

Report to: Council

Report: 1st March 2012

Subject: Revenue Budget 2012/13

Report of: Margaret Carney
Chief Executive

Wards Affected: All

Margaret Rawding
Head of Corporate Finance & ICT

Is this a Key Decision? Yes.

Is it included in the Forward Plan? Yes

Exempt/Confidential

No

This report comprises of three parts (Executive Summary, Part A and Part B) and along with other reports elsewhere on the agenda seek to agree the final steps required to deliver the 2012/13 budget. The Council has a statutory responsibility to set a balanced budget. This report presents a "Framework" Budget, as referred by Cabinet on 16 February 2012 to Overview and Scrutiny (Performance and Corporate Services) 21 February 2012, this is a basis for Council to consider, and subsequently determine, an approved Revenue Budget for 2012/13. It is imperative that Members take account of the information contained in this and the further information supplied to Cabinet Members when considering its final decisions.

Report Content

Executive Summary

Annex A Revenue Budget Proposals 2012/13

Annex B Revenue Budget Summary 2012/13

Part A Transformation Programme

1. Work Programme & Prioritisation
2. Consultation & Engagement Overview
3. Impact Assessment Overview
4. Risk Management
5. Remaining relatively Low & Medium Impact Options
6. Reviews
7. Options requiring further consideration
 - a. Landscape Services
 - b. Supporting People
 - c. Adults Transport
 - d. Re-Commissioning of Nursing & Residential Care
8. Conclusion

The report contains the following Annexes -

Annex C Work Programme Timetable

Annex D Remainder of options where the impact has been assessed as relatively low or medium following the analysis of the consultation and engagement activity

Annex E Community Care Practitioner Review

- Annex F Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector Review (VCF)
- Annex G Terms of Reference Library Services Review
- Annex H Terms of Reference Leisure Activity Review
- Annex I Terms of Reference 24 Hour Response Review
- Annex J Terms of Reference Street Lighting Review
- Annex K Landscape Services Change Proposals
- Annex L Supporting People Proposal

Part B - “Framework” Budget (as presented to Cabinet 16 February 2012)

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			√

The Council continues to forecast a significant budget gap over the next three years and additional budget savings will need to be identified over the coming months to ensure that future years’ budgets can be balanced.

What will it cost and how will it be financed?

FD1381/12 The Head of Corporate Finance and ICT has agreed this report.

(A) Revenue Costs

This report presents the financial impact of individual budget saving options, along with related background information and consultation feedback. Cabinet referred the Framework Budget for 2012/13 to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Performance and Corporate Services) for consideration. The following two years revenue budget gaps have been identified to assist Members in future revenue budget planning.

(B) Capital Costs

The Council has approval to capitalise up to £2m of statutory redundancy costs incurred in 2011/12, including those decisions taken relating to the 2012/13 budget. The funding of redundancy costs relating to decisions taken following further reviews (which are not due to be completed until the summer) may be met from the Redundancy provision if additional capitalisation is not available.

Implications:

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

Legal LD 735/12

Members will recall that the LD comments in all transformation reports have previously advised that each individual project must clearly consider the legal, human rights and equality implications and that this consideration must be evidenced. In order to achieve this, the following has been included in the report before Members

- a. Each option that has become a proposal has had the statutory basis for the service considered and details are included in the individual reports.
- b. The outcome of each individual consultation and equality impact assessment has been included in the reports.
- c. In addition mitigating factors have been included in the individual proposal reports.
- d. Generic risks including legal risks have been reported to Members previously and are re-iterated in section 4 (Part A) of this report.
- e. The rationale for inclusion of this information, is to ensure that Members have all relevant information available, and that the information can be weighed up carefully when making each and all of the decisions.

Human Resources

Currently there are 66 individuals formally at risk of redundancy as a result of approved proposals, service reorganisations and cessation of external funding. These figures will increase when an assessment is made as to the impact of options taken, further options are taken forward later in the year when the implications of several large service reviews are known. Regular consultation on proposed changes will continue with the trade unions and employees will be informed of developments by their respective Service Directors. Employees within service areas are aware that their status may change subject to the outcome of these options and reviews. Also a number of areas have adopted revised working practices and reduced hours to avoid redundancies. These helpful amendments have been achieved following further consultation.

Equality See Part A Section 3

The Corporate Commissioning Team holds the responsibility for taking an overview on equality implications and assessing the impact of Members taking the decisions before them. These will be published on the Council website.

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

In relation to compliance with the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, Members need to make decisions in an open minded balanced way showing due regard to the general duties. Members need to have a full understanding of any risks in terms of people with protected characteristics and any mitigation that has been put in place. Equality analysis, including consultation, provide a clear process to demonstrate that Cabinet and Council have consciously shown due regard and complied with the duty.

Contact Officers:

Jan McMahon, Head of Transformation Services
Tel: 0151 934 4431
Email: jan.mcmahon@sefton.gov.uk

Jeff Kenah, Corporate Finance Manager
Tel: 0151 934 4104
Email: jeff.kenah@sefton.gov.uk

For Equality Analysis Report information
Sue Holden
Tel: 0151 934 4722
Email: sue.holden@sefton.gov.uk

Background Papers:

The following papers are available for inspection by contacting the above officer(s).
Reports to Cabinet and Council 3 March 2011: Transformation Programme and Final Revenue Budget Items 2011/12
Report to Cabinet 14 April 2011: Transformation Programme 2011/12
Report to Cabinet 26 May 2011: Transformation Programme 2011-2014
Report to Cabinet 23 June 2011: Transformation Programme 2011-2014
Report to Cabinet 21 July 2011: Transformation Programme 2011-2014
Report to Cabinet 18 August 2011: Transformation Programme 2011- 2014
Transformation Update Report September 2011
Report to Cabinet 13th October 2011: Transformation Programme 2011- 2014
Report to Cabinet 10th November 2011: Transformation Programme 2011- 2014
Report to Council 24th November 2011: Transformation Programme 2011- 2014
Report to Cabinet 19th January 2012: Transformation Programme 2011- 2014
Report to Cabinet 2nd February 2012: Transformation Programme 2011- 2014

Responses and Analysis to Sefton Council's consultation on the option to (i) cease the provision of specialist transport for adults (E2.3) and on the option to (ii) increase the flat rate charge for specialist transport for adults (E2.4)

Responses and Analysis to Sefton Council's consultation on the option 6.1 Reduce the function of Mayor to the statutory minimum

Budget Update Members Briefing 9th February 2012

Responses and Analysis to Sefton Council's consultation on the option E3.14 to reduce the Crosby Civic Hall from a fully staffed and serviced venue to a 'latch key' operation available solely for self-hire

Additional information for Cabinet Members

Frequently asked questions

Recommendation(s)

In respect of Part A of the Report

- a) note the work programme timetable contained in Annex C

In respect of the remaining Low and Medium Impact Options

- b) consider proposals E4.4, E6.6 and E6.7 as detailed below and in so doing demonstrably

take account of the information within each of the remaining relatively low and medium impact proposals in Annex D. Members will need to be mindful of the relevant legislative framework, and weigh up the issues accordingly, taking account of

- the equality analysis report
- the consultation feedback
- risk and
- the mitigating actions

c) approve the recommendations E4.4, E6.6 and E6.7 as detailed below

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendations	2012/13 £m
E4.4	Highways Maintenance	A further reduction in Highways Grounds Maintenance Works Budgets which will be delivered by a reduction in the number of cuts to all highway grassed areas	Council is asked to a) approve that a reduction of three cuts to all highway grassed areas at a saving of £50,000 be approved	-0.050
E6.6	Public Conveniences	Public Conveniences – Market Test	Council is asked to approve a) a formal procurement process to provide the public convenience operational service be approved at a saving of £100,000	-0.100
E6.7	Tourism	Review of Service	Council is asked to a) approve that the Tourist Information Centre be relocated to the Southport Cultural Centre (SCC) in 2013 resulting in a saving of £90,000 be approved b) note that £38K will be taken from the Tourism event reserve budget in the 12/13 financial year to achieve the £90K target in order to manage the transitional arrangements pending the opening of the SCC	-0.090

