An extra £16.00 per week allowance is deducted from income for disability related expenditure to those service users who receive Attendance Allowance (any rate) or the middle/high rate care component of Disability Living Allowance. Where expenditure is in excess of this amount then the actual expenditure will be will be allowed. It is proposed to reduce the minimum level of disability related expenditure to £11.00 per week. This option will mean a change in Council policy.
- Couples - disregard income buffer when assessing care needs for those clients not in receipt of Income Support/Pension Guarantee Credit. Sefton has allowed other clients, who are carers and not in receipt of these benefits, an additional allowance when calculating their contribution towards the services they receive. It is proposed to restrict this additional allowance to just those service users who receive the carer's premium as part of their Income Support/Pension Guarantee Credit entitlement this is compliant with Dept of Health Fairer Charging guidance. The carer's premium is paid to those carers receiving qualifying benefits. This option will mean a change in Council policy.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** Local Authorities can and do subsidise services. The Council can no longer afford to provide the current range and level of subsidy. The government's "Fairer Charging" guidance will continue to be followed and all service users have a financial assessment.

This disposable income element of this option would bring Sefton in line with other Councils

<b>Council</b>	<b>% Charge against disposable income</b>
Blackpool	100
Bury	100
Cumbria	100
St Helen's	100
Stockport	100
Tameside	100
Trafford	100

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Change to the policy for subsidising services as detailed above

**Impact of Service Change –** This option will increase the contributions made by some vulnerable and elderly people towards the cost of their care. The actual increase to individual client contributions could vary significantly based on personal financial circumstances and any changes to these circumstances that have occurred in the interim since the client's finances were last assessed.

The estimated cumulative impact of implementing the 3 proposed increases is:

- 1200 clients will be affected.
- the average increase will be approx £14.00 p/wk
- the highest increase will be £106.00 p/wk.
- changes will affect predominately those who are already paying a contribution.

# Agenda Item 4

A small number (less than 100) will pay a contribution for the first time.

**Partners** –None

**Council** – may be an impact on the level of Council debt as clients may not pay the increased charge.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement** –

Type Inform  Consult (External & Partn  En

Officers are putting plans in place to ensure that services users are engaged with about the change in approach and the Council will also ensure it continues to meet service users needs in accordance with any legal care planning processes. Plans also include operational tasks such as updating the Council website, Contact Centre and Social Care processes.

This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:

- Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,
- To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.
- Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.
- To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.
- To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.

**Public Sector Equality Duty**– This option is still subject to appropriate consultation, engagement and information processes. The Council will continue to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed in light of this ongoing consultation, should significant issues arise between now and Budget Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.

**Legislation Considered** – Health and Social Services and Social Security

Adjudications Act 1993

Policy Guidance:

Fairer Charging Policies for Home Care and other non-residential Social Services, 2003 - The Council has a discretionary power to levy charges (or contributions) towards the costs of Adult Non-Residential Care services, such as home care and day care. The Council can only do this as long as these contributions are in line with the Government's "Fair Access to Care Service" national guidance.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – Clients may refuse to pay increased charges and may cancel the services they receive and this may impact on their health and wellbeing. There is a potential risk to income generated as a result of the impact of Welfare Reform and the Council Tax Support Scheme that reduce the income of working age clients, as well as reduced income from clients who cancel services. The Welfare Rights team will ensure advice and assistance is offered to all clients. Discretion may need to be considered on an individual basis where the proposed increase is significantly above the average. The Financial Visiting Officers will be responsible for managing all appeals and presenting cases where discretion should be considered, they will also retain responsibility for all new assessments and for re-

# Agenda Item 4

assessments.

In order to implement the proposed changes it will be necessary to defer realisation of £75,000 of the existing £200,000 staff savings in Option 2.8 Area Finance – Review of processes and staffing arrangements (incl FVOs) (This was agreed by Cabinet December 2012).

**Part year saving 2013/14 : £444,000**

**Full year saving 2014/15: £120,000**

**Investment Required: £ Nil**

**Staff at Risk: Nil**

# Agenda Item 4

## **Service Description Direct Payment Recovery and Workplace Insurance (Adults)**

A Direct Payment is money given to service users to enable them to buy and arrange their own care or support. Direct Payments are an alternative to receiving direct services like home care, day centres and residential care. Direct Payments enable users to take responsibility for arranging the services or support they require, managing their money, employing staff to provide their support.

If a service user receiving a Direct Payment employs their own Personal Assistant they are bound by all the laws that cover employment and would be responsible for things like payroll, workplace insurance, health and safety and recruitment.

Whilst there should be some support available from local councils for general direct payment administration, by accepting direct payments the user accepts responsibility for the arrangement and administration of their services. If employing staff directly this can include a considerable amount of employment administration, such as payroll and recruitment. To assist with this the Council currently provides a 'one off' payment of £150 to purchase Employers and Public Liability insurance for the first year only

### **It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –**

Recover surplus, unspent Direct Payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150.