In respect of Assessment & Care Management - Community Care Practitioners (CCP)

Council is asked to

- d) approve a re-organisation of the CCP staff to target resources more effectively and realise efficiencies. This could entail an immediate reduction in the levels of CCP's within the Adult Social Care Teams by further four posts, resulting in a further saving of approximately £86K
- e) note that savings of £171k, associated with the CCP Review have already been achieved through the VER/VR process

- f) note that further information was provided to Cabinet Members for consideration and a recommendation will be made to 1st March Council

In respect of E6.4 VCF Review

Council is asked to

- g) note that VCF review is now concluded and any future changes will be considered within the prioritisation process
- h) note and take into account the key messages identified from the results of the VCF consultation and equality analysis report
- i) agree to the introduction of three year commissioning processes where grant aid is given to organisations subject to annual performance reviews
- j) approve a budget reduction of £170k and note that further information was provided to Cabinet Members for consideration regarding Sefton Play Council

In respect of Landscape Services Change Proposals

- k) consider and demonstrably take account of the information within each of the proposals E4.5, E4.6, E4.7, E4.8, E4.10, E4.11 and E4.12 associated with Landscape Services. Members will need to be mindful of the relevant legislative framework, and weigh up the issues accordingly, taking account of
- i. the equality analysis report
 - ii. the consultation feedback
 - iii. risk and
 - iv. the mitigating actions
- l) approve the recommendations E4.6, E4.7 and E4.8 as detailed below

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendations	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m
E4.6	<i>Landscape Services</i>	Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities	Council is asked to a) approve the recharging to sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities	-0.059	0.000
E4.7	<i>Landscape Services</i>	Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance	Council is asked to a) approve of recharging formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance	-0.091	-0.020
E4.8	<i>Landscape Services</i>	Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park	Council is asked to a) approve the Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park	-0.050	0.000
Total				-0.200	-0.020

- m) approve the proposal to redesign the Parks and Green Spaces Service and Coast and Countryside Service in order to achieve a saving of £250,000 in 2012/13 and £330,000 in 2013/14 and note that final proposals will be reported to June Cabinet at the conclusion of the process

In respect of Supporting People

Council is asked to

- n) approve an in principle budget reduction of £2m in 2012/13 and a further £1m in 2013/14
- o) agree a further period of consultation on commissioning priorities and the detail of how the budget reduction could best be delivered whilst minimising/ mitigating the impacts i.e. a further review
- p) note that this further review will be completed by May 2012. The further review will determine commissioning priorities and identify if and how services are to be ceased/de-commissioned, rationalised. The outcome of this review will be reported to Cabinet in June 2012. It will also confirm if the in principle budget can be achieved
- q) note the high level project plan for the further review of the Supporting People budget and services

In respect of Adults Specialist Transport

- r) agree a further review of transport services provided for vulnerable adults in order to establish a policy and appropriate provision of such transport

In respect of Re-Commissioning of Nursing & Residential Care

- s) approve an in principle budget reduction of £1.5m in 2012/13 and a further £1.5m in 2013/14
- t) agree to continue the review of Nursing and Residential “real cost of care”
- u) in parallel agree to commence a procurement process and to continue to explore alternative commissioning approaches
- v) note that it is anticipated the review at (t) will be concluded in May/June 2012. The outcome of this will be reported to Cabinet in June/July 2012. The review and the work identified in (u) will also confirm if and how the in principle budget reduction can be achieved.

Other Reviews (Annexes G-J)

- w) approve the Review Terms of Reference as outlined in Annexes E-G and the associated timescales

Annex G	Terms of Reference Library Services Review
Annex H	Terms of Reference Leisure Activity Review
Annex I	Terms of Reference 24 Hour Response Review
Annex J	Terms of Reference Street Lighting Review

- x) note that Terms of Reference for other reviews will be presented to Cabinet at a later date

In respect of the Executive Summary

Council is asked to –

- I. consider the remaining Revenue Budget options for 2012/13 contained within Annex A and determine which options should form part of the Council's Revenue Budget 2012/13 and the Medium Term Financial Plan to enable a balanced budget to be achieved.
- II. authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately in relation to those proposals in Annex A (or as potentially amended by Members). Then subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions, issue relevant statutory and contractual notifications
- III. subject to consideration of all recommendations in the report and any subsequent amendments moved and carried, Council is asked to approve the overall Revenue Budget for 2012/13 as set out in Annex B
- IV. note that the Revenue Budget 2012/13 assumes no savings from the following options -
 - E1.3 Children's Special Transport
 - E2.3/4 Transportation for Adult Client Groups
 - E2.10 Fair Access for Care Criteria
 - E3.14 Crosby Civic Hall
 - E4.3 Capita contract
 - E5.6 Home Improvement Agency
 - E6.1 Dispense with Mayoral / Twinning
 - E6.10 Southport Theatre / Floral Hall

Impact on Service Delivery:

Described in the Annexes of Part A - Transformation Programme

What consultations have taken place on the proposals and when?

Regular and ongoing consultations have taken place with Strategic Directors, Director of Built Environment, Director of Street Scene, Director of Young People & Families, Director of Older People, Director of Corporate Support Services and Director of Commissioning, Head of Personnel, Head of Corporate Finance & ICT, Head of Legal Services, Partners and Trade Unions.

The approach to consultation involving public, service users and all key stakeholders relevant to each specific proposal was approved by the Consultation Panel on 21st October 2011. Detailed consultation reports are included in the report.

Are there any other options available for consideration?

Further options may be developed and brought forward at a later date. Any such options would be the subject of appropriate consultation.

Implementation Date for the Decision

Following 1st March Council 2012.

Executive Summary

- a) Members will be aware from previous reports that the Council has originally forecast revenue gaps for the years 2012/13 to 2014/15 were £20.05m, £7.65m and £10.82m respectively. The forecast required savings represent approximately 19% of the Council's controllable resources and are in addition to the £44m achieved in the current financial year.
- b) Members have been approving proposals since October 2011 and the table below identifies the current position;

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m
Forecast saving requirement	20.05	7.65	10.82
Less			
Assumed Council Tax Freeze Grant	-2.95	+2.95	0.00
Changes to MTFP Assumptions Approved by Council 27 th October	-1.63	0.00	0.00
Change Proposals Approved by Council 27 th October	-4.12	-0.39	+0.80
Change Proposals Approved by Council 24 th November	-1.57	0.00	0.00
Change Proposals Approved by Council 16 th February	-1.56	-0.12	+0.40
Updated Forecast Residual Net Saving Requirement	8.22	10.09	12.02

It is important to note that these figures assume the following

- The 25% reduction in Management and Support will be achieved (20% achieved in 2011/12). This is on target.
 - At this stage it is assumed that the Council will accept the additional grant under the Government scheme to freeze Council Tax i.e. £2.9m, for 2012/13 only. The Council has an option to increase the Council Tax in 2012/13 by £1.9m (without needing a referendum). This would realise £1.9m in each future year. £700k less than acceptance of the grant in 2012/13.
- c) Detailed information on further savings options that have been identified from the Council's Transformation Programme. These were considered by Cabinet on 16 February 2012, and should assist the Council in approving a balanced Revenue Budget for 2012/13. The relevant information can be found in **Part A** of this report.
- d) Cabinet on 16 February referred the 2012/13 Framework Budget to Overview and Scrutiny (Performance and Corporate Services) for consideration prior to it being forwarded to Council for consideration and subsequent determination as an **approved** Revenue Budget for 2012/13. **Part B** of this report highlights the details considered at the last Cabinet meeting. Included in this budget is an assumption that the Council will accept the Council Tax Freeze Grant from the Government and freeze the Council Tax.
- e) Based on the recommendations within this report the options to be determined in agreeing a balanced budget for 2012/13 are identified in Annex A of this Executive Summary. For completeness those matters agreed at the 16th February Cabinet are included in this Annex.
- f) Council is asked to consider the remaining Revenue Budget options for 2012/13 contained within Annex A and determine which options should form part of the

Council's Revenue Budget 2012/13 and the Medium Term Financial Plan to enable a balanced budget to be achieved (*recommendation I*).

- g) Council is asked to authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately in relation to those proposals in Annex A (or as potentially amended by Members). Then subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions, issue relevant statutory and contractual notifications (*recommendation II*).
- h) Subject to consideration of all recommendations in the report and any subsequent amendments moved and carried, Council is asked to approve the overall Revenue Budget for 2012/13 as set out in Annex B. (*recommendation III*).
- i) Elsewhere on the agenda is the Council Tax Resolution report. As mentioned above, the acceptance of the Council Tax Freeze Grant has been assumed within the "Framework" budget. Should the Council decide to change its Council Tax level for 2012/13, and amend the Revenue Budget, an amendment would also be required to the recommendation within the Council Tax setting report.
- j) Council is asked to note that the Revenue Budget 2012/13 assumes no savings from the following options: -

E1.3	Children's Special Transport
E2.3/4	Transportation for Adult Client Groups
E2.10	Fair Access for Care Criteria
E3.14	Crosby Civic Hall
E4.3	Capita contract
E5.6	Home Improvement Agency
E6.1	Dispense with Mayoral / Twinning
E6.10	Southport Theatre / Floral Hall

(*recommendation IV*).

- k) The significant savings required over the next three years will continue to require tough and far reaching decisions regarding services cessation, reduction and change in order to meet the financial objectives set by Government. Even where service activity is prioritised, it is imperative that this is undertaken in the most efficient way, and therefore it is essential that all opportunities to achieve savings continue to be fully explored.

Conclusion

The Council has faced a very significant reduction in its resource base over the last two years and there are further challenges in future years. The 2012/13 budget will be determined from the information in this report and the previous reports to Council. The process has been extensive, involving large scale consultation and engagement processes and a detailed examination and reporting of the implications associated with all options.

These processes have identified the options members could consider to achieve a balanced budget while meeting its previously agreed prioritisation. The majority of these savings have been achieved through real efficiencies and better commissioning. It is particularly pleasing to note that the Council has protected the most vulnerable and there has been no disproportionate impact on protected groups.

Members will be aware that the Council now needs to turn its attention to identifying further long term sustainable change which will deliver priorities whilst meeting our financial objectives. This process has started with the identification of the reviews within this report and will continue with further integration and transformation of services. This will be the subject of further reports.

An area of particular focus for the Council will be the delivery and funding of Adult Social Care and services for the elderly. The combination of demographic changes, increased costs and potential policy implications at a national level is going to be a significant challenge.

Achievement of this further change will require innovation and creativity in addition to strong partnerships with our communities and partners. Further refinements of our prioritisation is essential to ensure it continues to meet the Council's key objectives. The change will also require the dedicated capacity of elected members and officers

Executive Summary Annex A
Revenue Budget Proposals 2012/13

	Ref:	<u>Categorisation/Service</u>	2012/13 Budget	2013/14 Budget	2014/15 Budget
			£m	£m	£m
1		<u>Budget Gap - Council - 24th November 2011</u>	9.780	10.210	11.620
		Approved 2nd February Cabinet /16th February Council			
		<i>Low and Medium Options</i>			
		<u>Children and Families</u>			
2	E1.2	Short Break Overnight Respite Children's	-0.100	0.000	0.000
3	E1.4	Parenting Team - Think Family Grant	-0.087	0.000	0.000
4	E1.7	Early Years Outcomes Monitoring & Quality	-0.250	0.000	0.000
		<u>Older People</u>			
5	E2.8	Area Finance / Finance Visiting Officers - Review	-0.100	-0.100	0.000
6	E2.2	Supporting People Commissioning Functions	-0.043	-0.014	0.000
		<u>Leisure and Culture</u>			
7	E3.6	Sports & Recreation Service - Swimming Pools Lifeguard cover	-0.070	0.000	0.000
8	E3.7	Sports & Recreation Service - Litherland Sports Park - Coaching / Casual Staff	-0.015	0.000	0.000
9	E3.9	Library Service - Stock Services Unit / Stock Fund	-0.130	0.000	0.000
10	E3.12	Library Service - Local History & Information Services Team	-0.037	0.000	0.000
11	E3.13	Library Service - Cease provision of Mobile Library Service	-0.039	-0.003	0.000
		<u>Built Environment</u>			
12	E4.2	Highways Maintenance	-0.400	0.000	0.400
13	E4.9	Cease Supply of Hanging Baskets	-0.030	0.000	0.000
		<u>Regulatory</u>			
14	E5.4	Fairways Park and Ride - Figure Reduced from £20k	-0.015	0.000	0.000
15	E5.7	Cemeteries and Crematoria - Increased Income	-0.215	0.000	0.000
		<u>Other</u>			
16	E6.3	Reduce Area Committees Budgets	-0.026	0.000	0.000

17	Remaining Gap		8.223	10.093	12.020
	<i>Proposed Changes to MTFP Assumptions - Cabinet 16th February</i>				
	<u>Cabinet - 19 January 2012</u>				
18		Operating Southport Cultural Centre	0.398	0.324	0.000
	<u>Impact of non-achievement of previously identified savings:</u>				
19		Terms and Conditions	1.454	0.000	0.000
20		Capita (11/12 & 12/13)	0.224	0.000	0.000
	<u>Other Potential Changes to Budget Gap:</u>				
21		Additional Council Tax income due to Base change Cabinet 24th November	-0.055	0.000	0.000
22		Reduction in Levy Payments - Merseytravel and MWDA	-0.451	0.000	0.000
23		Adult Social Care - Inflation on Domiciliary Care Not required as contract has inflation freeze built in	-0.233	0.000	0.000
24		Adult Social Care - Domiciliary Care - Savings following retendering	-0.500	0.000	0.000
25		Carbon Reduction Commitment - Schools have agreed to fund	-0.250	0.000	0.000
26		New Homes Bonus - Utilise £2.4m of £3.4m Capital Grant to replace 2011/2012 allocation	-0.406	0.000	0.000
27		New Homes Bonus - Utilise £1.0m of £3.4m Capital Grant to partially replace 2012/2013 allocation	-0.405	0.000	0.000
28		Treasury Management Additional Savings	-0.300	-0.100	0.400
29		Elections - Fallow Year	-0.100	-0.100	0.200
30		New Connexions Contract	-0.200	-0.136	0.000
31		Potential Additional Costs in future years:			
32		Increments	0.000	1.737	1.500
33		Housing / Council Tax Benefit Admin Subsidy	0.000	0.250	0.250
34	E6.9	Personnel - Trade Unions facility time	-0.012	0.000	0.000
35		Landscape Services - Grounds Maintenance Contract	-0.130	0.000	0.000
36	Revised Budget Gap		7.187	12.068	13.970
	<u>Options to be considered on 16th February Cabinet</u>				
	Deferred from Cabinet 2 February				
37	E3.14	Arts & Cultural Services - Crosby Civic Hall – As agreed by Cabinet 16 February	0.000	0.000	0.000