Because service users receiving direct payments have greater flexibility to decide how to meet their needs and how much to pay for services they purchase, this can result in them receiving more money than they need to spend. An end-of –year reconciliation is done and surpluses are recovered, it is proposed to undertake this reconciliation more frequently and to proactively adjust the future direct payment rate.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** Early reconciliation of unspent Direct Payment funds to achieve better value for money. The Council is not legally required to pay for workplace insurance

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Current Direct Payments would be reassessed and potentially reduced throughout the year and the workplace insurance payments for new Direct Payments recipients will cease.

### **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Unspent funds will be recovered and needs re-assessed to ensure that service users are receiving appropriate levels of care and support. The workplace insurance will not impact on existing users but would not be payable to future users.

**Partners – Unspent Direct Payment funds and** workplace insurance processes are currently administered by the Carers Centre and their procedures would need to reflect this change if approved

**Council –** Unspent direct payment recovery will need to be administered by Finance in partnership with the Carers Centre.

### **Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

Officers have plans in place to ensure that services users are engaged with about the change in approach and the Council will also ensure it continues to meet service users needs in accordance with any legal care planning processes.

This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social



# Agenda Item 4

<p>care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,</li><li>• To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.</li><li>• Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.</li><li>• To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.</li><li>• To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – This option is still subject to appropriate consultation, engagement and information processes. The Council will continue to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed in light of this ongoing consultation, should significant issues arise between now and Budget Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Health and Social Care Act 2001 Dept. of Health Best Practice Guidance on Direct Payments, 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – Service Users are assessed according to their individual needs. Direct payments should be sufficient to enable the recipient to lawfully secure a service of a standard that the Council considers appropriate to fulfil the need of the service to which the payment relates. In estimating the reasonable costs of securing the support required, the Council should include associated costs that are necessarily incurred in securing that provision.</p>	
	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#): £752,000</b>      Year <b>Investment Required: £ Nil</b> <b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b></p>

# Agenda Item 4

**Service Description: Re-ablement** Re-ablement is a means of promoting independence, providing personal care, help with daily living activities and other practical tasks. Re-ablement encourages service users to re-gain and develop the confidence and skills to carry out day to day activities. Another important aspect is that the service user continues to live at home.

**It is proposed to –** To obtain funding from the PCT and agree a model of re-ablement to enable more users to go through a re-ablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short & long term care.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** In 2011 the Department of Health allocated funding to PCTs to work with local authorities to devise a new and improved model of re-ablement which will contribute to the reduction in re-admissions to hospital and short term care and support adults to live at home

The Council currently re-ables 35% of our clients who are eligible for a service upon hospital discharge (1816 as at November 2012), the new model suggests that this can be increased to 58% reducing the number of people who go on to have services with adult social care.

Evidence shows that timely intervention of social care re-ablement, focusing on skills for daily living, can enable people to live more independently and reduce their need for ongoing homecare support. Homecare re-ablement complements the work of intermediate care services to help:

- maximise independence
- minimise whole life cost of care.

The approach needs to ensure that the lowest appropriate level of intervention is provided set within an active and ongoing assessment process to balance risk against 'quality of life' for adults who need care. Other initiatives such as assistive technology services will also play a significant part in supporting people in their 'home', whether it be an individual residence, sheltered or extra care housing.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** The Council will develop a new re-ablement model and commission services accordingly. This may include a different approach to re-ablement that will motivate, encourage and empower service users to take control and have a more active role in their self care. The delivery of this model will seek to make best use of

- additional roles within the social care workforce including occupational therapists, healthcare staff, etc.
- Increase the use of assistive technology
- Commissioning of services that more appropriately supports adults upon discharge from hospital.
- Working in partnership with Clinical Commissioning Groups

It is anticipated that this approach will enable more service users to go through a re-ablement process, therefore reducing hospital admissions and admissions to short-term nursing or residential care.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Positive impact that will help maintain or improve independence at home and in some cases without the need for Social Care

**Partners –** Positive impact for acute hospital care and CCGs.

**Council –** A number of studies have shown impressive results, both in personal and financial terms, following the increased use of assistive technologies in enabling people

to stay in their homes for longer by being more self-sufficient. A wide range of interventions are currently being developed and assessed within the Council's Careline Services and will be ready for deployment by 2013/14. Further details of all of these proposed new services and solutions will be presented prior to their implementation by April 2013.

## **Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

- Receipt of £900,000 funding from PCT will commence upon Cabinet approval
- Consultation with SND has commenced
- Commissioning of new service will commence upon Council approval

Officers are putting plans in place to ensure that services users are engaged with about the change in approach and the Council will also ensure it continues to meet service users needs in accordance with any legal care planning processes.

This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:

- Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,
- To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.
- Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.
- To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.
- To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.

**Public Sector Equality Duty –** The Quality Assurance Group (QAG) in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an update in clinical approach that is applied to the recipient; the policy of re-enabling people has not changed. The QAG recognises that the needs assessment process applied to the individual meets the Equality Act 2010 requirements. The QAG asks that the progress of this proposal is monitored and any issues that come from the change in approach are reported back.

**Legislation Considered –** Community Care (Delayed Discharges, etc) Act (Qualifying Services)(England) Regulations 2003

Best Practice Guidance - Intermediate Care - Halfway House: updated guidance for the NHS and local authorities, 2009

## **Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Based on the evidence arising from a number of studies undertaken into this area over recent years, there is little doubt that large savings are available and can be accrued following the introduction of a wider range of assistive living and telehealth technologies than those currently offered. However, because of the wider and more inclusive nature of such provision, additional or 'new' users are sometimes identified leading to higher baseline costs before any savings to existing budgets are achieved.

Initial amendments and trials will be concentrated on existing clients for whom the Council are currently responsible for subsidising by way of revenue support.

The utilisation of such new technologies also allows for the development of new opportunities and clients groups, and the adoption of a more commercial approach to these new markets. This may include clients in a wider geographical area outside of the

# Agenda Item 4

Borough, as well as opportunities to work with new and alternative service suppliers on a regional and even national basis.

In order to take advantage of these opportunities the Council's Careline and Telehealth services have been relocated to work alongside Sefton Security in identifying increasing opportunities to recover costs from additional and potentially external sources and reduce the direct expenditure of the Council in these areas.

<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#): £1,200,000</b>
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Investment Required: £ Nil</b>
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b>

<p><b>Service Description Housing Related Support (Commissioning Budget)</b>  Housing Related Support (previously Supporting People) was a Government run programme that funded services to help older people and others to live independently at home. Local Councils had responsibility for identifying what the local needs were, for funding the services to meet those needs, and making sure that the services were effective and of good quality. They had contracts with the organisations providing the services which specify the type of service to be provided. This once ring-fenced budget has now been integrated within the council's base budget and forms part of the Adults Community Care budget.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option – A</b>  further reduction of the budget for housing related support services</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Incremental reductions in housing related funding have reduced the requirement for commissioning/contractual functions.</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> In the main, the housing related support services are commissioned discretionary services intended to meet low level support needs.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users –</b> Reduction or cessation of housing related support services  <b>Partners –</b> reduction in funding to service providers.  <b>Council –.</b> A small number of services are commissioned within the Council, reductions to funding for those services could have human resource implications.</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>  Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Extensive consultation has previously taken place</p> <p>Officers have plans in place to ensure that services users are engaged with about the change in approach and the Council will also ensure it continues to meet service users needs in accordance with any legal care planning processes.</p> <p>This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,</li> <li>• To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.</li> <li>• Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.</li> <li>• To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.</li> <li>• To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> This option is still subject to appropriate consultation, engagement and information processes. The Council will continue to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed in light of this ongoing consultation, should significant issues arise between now and Budget Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> None</p>

# Agenda Item 4

<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> –There is a potential that a reduction in funding for housing related support services will lead to negative impacts for the vulnerable people supported by the services, including those with protected characteristics of age, disability, gender and those in receipt of care packages for assessed care needs. Any impact will be mitigated as far as possible within care management practices.	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> <b>£4.7m Staffing: N/A Other</b> <b>Resources used: Partner</b> <b>organisations</b> <b>commissioned to deliver</b> <b>current activity</b>	<b>Saving 2014/15    £500,000    Year Investment</b> <b>Required: £   Nil Staff at Risk: Nil</b>

# Agenda Item 4

## Annex E – New Options for Consideration by Cabinet

<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Learning & Support	To effect a further saving from the retained element of the Connexions Grant. This will include redefining the service provided in terms of information, advice and guidance to young people in context of required legislation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council for budget planning purposes the approval of £400k</li> </ul>
Children's Services	To review the pathway of support for children with additional needs to ensure that it is more effective and efficient.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with users, families, carers, employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>recommend to Council for budget planning purposes the approval of £400k (2014/15)</li> <li>should further related opportunities and or significant issues arise they will report to Cabinet</li> </ul>
Health & Wellbeing	Management fee reduction - Formby Pool Contract-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the total budget reduction of £50k</li> </ul>
Public Health Substance Misuse	Reduced service specification-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the total budget reduction of £50k</li> </ul>
Investment & Infrastructure	Increase income coming from Network Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the total budget re-alignment of £50k</li> </ul>
Economy	Southport Theatre Complex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>note the intention to invite tenders</li> <li>note the intention to explore an in-house management option</li> <li>recommend to Council for budget planning purposes the approval of £100k (2014/15)</li> </ul>
Economy &	Withdraw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence engagement processes with the contractor</li> </ul>