38	E4.4	Grass Cutting - Reduce Frequency	-0.050	0.000	0.000
39	E6.6	Public Conveniences - Market Test	-0.100	0.000	0.000
40	E6.7	Tourism – Review of Service	-0.090	0.000	0.000
	High Impact				
41	E4.6,7 &8	Parks Management & Trees In Parks	-0.200	-0.020	0.000
42	E4.5,10,11,12	Parks, Greenspaces, Coast & Countryside Redesign	-0.250	-0.330	0.000
43	E2.6,7,9	Re- Commission Nursing and Residential Care (*)	-1.500	-1.500	0.000
44	E2.1	Supporting People (*)	-2.000	-1.000	0.000
45	E6.4	VCF Review	-0.170	0.000	0.000
46		Gap Remaining	2.897	9.218	14.370
47		Use of One-Off Resources to fund Part Year Effect of savings (*) (Figure adjusted because of line 43)	-2.500	2.500	0.000
48		Gap Remaining	0.397	11.718	14.317
	Other Potential Savings Options				
49		Assessment & Care Management - Community Care Practitioners	-0.257	0.000	0.000
50		DFGs - Replaced by new government grant	-0.500	0.000	0.000
51		NW Employers - Reinstate Membership	0.028	-0.028	0.000
52		LGA – As agreed by Cabinet 16 February	0.048	-0.048	0.000
53		Net surplus(-)/savings gap	-0.284	11.642	14.370

Annex B Executive Summary
Revenue Budget 2012/13

SEFTON COUNCIL - 2012/2013 Revenue Budget

<u>Categorisation/Service</u>	2012/13 Budget £m	2013/14 Budget £m	2014/15 Budget £m
<u>Priority Services</u>			
<u>Critical Services</u>			
People - Young People & Families	35.568	34.591	34.317
People - Older People	89.184	88.541	90.542
<i><u>Other Services - Influenced but contracted</u></i>			
Place - Street Scene	0.345	0.345	0.345
Corporate Support Services - Corporate Finance & ICT	3.210	3.620	4.070
<i>Sub Total Critical</i>	128.307	127.097	129.274
<u>Frontline Services</u>			
People - Young People & Families	2.281	2.281	2.281
People - Older People	0.221	0.221	0.221
People - Libraries	2.109	2.084	2.084
People - Leisure Centres	0.744	0.724	0.724
People - Arts / Museums	0.428	0.628	0.628
Place - Street Scene	10.728	11.398	11.398
Place - Built Environment	8.232	9.316	9.716
<i><u>Other Services - Influenced but contracted</u></i>			
Place - Street Scene	2.642	2.642	2.642
Place - Built Environment	0.581	0.581	0.581
<i>Sub Total Frontline</i>	27.966	29.875	30.275
<u>Regulatory Services</u>			
People - Young People & Families	10.381	10.381	10.381
People - Older People	0.381	0.381	0.381
Place - Street Scene	-0.912	-0.912	-0.912
Place - Built Environment	3.983	3.921	3.921

Corporate Support Services - Corporate Finance & ICT	0.360	0.360	0.360
Corporate Commissioning	0.341	0.241	0.441
<i>Sub Total Regulatory</i>	14.534	14.372	14.572
Grand Total of Priority Services	170.807	171.344	174.121
<u>All Other Services</u>			
<u>Cost of Democracy</u>	1.671	1.671	1.671
<u>Non-Controllable Costs</u>	2.847	2.847	2.847
<u>Unallocated Items</u>	0.761	6.786	11.681
<u>Trading Services</u>			
Place - Street Scene	0.299	0.299	0.299
Place - Built Environment	-1.264	-1.264	-1.264
People - Older People	-0.499	-0.499	-0.499
<i>Sub Total Trading Services</i>	-1.464	-1.464	-1.464
<u>General Corporate and Departmental Support Services</u>			
General Corporate and Departmental Support Services	17.082	17.006	17.006
Corporate Support Services - Influenced but contracted	9.500	9.262	9.262
Safer, Stronger Communities and Neighbourhoods	1.174	1.174	1.174
Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector	1.751	1.751	1.751
<i>Sub Total Corporate and Departmental Support Services</i>	29.507	29.193	29.193
Sub-total	33.322	39.033	43.928
<u>Other Items</u>			
<u>Other Commitments</u>	57.005	57.334	59.134
<u>Other Priority Services - Influenced but contracted</u>	3.134	2.998	2.998
<u>One-Off / Corporate Savings:</u>	-2.782	-2.760	-2.760
<u>General / Specific Grants Supporting the Budget</u>	-23.707	-23.576	-23.576
<u>Total Other Items</u>	33.650	33.996	35.796
<u>Net Expenditure</u>	237.779	244.373	253.845

One-off Resources to meet Budget Gap 2011/2012

One-off Resources to meet Budget Gap 2012/2013

-2.500

Overachievement of Savings Required to meet Budget Gap 2012/2013

0.284

0.284

0.284

Savings Required to meet Budget Gap 2013/2014

-11.642

-11.642

Savings Required to meet Budget Gap 2014/2015

-14.370

Additional Resources from Council Tax Freeze Grant in 2012/2013

-2.950

0.000

0.000

24 February 2012

232.613

233.015

228.117

Part A - Transformation Programme 2011-2014

1. Work Programme & Prioritisation

- 1.1 Annex C details the agreed work programme. It is important to note that these activities will continue to be supplemented as required in order to ensure that timescales are met. Council is asked to note the work programme timetable contained in Annex C (*recommendation a*).
- 1.2 During these extremely challenging times the prioritisation of Council activity continues to be based on ensuring that impact on services at the frontline and those, which are critical to vulnerable people, is minimised.
- 1.3 To this end the Council has prioritised and critically assessed how available resources are spent and this has been an extremely difficult task. On analysing the use of resources the Council is able to evidence that it has maintained a proportionate response.
- 1.4 At a full Members briefing, 9th February 2012, Members received information with regard to this matter, the impact that their decisions have had so far and the potential impact of remaining options.
- 1.5 Work must begin immediately to build upon the existing Prioritisation process to plan and prepare for the required further reduction. As discussed at the full Members briefings 9th and 16th February 2012, these further reductions will only be achieved with a radical redesign of Council services and by enhancing the Council's ability to manage the risk and demand associated with the critical services particularly adult and children's social care.
- 1.6 At its meeting 21st February Overview and Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services) considered whether or not the Council was in a position to set a revenue budget that reflected Council priorities and agreed that the Framework Budget as it was presented to them did so.
- 1.7 At this meeting Members recognised that in future years the Council would need to build upon the existing process and ensure that future changes are sustainable and reiterated the need for radical redesign of Council services and enhancement of the Council's ability to manage the risk and demand associated with protecting the most vulnerable people in Sefton.
- 1.8 In addition to this the committee asked Officers to explore the following with a view to developing options that may contribute to 2013/14 budget;
 - a) use of ring-fenced funding to support services
 - b) allocation of carbon tax to specific buildings
 - c) debt collection.

2. Consultation and Engagement Overview

- 2.1 As previously reported to Cabinet and Council, extensive consultation and engagement has taken place to seek the views of the public, service users and all key stakeholders on the budget proposals put forward in October 2011. A wide range of methods were used including e-consult, questionnaires a telephone survey, meetings, letters, forums and group sessions. E-consult

attracted 13,560 views, 5,680 questionnaires were completed, (2,900 on line), 303 people responded to the telephone survey and a range of events were held with special interest groups. The consultation feedback reports have been published alongside the budget proposals.