# Agenda Item 4

Neighbourhoods	financial support from Southport's Christmas Lights and Christmas trees across the borough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council for budget planning purposes the approval of £30.2k</li> </ul>
Corporate Support	Further savings from Learning & Development (including departmental budgets)	recommend to Council the total budget reduction of £50k
	Further savings from public health integration	recommend to Council the total budget reduction of £100k
Democratic Services	Reduce the number of Area committees from 7 to 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement process employees, Trade Unions and the community representatives</li> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the total budget reduction of £20k</li> </ul>
	Stop servicing all non-member meetings and those non-standing committees without decision-making powers. Reduce frequency of meetings and review of Overview and Scrutiny Committees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement process employees, and Trade Unions</li> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the total budget reduction of £51k</li> </ul>
Council Tax	Charge 100% on empty properties from month 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>note that extensive consultation has taken place as part of the Council Tax Scheme</li> <li>consider the change proposed</li> </ul> <p>recommend to Council the total budget adjustment of £400k</p>



<p><b>Service Description Connexions</b>                  The Merseyside Authorities have a contractual arrangement with the Greater Merseyside Connexions Service to provide information, advice and guidance to young people through schools and other engagement mechanisms, particularly for vulnerable groups. The contract ceases on the 31st March 2014.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –</b>                  To effect a further saving from the retained element of the Connexions Grant.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> To redefine the service provided in terms of information, advice and guidance to young people in context of required legislation.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The current contract with Merseyside Connexions Partnership ceases in March 2014</p> <p>Focus to be kept on the defined vulnerable groups rather than the broader definition of those vulnerable of becoming Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET).</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users</b> - None directly as this is flexible enhanced activity funding</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Potential staff losses for Connexions</p> <p><b>Council</b> – None</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b></p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> 2008 Education and Skills Act. Apprenticeship, Skills and Learning Act 2009.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b></p> <p>Potential lack of progression of certain vulnerable groups, without focused support, in to Education, Employment or Training (EET).</p> <p>Potential not to be able to effectively track those at NEET to focus intervention.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £1.2m</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> nil</p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £400,000</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk:</b> none</p>

# Agenda Item 4

<p><b>Service Description: Sport &amp; Recreation (Leisure Activity Review) – Formby Pool</b></p> <p>Brief Description; In discussions with Formby Pool Trust and Formby Land Trust to vary the existing 40 year contract, and identify savings for the Council.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b></p> <p>Discussions have been on going with FLT and FPT to vary the contract to benefit both parties and allow for a reduction in annual subsidy from the Council.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b></p> <p>This is part of the Leisure Activity Review. The varying of the contract can be achieved with the permission of all parties, the Council, FLT and FPT. Both partners are sympathetic to the Council’s current position and would like to assist, but not at the detriment of their operation.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b></p> <p>FLT and FPT are prepared to accept a reduction (17%) in the Council’s agreed subsidy if the Council will agree to vary two aspects of the Contract.</p> <p>1. That FPT be allowed to charge users at a rate 20% above the charges set by the Council. The current limit is 10%. The Council would benefit from this as an income share agreement would be put in place that grants the Council a percentage of additional income generated above a set target. Discussions on the level of this target are ongoing.</p> <p>2. That the lease of operation for FPT is extended by a further 20 year term. Both The Council and FLT are pleased with the performance of FPT as the Centre Operator. The current lease has 4 years remaining, and an additional 20 would give FPT a 24 year lease period, which in business planning terms would allow them to develop a long term business strategy and potentially improve their credit rating for future investment into the facility.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users</b> – Maintain and improve the service operated by the current leaseholder.</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Greater certainty, improved flexibility and long term business stability.</p> <p><b>Council</b> – Reduction in subsidy and income share from revenue generated above an agreed target.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –N/A</b></p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered - N/A</b></p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b></p> <p>Concessions will still be applied in line with the Council’s offer via the Active Choices card (leisure passport scheme)</p>	
	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#): £ 50,000</b></p>

## Economy & Neighbourhoods

### **Service Description: Support for Christmas Tree Displays**

For a number of years Sefton MBC has installed and decorated 11 Christmas trees in 11 specified sites throughout the borough. The Council has also contributed and supported Christmas celebrations throughout the borough.

### **It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change**

It is proposed to cease the councils support for the installation and decoration of 11 Christmas trees within the borough and to cease its financial contributions for Christmas celebrations throughout the borough.

### **Rationale for service change proposal**

The cost of installing and decorating 11 Christmas trees within the borough is now at an unsustainable amount circa £19,000. The projected budget shortfall is £7,000 which equates to a % rise on the original budget held (£10,200). Economic Development and Tourism also hold an £8,000 Christmas light support fund along with a £12,000 Christmas lights budget for Southport. In previous years Bootle, Crosby and Maghull has also benefited from this funding, both of these funds will no longer be available due to budget reductions.

### **The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce**

The council will no longer supply, install and maintain the 11 Christmas trees and provide financial support throughout the borough for Christmas celebrations.

### **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – None identified.

**Partners** – None identified.

**Council** – If the proposal is accepted this may result in negative press against the council. Mitigations will need to be put into place to explain the decision to our residents and businesses.