- 2.2 Significant media coverage has been generated and co-ordinated by the Corporate Communications team in order to explain the complex and lengthy Cabinet Reports. This has led to balanced reporting of the budget options process across local and regional media, including newspaper, web and radio. The team has also ensured that any media enquiries have been dealt with in a timely and transparent manner in order to help clarify and to avoid any confusion.
- 2.3 The Council's website has been updated with the latest Cabinet reports and annexes to reveal the outcomes of the consultations for residents and other interested parties externally. Staff have been kept informed through the Informing Sefton news-letters and regular Personal Messages from the Chief Executive.
- 2.4 We 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 1st March 2012. Corporate Communications continue to lead on this aspect of work with regular briefings, press releases and timely responses to media enquiries.
- 2.5 Further consultation will take place on the reviews outlined in Annexes D-G in accordance with the standards for consultation and engagement.
- 2.6 At its meeting 21st February Overview and Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services) reflected upon the scope of the consultation and engagement and agreed that the Council had been pro-active in this process and had sought a wide range of views and comments. The committee also confirmed that both Members and the public have had adequate opportunity to express their views.
- 2.7 Members noted at this meeting that not all groups could engage with all methods of communication but there had been a very wide range of methods used. Members also remarked that the Council must also take the opportunity to learn from the process and further improve the process in future years.
- 2.8 Consultation continues to take place with the recognised trade unions, and as applicable employees, as to options which are out for consultation, options which have been approved for progression and any other circumstances which may give rise to the loss of employment and changed employment matters generally.
- 2.9 Weekly meetings continue to take place on all matters with trade unions. This consultation continues to look at prospective options and also considers options that are to go forward. Even when options are approved to go forward, meaningful consultation takes place with regard to mitigation and avoidance of job loss.

3. Equality Analysis Overview

- 3.1 The options outlined in Annexes B, D, I and J have been subject to public 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. Attached to each option is an equality analysis report which identifies any

potential impact on those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions to be taken should any risks remain. Members are requested to note the detail within the equality analysis report, the consultation feedback and the mitigating actions within each option in taking their decisions on the recommendations made (*recommendations b, i and l*).

3.2 Further equality analysis reports as and when the reviews Annexes E – H are concluded to ensure the Council continues to meet its duties under the Equality Act 2010.

4. Risk Management Overview

4.1 As part of budget setting process the Council continues to regularly review strategic and operational risks and put in place measures to manage those risks. The Council will continue to make decisions so that it can continue to deliver priority services within available resources.

4.2 In considering those risks identified, officers have been mindful of a range of risk factors including but not limited to the following:

- The impact of the Equality Act 2010 and the public sector duties accordingly
- The Human Rights Act 1998
- The possibility of judicial review on decisions that might be made by members. Possible grounds for judicial review include, but are not limited to;
 - failure to follow statute and/or statutory guidance, failure to meet statutory requirements - generally termed illegality
 - failure to take into account relevant considerations or taking into account irrelevant considerations, - generally termed irrationality/unreasonableness
 - failure to address/meet a legitimate expectation, inadequate consultation processes, - generally termed procedural impropriety
- The risk of complaints to the Ombudsman
- Reputational risks to the Council
- Ensuring that contractual (including employment) provisions and requirements are adhered to
- The possibility of other legal proceedings, including employment tribunals and county court proceedings.

All of the above is to be considered in light of the statutory requirement for the Council to set a balanced and robust budget for the forthcoming financial year 2012/13.

4.3 Creating the capacity to develop and implement the required change continues to carry a significant risk. The Strategic Leadership Team (SLT) will continue to monitor progress and agree priorities. This risk should not be underestimated, as the authority shrinks and changes to meet the new budget regime.

4.4 Changes in statute and policy can have a direct impact on the Council. SLT will continue to plan for known changes with the Corporate Commissioning Team providing regular policy updates. These updates will be made available to Elected Members and Officers on a regular basis.

4.5 High level Communication with the public, staff and partners has, and will continue to be, considered at all stages of this process. We have continually

communicated the options through the media and other channels in a clear and transparent way. Following the conclusion of the consultation we updated the Sefton Council website to say that the information is being compiled and further updates, including the publication of this report will be made. We 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 key dates, such as Full Council on March 1. Corporate Communications continue to lead on this aspect of work with regular briefings, press releases and timely responses to media enquiries. The Communications team also continues to lead on the publication of the Transforming Sefton webpages for external consumption, as well as producing internal messaging such as the Informing Sefton News-Letters and co-ordinating the staff messages from the Chief Executive.

- 4.6 The implementation of approved proposals will continue to be monitored by the Strategic Leadership Team with a view to ensuring that where possible mitigating actions are put in place and the savings are delivered to an agreed timescale.
- 4.7 Members will recall that Council noted and took account of the risks and identified mitigating actions outlined in 16th February Council report. Members are requested to pay particular attention to the risks associated with the proposals contained in this report. The extent and availability of mitigation varies for each proposal (*recommendations b, i and l*).
- 4.8 Officers continue to strive to ensure that the data presented to Members is as accurate as possible. Inevitably on consultation and budget reduction on the scale that has been conducted there may be factual errors or misreading of data, this will be kept under review and should it be identified Members will be alerted at the earliest opportunity.
- 4.9 At its meeting 21st February Overview and Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services) agreed that both Members and residents had been well informed in respect of the potential impact, risks and mitigating actions associated with options.

5. Low & Medium Impact Options

- 5.1 Annex D contains a number of options on which consultation is complete and are all identified as being relatively low to medium impact proposals. These options have been amended in the light of the consultation, consideration by Cabinet and are now recommended to Council for approval.
- 5.2 Council is asked to consider and demonstrably take account of the information within each of the proposals in Annex D. Members will need to be mindful of the relevant legislative framework, and weigh up the issues accordingly, taking account of
- i. the equality analysis report
 - ii. the consultation feedback
 - iii. risk and
 - iv. the mitigating actions (*recommendation b*)
- 5.3 Council is asked to approve the recommendations E4.4, E6.6 and E6.7 as detailed below (*recommendation c*)

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendations	2012/13 £m
E4.4	Highways Maintenance	A further reduction in Highways Grounds Maintenance Works Budgets which will be delivered by a reduction in the number of cuts to all highway grassed areas	Council is asked to b) approve that a reduction of three cuts to all highway grassed areas at a saving of £50,000 be approved	-0.050
E6.6	Public Conveniences	Public Conveniences – Market Test	Council is asked to approve b) a formal procurement process to provide the public convenience operational service be approved at a saving of £100,000	-0.100
E6.7	Tourism	Review of Service	Council is asked to a) approve that the Tourist Information Centre be relocated to the Southport Cultural Centre (SCC) in 2013 resulting in a saving of £90,000 be approved b) note that £38K will be taken from the Tourism event reserve budget in the 12/13 financial year to achieve the £90K target in order to manage the transitional arrangements pending the opening of the SCC	-0.090

5.4 At its meeting 16th February Cabinet determined that in respect of option E3.14, which was to reduce the Crosby Civic Hall from a fully staffed and serviced venue to a 'latch key' operation available solely for self-hire. Cabinet noted that negotiations were on-going with possible interested parties and this option will not contribute to 2012/13 revenue budget (*recommendation IV*).

5.5 Option E6.1 Reduce the function of mayor to the statutory minimum - Following completion of the consultation exercise and in light of some issues raised about events/organisations supported by the Mayoral office, a further mini-review will be conducted by officers before recommendations are made to Members. Such review will be completed and reported to Cabinet by the end of May 2012.

5.6 Progress relating to option E6.9 Reduction in Trade Union Facility Time is covered in the "Framework" Budget report (Part B of this report).