### **Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

Partnership

Proposed Timeline: Immediate

Implementation: Immediate

**Public Sector Equality Duty** The QAG recognises that whilst community Christmas lights and trees are part of the cultural landscape, it recognises that people, businesses and communities can put up their own decorations etc ( in line with public safety regulations) but the Council can no longer afford to fund this provision. This is now in line with other religious festivities.

# Agenda Item 4

<b>Legislation Considered</b> There are no statutory or legislative requirements on the Council to provide Christmas trees.	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> Communications will need to be put into place to explain the decision to our residents and businesses.	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £30,200 (In year saving)	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £30,200 Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b> N/a	
<b>Other Resources used:</b> N/a	

## Children's Services

<b>Service Description: Support packages for Children with Additional Needs</b>	
<p><b>It is proposed to continue with consultation with a view to implementing the following change</b> to review the pathway of support for children with additional needs that supports them more effectively and efficiently. Children with additional needs are supported to live within their community and with their families wherever possible.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b>            To rationalise and redesign the overall service linking this with the current children with additional needs pathway review, with a view to creating the right level of support at the right time that will enhance and improve long term outcomes for the child and provide efficiencies.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity is anticipated will change:</b>            A scoping exercise will be undertaken to look at ensuring that the best support is offered to children within the context of a £3.1m budget. This will include a review on the most effective commissioning of respite care arrangements and a retender of care services provided to children to ensure that they are as cost effective as possible. Assessed need will continue to be met. Where possible support will be provided to children within the family setting.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change:</b>  <b>Service Users</b> – Revised offer that better meets their needs.  <b>Partners</b> – Potential impact on externally commissioned activities.  <b>Council</b> – Potential impact on internally commissioned activities.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>  <b>Type Inform</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consult</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> This option will be subject to appropriate consultation, engagement and information processes. The Council will continue to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed in light of this ongoing consultation, should significant issues arise between now and Budget Council Officers will advise Members accordingly</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b>            Ofsted Inspection of child protection including early help provision.            Statutory provision from April 2011 to provide a range of short breaks – no guidance or case law. The Children's Act 1989.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>            Ensure offer and communication is transparent and is informed by child/young person and parent engagement. This will require both the pathway and individual cases to be reviewed.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £ 3.5m</p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15:</b> £400,000  <b>Investment Required:</b> This will require one off capital investment from the Aiming High for Disabled Children grant.  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk:</b> to be determined note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this optiona</p>

# Agenda Item 4

<p><b>Service Description: Drugs and Alcohol Services (Public Health)</b></p> <p>The service provides specialist support, advice and community based treatment services for alcohol and substance misuse as well as the provision of a needle exchange service.</p>		
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b></p> <p>Public Health budget and new contract to explicitly specify a more focussed and integrated drugs and alcohol service. Absorbing additional/peripheral service costs within the new “Community Treatment Service” tender specification and current primary Community Treatment Service costs.. Plus reducing/ceasing costs and services that stand outside the new “Community Treatment Service” tender specification This has been agreed by Health &amp; well Being Board and Strategic Integrated Commissioning Group.</p>		
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b></p> <p>The Comprehensive Alcohol Needs Assessment identified the need for an integrated Drug and Alcohol service. It is proposed to absorb additional/peripheral service costs within a new tender specification and current primary community treatment service costs and will reduce/cease costs and services that stand outside the new Community Treatment Service tender specification.</p>		
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b></p> <p>Current separate drug treatment services will be replaced by new integrated service.</p>		
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> Enhanced levels of support for alcohol mis-users, more recovery orientated service provision model.</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> Current partners may not be re-commissioned</p> <p><b>Council –</b> None</p>		
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this option recognises that it is related to a tender process and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change.</p>		
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b></p> <p>The Medicines Act 1968          Crime and Disorder Act 1998          Drugs Act 2005</p>		
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b></p>		
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b></p> <p><b>Staffing:</b></p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £500,000</p> <p><b>Investment Required:</b> £ Nil</p> <p><b>Staff at Risk:</b> Nil</p>	<p>Full Year</p>

## Council Tax

<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change</b> – Increase the Council Tax charged from 50% to 100% on Class C properties empty for longer than one month.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – to encourage empty homes to be brought back into usage more quickly.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – the Council Tax on each empty property will become payable in full after only one month of the property being determined as empty</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change</b></p> <p><b>Service Users</b> – there will be a greater charge for some property owners holding vacant properties</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> – Extensive Consultation has taken place as part of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> –will be considered as part of a review of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2014/2015.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Local Government Finance Act 2012</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b></p> <p>Risk: Owners of the empty dwellings may refuse to pay - leading to an increase in the level of outstanding debt on the collection fund and increased compliance costs.</p> <p>Risk: Owners of the empty dwellings may take action to avoid paying the full council tax charge.</p> <p>Mitigating Action: Council Tax inspectors regularly investigate properties suspected of being unoccupied. Links have been set up between the Arvato Revenues Collection Team and the Department of Built Environment to share information on empty properties. This will help identify potential tax avoidance. An estimate of the compliance costs, losses due to avoidance, and non payment has built into the estimated net saving.</p>	
<p><b>Additional Saving 2014/15: £ 400,000 Full Year</b></p>	

# Agenda Item 4

## Democratic Services

<p><b>Service Description: Reduce number of Area Committees</b> To reduce the number of Area Committees from 7 to 3</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b> To reduce the number of Area Committees from 7 to 3</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> this will result in a reduction in the cost of democracy and maintain a balanced approach which recognises the geography of the borough and allow councillors and members of the public to access this forum.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The number of Area Committees across the Borough will be reduced by reconfiguring the area covered by each bearing in mind the legislative requirements set out below.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> There may be greater distances for service users to travel to attend their Area Committee</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> There may be greater distances for service users to travel to attend their Area Committee</p> <p><b>Council –</b> Agendas for meetings will cover a larger geographic area which may have conflicting priorities which could result in limited resources being more effectively targeted</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline This could be implemented for the start of the Municipal Year in May 2013.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change. Whilst there may be more travel involved for members of the public, if this presents particular problems, they still have the option of meeting/contacting with their local councillor to put their views forward. Where the change affects staff, officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered -</b> Local Government Act 2000, Part II, s18 (5) requires that where executive functions are delegated to Area Committees, each Area Committee covers no more than 2/5 of the Borough both in terms of area and population.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Venues could alternate to allow equal opportunity to access the meetings</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £386,750</p> <p><b>Staffing: 10.5</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £20k Full / Part Year</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 0.5</b></p>



<p><b>Service Description: Democratic Services</b>          Reduce governance structure of the Council and frequency of meetings and restructure democratic services to meet reduced structure. NB This option is also linked to the option relating to a reduction in the number of Area Committees.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b>          Stop servicing all non-member meetings and those non-standing committees without decision-making powers(officer meetings, taxi drivers annual meeting, area partnerships, etc)          Reduce frequency of meetings for example Cabinet 14 to 10, Area Committees each meeting from 5/6 meetings per year to 4, Licensing and Regulatory Committee (6 meetings to 4 )          This option will also consider current Overview and Scrutiny arrangements</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b>          The option will facilitate a leaner decision making process. It will also reflect the Council's reduced resources, release capacity so as to facilitate the changing role of the Council in the future.</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b>          The number of formal decision-making meetings will significantly reduce.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> None</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> None</p> <p><b>Council –</b> There will be less formal decision making meetings and therefore agendas for remaining meetings may increase in business.</p> <p>The responsibility for meetings no longer serviced by democratic services would need to be transferred to service departments.</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline The revised calendar of meetings can be implemented for the start of the 2013/14 Municipal Year and the resultant restructure implemented for June 2013.</p> <p>Implementation: The calendar of meetings for Cabinet is a matter for the Leader of the Council to determine. The calendar of meetings is a matter for full Council to determine. Changes to the Constitution would be required to implement the new structure and this would also be a matter for the full Council.</p>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duties –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that there will be no change to the community. As a consequence there will be no equality</p>

# Agenda Item 4

<p>implication to this change. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Local Government Act 1972, Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Localism Act 2011</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>            There is a risk that the remaining Cabinet meetings may contain a large number of items and there is an increased risk of urgent decisions being required outside of the Cabinet timetable.</p> <p>There is also a risk that a reduced timetable may mean that additional meetings are called which would reduce the savings that are made. The Constitution currently allows for any 5 Members to call on the Mayor to arrange a special Council meeting and any two Members can call a special Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting. Consideration may need to be given to this.</p> <p>As resource would be focussed on meeting the Council’s statutory requirements, As Democratic Service staff also assist with elections during peak times, arrangements would need to be made with other Council departments to release staff during those peak periods.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £386,750</p> <p><b>Staffing: 10.09FTE (across Democratic Services as a whole)</b></p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>                      £    41k      Full Year</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 1fte</b></p> <p><b>Staffing savings would be 1-FTE (£41k) if all of option taken, Additional £8,520 saving in SRA allowances is scrutiny option taken</b></p>

**Service Description**

Health & Wellbeing – Libraries – Local History Service

**It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –**

To consider the transfer of the operation and delivery of the Local History Service for Sefton to the Voluntary Sector (Sefton CVS).

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

The Local History Service is based at Crosby library. It provides a specialist unit for people researching local and family history service, and for more detailed specialist enquiries. Although based at Crosby it is a borough wide service providing specialist support and advice for all the libraries in Sefton. It houses the historical archives of Sefton Council. The annual number of local history enquiries = 12,500.

It is considered that the service may be able to be delivered by the Voluntary sector given the spread of local history groups across the borough.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –**

If achievable the service would be provided by the voluntary sector as oppose to the Council. The service may continue to be delivered from Crosby Library initially, but likely with reduced hours. There will be a loss of specialist knowledge from the Council's professional staff.