6. Reviews

6.1 Members will recall that Officers are progressing a number of reviews and that these may identify further options at a future date. Members are asked to

consider the information presented to 2nd and 16th February Cabinet plus any additional information subsequently provided and recommendations associated with -

6.1.1 **Community Care Practitioners (CCP) Review** (Annex E)

- a) A review of the role and function of Community Care Practitioners (CCP) was carried out from the 1st November 2011 to 16th January 2012. Savings of £171k have already been achieved through the VER/VR process.
- b) The Community Care Practitioners Service (CCP) currently undertakes activity in 3 general work areas. A précis of the role of these teams is set out below, but is by no means comprehensive:
 1. Adult Social Care and Independence Teams - undertaking community care assessments with service users, carers and relevant professionals. Typically service users can have chronic and multiple health problems making the assessment issue quite lengthy and involving other professionals such as doctors and therapists. Following the conclusion of an assessment the CCP will make a recommendation about the level of support and assistance required. If the recommendation is accepted then the CCP will proceed to commission services, liaise with service users, family, carers etc to ensure that appropriate care and support is co-ordinated.
 2. Hospital Teams - cover all of the hospitals located within the Sefton Borough, and assist Sefton residents who have been admitted to hospitals outside of the borough boundary. The CCP may have a set timetable to put together a discharge plan. Failure to meet the appropriate deadlines or if there is a delay in the planned discharge, and can result in a penalty on the Council which is payable to the relevant NHS body. Similar to the Adult Social Care team - the assessment can involve a range of professionals. The service can include out of hours work to meet with carers who work or to assist the hospital at peak times such as bad weather, staff shortages etc.
 3. Sensory and Mobile Assessment - with respect to the sensory service, the CCPs in this team, assess, demonstrate and provide services to users. The CCPs visit users in their own homes and provide various drop in clinics. Home visits can include environmental safety checks, and ensure that recipients of the service optimise their use of any equipment provided. With respect to the Mobile Assessment team - they perform assessments for minor equipment and works such as bathing equipment and minor adaptations.
- c) The work of each area is quite distinct, however there are some commonalities across the teams as well such as provision of welfare advice.
- d) As mentioned above a service review has been undertaken to critically and impartially examine the role of the CCPs' work currently undertaken as outlined above.
- e) There is a statutory context to this service, of which Members should be mindful. The NHS and Community Care Act 1990 stated that it is a duty for local authorities to assess people for social care and support. This is to ensure that people who need community care services or other types of support get the

services that they are entitled to. This approach is supported through the Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) framework.

- f) Council is asked to
1. approve a re-organisation of the CCP staff to target resources more effectively and realise efficiencies. This could entail an immediate reduction in the levels of CCP's within the Adult Social Care Teams by further four posts, resulting in a further saving of approximately £86K (*recommendation d*)
 2. note that savings of £171k, associated with the CCP Review have already been achieved through the VER/VR process (*recommendation e*)
 3. note that further information was provided to Cabinet Members for consideration and a recommendation will be made to 1st March Council (*recommendation f*).

6.1.2 Option 6.4 VCF Review of existing arrangements

- a) The purpose of the VCF review was to understand what resources the Council give to the VCF sector and what the outcomes of this are. As part of this, it was felt important to give a voice to the VCF sector in terms of influencing future commissioning and priority setting. The following key outcomes have come out of this. These are consistent messages that have come from across the sector and are integral to understanding how the Council moves forward in its future engagement and commissioning of VCF organisations.
- Fundamentally, and above all else, the sector wants good communication between themselves and the Council. This includes the provision of clear and timely information about what is happening and why and ideally having one point of contact.
 - Confirmation is needed as to whether funding will be available post March 2012 and if so what organisations will be required to do. Organisations have said they need to know this as soon as possible.
 - In order to provide needs led services that are also responsive to change organisations need longer-term contracts, ideally for 3 years. It has been made clear that whilst any funding is appreciatively received it does not help a service to plan for the future, nor is it conducive to building and maintaining staff and service user relationships, which are an essential part of what community based services provide. In addition short term funding results in job insecurity, which can create instability within the sector through the loss of staff and subsequent loss of knowledge and investment in training. Short term, particularly yearly, contracts make planning difficult
 - Organisations would like Council priorities to be clear and understand how any funding they receive ties back to these so they can ensure their delivery provides what the Council wants.
 - Organisations want an agreed measurement for capturing social value outcomes – a consistent approach that is simple and can be made part of their day to day collection of evidence

- Support on commissioning and tender processes would be of great benefit. More local VCF organisations could potentially deliver more services if they were supported to become tender ready.
 - Support to explore consortium working would also be of benefit, which also links to organisations being able to consider tender opportunities through partnership working.
 - Organisations would like the Council's commissioning process to be clear, open, and transparent. They would also like appropriate timescales to be built in to allow VCF organisations the opportunity to respond properly.
- b) The sum of £170k is felt to be achievable by Officers and is based on elements of services currently being provided by the Council no longer being seen as a priority. As mentioned earlier in the report consultation has taken place in accordance with Best Value Statutory Guidance from DCLG (duty of Best Value).
- c) There will be a process of continuous challenge within the VCF Review to identify if any further savings can be made.
- d) Picking up points raised within the VCF Review, there is a strong desire for a corporate system for recording social value to be developed to give VCF organisations a consistent mechanism for showing the additional value they are able to bring to local community provision. Any models would be consulted on with VCF organisations to ensure it is fit for purpose.
- e) Transitional Arrangements - Whilst the overall outcomes of the VCF review are being worked on and the process for defining priorities is ongoing, Cabinet is asked to commit to three year commissioning processes where grant aid is given to organisations. This would respond to the need for some certainty in the sector, but officers would recommend a robust annual appraisal of performance which would be an integral part of any Service Level Agreement.
- f) The arrangements for how we work with the VCF sector in general will form part of the emerging Corporate Commissioning Framework. This will respond to the range of different processes that are currently in place and make them fit for purpose and flexible to the needs of the sector and the Council. This review is now concluded and any future changes will be considered within the prioritisation process.
- g) The VCF Consultation report and equality analysis are detailed in Annex F.
- h) At 16th February Cabinet further information was sought in respect of the Sefton Play Council. This was provided to Cabinet Members.
- i) Council is asked to (*recommendations g, h, i and j*)
1. note that this review is now concluded and any future changes will be considered within the prioritisation process (*recommendation g*)
 2. note and take into account the key messages identified from the results of the consultation and equality analysis report (*recommendation h*)

3. agree to the introduction of three year commissioning processes where grant aid is given to organisations subject to annual performance reviews (*recommendation i*)
4. approve a budget reduction of £170k and note that further information was provided to Cabinet Members for consideration and a recommendation will be made to 1st March Council in respect of Sefton Play Council (*recommendation j*).

6.2 **Review of Library Services** - In respect of Library Services Annex G details the Terms of Reference for this review.

6.3 **Review of Leisure Activity** - In respect of Leisure Activity Annex H details the Terms of Reference for this review.

6.4 **Review of 24 Hour Response** - In respect of 24 Hour Response Annex I details the Terms of Reference for this review.

6.5 **Review of Street Lighting** - In respect of Street Lighting Annex J details the Terms of Reference for this review. .

6.6 Council is asked to note the Review Terms of Reference as outlined in Annexes G-J and the associated timescales (*recommendation w*).

6.7 Terms of reference relating to a number of other reviews will be presented to a future meeting of Council for approval, including Adults Transport and Supporting People (*recommendation x*).

7. Options requiring further consideration

7.1 With respect to the options identified in the table below Members will recall the information presented to 2nd and 16th February Cabinet. These options are all identified as potentially having complex and far reaching impacts either across all the community or on the most vulnerable.