Every council has a statutory duty to maintain its historic records. Sefton Council is one of the few authorities without an Archive Service or any archivists. It therefore falls to the Local History service to fulfil this statutory role. The Local Government Act 1972 (s.224) requires local authorities to 'make proper arrangements with respect to any documents that belong to or are in the custody of the council of any of their officers' but does not oblige them to provide archive services.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** - The Local History Service is a highly valued, well used and a very localised service. The impacts are likely to be:-

- Significant reduction in the ability to provide access to information to members of the public
- Loss of specialist knowledge, which is expected by the public
- Reduced service provision of historic archives

**Partners** – A likely reduction in partnership working/reduction in services to all departments.

- Potential negative impacts particularly on Children's Services and schools as local history forms part of the national curriculum, if the voluntary sector cannot support

# Agenda Item 4

<p>schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential negative impact particularly on the Planning Department who require local historical information for development and conservation work.</li> <li>• Reduced service provision of departmental historic archives.</li> <li>• A potential reduced ability to provide council information to the public.</li> <li>• Overall delays in service to other council departments and loss of specialist knowledge.</li> </ul> <p><b>Council –</b></p> <p>The Local History section fulfils the council’s statutory responsibilities towards the council’s historic documents as laid down in the Local Government Act 1972.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b></p> <p>The requirements of an E.I.A. in relation to this proposal are currently being assessed and it is planned to undertake such an exercise in conjunction with any ongoing information and consultation exercise.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b></p> <p>The Local Government Act 1972 (s.224)</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b></p> <p>The risks are the reduced level of service as outlined above. There will be protest from local history service groups who have already seen the service reduced significantly.</p> <p>There is a risk of not being able to fulfil the Council’s statutory obligation.</p> <p>There is a risk of a lack of specialist knowledge.</p> <p>Mitigating actions will be to work closely with Sefton CVS and local history groups/ societies, and investigate if/how they can deliver the service.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b></p> <p><b>£44,000</b></p> <p><b>Staffing: 4</b></p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 : Nil</b></p> <p><b>Additional Saving 2014/15 : £40,000</b></p> <p><b>Investment Required: £ TBC</b></p> <p><b>Staff at Risk: 4</b></p>

**Annex F**

**Cabinet - 31 January 2013 - Options Summary**

Ref	Service Area	Option	Proposed Reduction
			Total
			£'000

<b><u>Options Previously Agreed by Cabinet but yet to be approved by Council</u></b>			
	Senior Management	Restructure	150
	Libraries	Review of Service	400
	Street Lighting	Review of lighting options	64
E2.1	Children's Social Care	Review of the commissioning of all residential care beds	1,000
F1.5	Parks (including Nursery and net of frontline)	Increase allotment fees	40
D1.1	Early Intervention and Prevention	Integrated Youth Support & Targeted Youth Support - Budget Re-alignment	92
D1.2	Early Intervention and Prevention	Substance Mis-use budget - Re-alignment to Drug Action Team	124
D1.3	Learning & Support	School Improvement - Budget re-alignment - supplies and services	9
D1.4	Learning & Support	Budget re-alignment Welfare and Pupil Attendance - Teaching elements to Dedicated Schools Grant	25
D1.5	Learning & Support	School Admission - supplies and services - Reduction in administration	19
D1.6	Learning & Support	Connexions - Budget re-alignment	60
D1.7	Children's Social Care	Social Care Commissioned Services - travel, supplies and services, VCF	100
D1.8	Economy	To relocate staff from The Investment Centre, to Magdalen House	48

# Agenda Item 4

D1.9	Economy	Budget re-alignment of salaries to be funded from grants, contracts and reserves	116
D1.10	Democracy	Budget re-alignment - members Allowances as agreed by July 2012 Council	147
D1.11	Corporate Support Services	Risk Management (Insurance)	50
D1.12	Corporate Support Services	Procurement. ICT and financial support	50
D1.13	Public Health	Integration Efficiencies	1,137
D1.22	Health & Wellbeing	Crosby Civic Hall - pilot external arrangements, with option of closure of unsuccessful	46
D1.23	Learning & Support	Aiming High - Review of Integrated Short Breaks	55
D1.33	Street Scene	Cleansing Service - Re-organisation of workload and work patterns of the Rapid Response Teams	50
D1.34	Built Environment	Further deferrment of the re-instatement of Highway management funding	800
			<b>4,582</b>

## **Terms and Conditions**

	Terms & Conditions	Amendment	3,000
			<b>3,000</b>

## **Car Parking**

F1.1 / D1.31	Car Parks (including management)	Not cancelling PCN for incorrect display of ticket or blue badge and increase in charges	300
			<b>300</b>

## **VCF**

F3.1	Corporate Commissioning	Decommission VCF Youth & early childhood services	283
F3.3	Corporate Commissioning	Reduced VCF commissioning	300
F4.2	Corporate Commissioning	Review VCF	267

# Agenda Item 4

D1.28	Corporate Commissioning	To reduce funding to VCF organisations	90
			<b>940</b>

## **Double Rating**

D1.29	Corporate Commissioning	Double Rating	180
			<b>180</b>

## **Options were Consultation Complete**

D1.16	Learning & Support	Reduce School Targeted Intervention	260
D1.17	Early Intervention and Prevention	Healthy Schools - Transfer function of co-ordination and consultant roles to schools	60
D1.18	Children's Social Care	Social Care - Central Management Costs and Support Costs - restructure / realign	100
D1.19	Street Scene	Building Cleaning - change frequency of office cleaning	100
D1.20	Environment	Trading Standards - staff restructuring	50
C3.1	Infrastructure	Re-integration, re-commission and restructuring of services – Built Environment	500
D1.21	Communications	Communications - Integration of staff	40
C3.2	Home Improvements	Housing Improvement Agency service brought in house	37
F1.2	Grounds Maintenance including Grass Cutting	Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for adult football/sports users/bowlers	85
F1.4	Cemeteries and Crematoria	Increase burial and cremation charges	400
F4.3	Corporate Commissioning	Double rating	33
D1.30	Built Environment	Pest Control - introduction of a charge	30
			<b>1,695</b>

# Agenda Item 4

## Adult Social Care

D1.14	Adult Social Care	Assessment & Care Management Teams - Reconfigure teams / skill mix	208
D1.15	Adult Social Care	Reconfiguration of the Supporting People commissioning team.	186
F1.6	Adult Social Care	Community Meals Subsidy	200
F3.2	Adult Social Care	Remodel day care opportunities	5,990
D1.39	Adult Social Care	Remodel all current day care and transport	
D1.41	Adult Social Care	Review of Respite Provision	
D1.35	Adult Social Care	Section 117 After Care Funding	200
D1.36	Adult Social Care	Community Health - Prioritise and undertake reviews of service users to ensure appropriate support	400
D1.37	Adult Social Care	Assistive Technology - Increase use of equipment to ensure users are able to remain in their homes with minimal outside support	200
D1.38	Adult Social Care	Increase charges for a range of services	564
D1.40	Adult Social Care	Recover surplus / unspent direct payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one-off workplace insurance payment	752
D1.42	Adult Social Care	Revise Re-enablement model. Investment of one-off payment of £900,000 from Health will enable more users to go through a re-enablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short & long term care	1,200
D1.43	Adult Social Care	Further incremental reductions in housing related support	500
			<b>10,400</b>



# Agenda Item 4

## **Options still Subject to Consultation**

D1.24	Street Scene	Cleansing - Cease provision of free Plastic Sacks, excluding premises with difficult access	60
D1.32	Street Scene	Closure of all Public Conveniences	52
D1.25	Economy	Cease subscription to Mersey Forest and voluntary reduction in working hours	51
D1.27	Corporate Commissioning	Corporate Commissioning & Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service - rationalise service	200
			<b>363</b>

## **Financing Options**

	Business Rates	Small Business Rates Relief - S31 Grant	1,171
	Health and Wellbeing	NHS Support for Social Care	1,748
	Levies		1,180
	Levies	To get total 2 year reduction to £4m	2,189
	Transport Authority	Recharge	631
	Street Scene	Cleansing - Charge for Green Waste collections - A 2014/15 / 2015/16 proposal for an opt-in charge	1,000
	DFGs / S106		1,000
	Council Tax	Council Tax Freeze Grant	1,180
	Council Tax	Council Tax Increase	1,396
			<b>11,495</b>

## **Service Options**

Para 4.3	Learning & Support	To effect a further saving from the retained element of the Connexions Grant	400
Para 4.3	Early Intervention and Prevention	Review pathway of support for children with additional needs to increase effectiveness and efficiency	400
Para 4.3	Health and Wellbeing	Management fee reduction - Formby Pool Contract	50

# Agenda Item 4

Para 4.3	Health and Wellbeing	Public Health Substance mis-use - Reduce service specification	500
Para 4.3	Investment and Infrastructure	Planning - Increase income from Network Management	50
Para 4.3	Economy and Neighbourhoods	Tourism - Southport Theatre Complex (Tender or In-house management)	100
Para 4.3	Economy and Neighbourhoods	Withdraw financial support from Southport's Christmas Lights and Christmas Trees across the Borough	30
Para 4.3	Corporate Support	Further savings from Learning & Development (including departmental budgets)	50
Para 4.3	Corporate Support	Public Health integration	100
Para 4.3	Corporate Support	Area Committees - Reduce from 7 to 3	20
Para 4.3	Corporate Support	Democratic Services - Stop servicing all non-member meetings and those non-standing committees without decision-making powers(officer meetings, taxi drivers annual meeting, area partnerships, etc)	51
Para 4.3	Council	Council Tax -100% on empty properties from month 2	400
Para 4.5	Street Scene	Landscape -Co-ordination of voluntary work in parks (transition)	175
Para 4.5	Health and Wellbeing	Local History and Volunteers (transition)	40
			<b>2,366</b>

	<b>Total Options</b>		<b>35,321</b>
--	----------------------	--	---------------