Ref	Service Area	Option
E4.5	Parks and Green Space	Reductions in the standard of management and maintenance of parks and green spaces Changes in the style of management and general appearance of parks and green spaces Reorganisation of service
E 4.6	Parks and Green Space	Recharge formal sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities at pavilions, allotment sites etc
E 4.7	Parks and Green Space	Recharge formal sports users the costs of grounds maintenance to provide formal facilities
E 4.8	Parks and Green Space	Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park
E 4.10	Parks and Green Space	Park Ranger functions
E4.11	Coast and Countryside Service	Merger of Parks & Coastal Rangers
E4.12	Coast and Countryside Service	Reduction to site and visitor management activities
E 2.1	Supporting People	To review all services that are funded by Supporting People by

Ref	Service Area	Option
		looking at outcomes, contractual arrangements and diversity of services that this may fund.
E 2.2	Supporting People Commissioning functions	Review of staffing support
E2.3	Adults Specialist Transport	Cease the provision of specialist transport for adults attending day services in the borough
E2.4	Adults Specialist Transport	Increase flat rate charge for individual journeys to and from day care provision

7.2 Further discussions have now taken place with Members to ensure that all information is taken into account when making any final recommendations to Council. These options have been amended in the light of this, further analysis and risk assessment and are now presented to Council for consideration.

7.3 Landscape Services Change Proposals

7.3.1 Detailed change proposals were presented to 2nd and 16th February Cabinet. They were identified following brief reviews of the services provided by these sections during 2011 (Annex K).

7.3.2 The financial impact for each individual option was outlined in Annexes B-H inclusive of Annex K. Members will appreciate that some of the options can be taken independently of each other (i.e. E4.6, E4.7 and E4.8) whereas the others cannot (i.e. E4.5, E4.10, E4.11, and E4.12), as they are linked.

7.3.3 The following table summarises which of the options are stand-alone and those which are interdependent:

	Change Proposal	Total saving		Comment
		2012/13	2013/14	
E4.6	Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities	£59,000		This option can be considered as a stand- alone decision.
E4.7	Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance	£91,000	£20,000	This option can be considered as a stand-alone decision.
E4.8	Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park	£50,000		This option can be considered as a stand-alone decision.

	Change Proposal	Total saving		Comment
		2012/13	2013/14	
E.4.5	General Reduction in Parks Management and Maintenance Standards	£250,000	£330,000	These change proposals are linked and are interdependent on each other. They are based on a model of parks / coast management that recognises the interrelationship between managing park, coast and countryside users, and the quality of infrastructure and standard of grounds maintenance. For example, if parks /coast infrastructure is poorer and
E4.10	Cessation of Park Ranger Functions			
E4.11	Merger of Parks and Coastal Ranger functions			

	Change Proposal	Total saving		Comment
		2012/13	2013/14	
E4.12	Coast and Countryside Site and Visitor Management			grounds maintenance is lower, then more interaction is needed with users to deter anti-social behaviour and the perceived fear of crime. It is proposed to re-engineer the Parks and Green Spaces Service and Coast and Countryside Service in order to achieve the phased savings as shown. The details of the savings are to be agreed with the Cabinet Member Leisure and Tourism
	Total if all options approved	£250,000	£330,000	

7.3.4 It is clear from the feedback following consultation that none of these proposals are supported. Due to the integrated approach to land management of Parks, Greenspaces, Coastal and Countryside areas it is now considered appropriate to re-engineer service delivery. The re-engineering process will consider overall service provision, this will include; staffing resource, maintenance standards, interaction with and management of visitors/users of these areas (i.e. education and enforcement activity). The process will also provide a further opportunity for the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Tourism to consider current service provision, take account of risks, impacts and feedback from consultation before approving any changes that will be implemented to achieve the savings stated below.

7.3.5 As a result of the above plus the interdependencies, consultation exercises, and in mitigation of the equality analysis reports, the Parks and Green Spaces Service and Coast and Countryside Service can be re-engineered, in order to achieve a saving of £250,000 in 2012/13 and £330,000 in 2013/14.

7.3.6 It was acknowledged, during the review process, that some of the options identified are likely to have a detrimental impact on other aspects of the service if a reduction or cessation is approved. This is because the Parks & Green Spaces section and the Coast & Countryside section use an integrated approach to land-management/service delivery.

7.3.7 Council is asked to (*recommendation k*) consider and demonstrably take account of the information within each of the proposals associated with Landscape Services. Members will need to be mindful of the relevant legislative framework, and weigh up the issues accordingly, taking account of

- i. the equality analysis report
- ii. the consultation feedback
- iii. risk and
- iv. the mitigating actions

7.3.8 Council is asked approve the recommendations E4.6, E4.7 and E4.8 as detailed below (*recommendation l*)

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendations	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m
E4.6	Landscape Services	Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities	Council is asked to b) approve the recharging to sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities	-0.059	0.000
E4.7	Landscape Services	Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance	Council is asked to b) approve of recharging formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance	-0.091	-0.020
E4.8	Landscape Services	Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park	Council is asked to b) approve the Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park	-0.050	0.000
Total				-0.200	-0.020

7.3.8 Council is asked to approve the re-engineering of the Parks and Green Spaces Service and Coast and Countryside Service in order to achieve a saving of £380,000 in 2012/13 and £330,000 in 2013/14 (*recommendation m*).

7.4 Supporting People

7.4.1 Members will be aware from the information provided to 2nd and 16th February Cabinet (Annex L) that Supporting People is a discretionary programme that funds housing-related support services to help vulnerable people live independently in their own accommodation or to move from temporary accommodation into a more permanent place.

7.4.2 In light of the consultation to date and recognising that if and when services are to be discontinued/de-commissioned providers will need to undertake correct legal employment processes. It is proposed to amend the original option to the extent that, should Members approve this in principal budget option, the review of services funded by Supporting People would include a further period of consultation on commissioning priorities. Terms of reference relating to this review will be presented to a future meeting of Cabinet for approval.

7.4.3 Council is asked to give further regard to the information contained in 2nd and 16th February reports (as detailed in Annex L) and determine if the proposal below will be approved. Council is asked to approve an in principle full-year budget reduction of £3m in 2013/14 and a £2m saving in 2012/13 (*recommendation n*).

7.4.4 Council is asked to agree a further period of consultation on commissioning priorities for the remaining resources and the detail of how the budget reduction could best be delivered whilst minimising/mitigating the impacts i.e. a further review (*recommendation o*). This would mean that the consultation period has been extended for a further four months, accounting for an overall consultation period of over six months.

7.4.5 Council is asked to note (*recommendation p*) that this further review will be completed by May 2012 so that it identifies if and how the services to be ceased/de-commissioned, rationalised and resources targeted to maximise effect on the basis of those commissioning priorities. The outcome of this review will be reported to Cabinet in June at this stage Officers will confirm whether it will be possible to deliver the full year budget saving of £3m.

7.4.6 Council is asked to note the high level project plan below which will include inter alia; (*recommendation q*).

SUPPORTING PEOPLE CONSULTATION	Start	Finish	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	April 2012	May 2012	June 2012	
Preparation Initiate process to extend contracts as appropriate Hold discussions with provider groups about possible next steps and consult methods	6th Feb	17th Feb	[REDACTED]					
Consultation Process Produce Influence Interest matrix and agree stakeholders Identify best methods for each stakeholder Paper Questionnaire Development - focussing on commissioning priorities Produce Easy Read Versions Launch consultation Organise appropriate key events Produce consultation report	17th Feb	11 May	[REDACTED]					
Review current commissioned services Further analyse report from previous relevant consultation (Oct 2011 to January 2012) Analyse data on usage, value, outcomes for each of the 147 services Assess for priority Match with feedback from consultation Produce Priority of services Draft set of priority services to providers for comments Produce Equality Impact Assessments Produce cabinet report with recommendations	17th Feb	14th June	[REDACTED]					
Implementation (if approved) Implement outcome of the review to include	22nd June	30th Sept	[REDACTED]					



decommissioning, re-commissioning, rationalisation etc.

7.5 Review all Council transportation for adult client groups (Options E2.3 & E2.4)

- 7.5.1 The Specialist Transport Unit (STU) provides commissioned travel facilities to all adult client groups to enable access to specialist provision i.e. day care centres and day opportunity schemes. The need for day care services is based on a social care assessment for service users who meet 'substantial' and 'critical' Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) criteria. Service users include older people, adults with physical disabilities, older people with mental health problems, adults with a learning disability and adults with multiple complex needs. On average there are just under 700 adult users of the service at any one time. Consultation has taken place with service users, carers and families and other interested parties regarding the potential changes to the service.
- 7.5.2 There were two, alternative, options for consideration. Option E2.3: Cease the provision of specialist transport for adults attending day services in the borough and, Option E2.4: Increase flat rate charge for individual journeys to and from day care provision. The current flat rate charge is £1.50 per one way journey (those with capital in excess of £23,250 currently pay up to £6.50 per trip when using STU commissioned travel).
- 7.5.3 There is a complex mix of delivery mechanisms and routes, these include double routes (adult and children users) and the use of private hire taxis. Passenger assistants are used on the majority of internally and externally provided journeys, unless it is determined that a passenger assistant is not required.
- 7.5.4 There are interdependencies between the STU, the wider Council and commissioned services, therefore, when Members give consideration to any options or proposals associated with Specialist Transport, the following need to be considered:
- the impact on Children's Specialist Transport (use for children with Special Education Needs and Looked after Children)
 - the transport function required to convey service users to day centres and other commissioned Day Care Services
- 7.5.5 **Consultation and Engagement Overview**
- Overall clients using the service did not agree with either of the potential options (E2.3 and E2.4). Most felt there were better ways of saving money including re-organising the way the service itself was run. Many felt that these options would victimise the most vulnerable in society in particular if the service was ceased completely. 91% of those surveyed disagreed with the proposal to cease the service. The same percentage would prefer an increase in cost rather than cessation of the service if they had to choose.
- 7.5.6 Where the Council assesses a person as needing community based services it must consider their transport needs to access those services. Where a service user has an assessed eligible need for social care transport services, the Council must enable, provide or arrange transport services to meet those assessed eligible needs.

In addition the Council may make provision for a person to travel to and from their home for the purposes of participation in any services provided under s29 National Assistance Act 1948 or s.2 Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, which includes day centres.

Section 17 of the Health and Social Services and Social Security Adjudications Act 1983 provides the Council with a discretionary power to impose a reasonable charge for such services in accordance with the policy guidance *Fairer Charging Policies for Home Care and other non-residential Social Services*.

If a service user has the provision of transport in their care plan, that care plan cannot be amended without a review. It cannot be assumed that a carer is willing and able to provide this and it cannot be assumed that the service user is able to fund this service themselves.

7.5.7 It is acknowledged that changes made by the STU during 2011/12 to the way that transport services operate are now producing a significant reduction in the annual cost of providing such transport to both adults and children.

7.5.8 As can be seen from the above information Officers have continued to undertake further analysis and assess the risks in relation to these options. This coupled with the outcome of the consultation and the complex issues that require further consideration leads Officers to believe that it is no longer feasible to progress the options as previously described. The thrust of these options now needs to be refocused, undertaking of a further review of transport for vulnerable adults would enable officers to explore further options in relation to the potential to realise financial savings. This is with a view to move to a position of minimum statutory requirements and to commission appropriate transport services in future.

Terms of reference relating to this review will be presented to a future meeting of Cabinet for approval (*recommendation x*).

7.5.9 Council is asked to agree a further review of transport services provided for vulnerable adults in order to establish a policy and appropriate provision of such transport. (*recommendation r*).

7.5.10 Council is asked to note that the 2012/13 Framework budget does not include any reduction associated with options E2.3 and E2.4 (*recommendation IV*).

7.5.11 Should Council agree the key milestones are detailed below -

February 2012 –Review Initiation

- Context & principles
- Interdependencies: purpose, staffing, funding, detailed plans

February & March 2012 -Review Stage 1 - Information gathering & analysis

- Data & quality performance, costs
- Best Practice/research and analysis
- Mapping current transport delivery methods with data and costs

April, May 2012 & June 2012 – Review Stage 2 - information sharing

- Review and further analyse October 2011 to January 2012 consultation

- Engage with Day Centres for further comments/views
- Scope and draft range of future models

July, August & September 2012 – Review Stage 3 - consultation

- Consult with users future model options
- Further develop range of options

October 2012 – Review Stage 4 - reporting

- Report for approval to Cabinet
- Feedback to Day Centres and Users

November 2012 - Implementation Stage

7.6 Re-Commissioning of Nursing & Residential Care

- 7.6.1 Consultation on the 2011/12 and 2012/13 fees did not provide sufficient information. The Council considers it is not in a position at the moment to determine the fee rates for the forthcoming financial year. It wishes to have the opportunity to consider further the risk assessment in relation to the same and to gather further information from the sector re actual costs of care. It is also the Council's intention to explore alternative commissioning approaches as well as the commencement of a procurement process. Such consideration will be concluded and reported back to Members thereafter.
- 7.6.2 The financial implications of any decision reached on the 2012/13 fee rates will be met from the Council's reserves.
- 7.6.3 The Council should regularly review its commissioning arrangements to ensure they continue to provide the best means of meeting desired outcomes. The Council is required to periodically set the "usual cost" it would expect to pay for placing someone into residential care, in doing so it is required to have due regard to the "actual costs" of providing that care. In reality, there is a wide range of "actual costs" and different business models within the Sefton care homes market, this is difficult to reflect in any single "cost of care" figure, a review of care home commissioning arrangements would therefore include, amongst other options, considering a move to Framework Contracts (with a restricted number of care homes sufficient to meet the Council's anticipated demand for future placements). Such contracts would be awarded following a competitive tendering process in which each bidder identifies the "actual cost" of providing the required level and quality of care within their setting, together with evidence of a sustainable business model underpinning it.
- 7.6.4 There are a number of issues that require detailed analysis and consideration before a decision to adopt a Framework Contract or other radically different approach could be determined and as with all competitive tendering exercises, unless the Council decided to set a "ceiling price" as part of that process it can not be certain of the costs until tenders are submitted and evaluated. The Council would still need to set its "usual cost" of care, as individuals would continue to be free to choose an alternative care home, but this would be based upon the most competitive submissions on quality/price received through the tendering process. The ambition is that the alternative commissioning approaches will realise a saving of £1.5m in 2012/13, by a combination of the costs of care and operational and commissioning efficiencies and a further £1.5m in 2013/14. If the review identifies that this is not achievable Members will be informed accordingly.

7.6.5 Council is asked to (*recommendations s-v*)

- a) approve an in principle budget reduction of £1.5m in 2012/13 and a further £1.5m in 2013/14
- b) agree to continue the review of Nursing and Residential “real cost of care”
- c) in parallel agree to commence a procurement process and to continue to explore alternative commissioning approaches
- d) note that it is anticipated the review at (b) will be concluded in May/June 2012. The outcome of this will be reported to Cabinet in June/July 2012. The review and the work identified in (c) will also confirm if and how the in principle budget reduction can be achieved.

7.6.6 Should Council agree this key milestones are detailed below:

February 2012 –Review Initiation

- Context & principles
- Interdependencies: purpose, staffing, funding, detailed plans

February & March 2012 -Review Stage 1 - Information gathering & analysis

- Options identification
- Continued analysis of October 2011-January 2012 consultation feedback and the further consultation

April - May 2012 – Review Stage 2 - information sharing

- Further Consultation with Stakeholder
- Options appraisal

June - October 2012 – Review Stage 3 – Determination

- Report for approval to Cabinet
- Implementation of agreed commissioning approach

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex C Work Programme

22 September	Cabinet Review Day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree final options, Consultation engagement plan (detailed), Agree next steps and approval process
13 th October	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve options for immediate progression or consultation and engagement
21 st October	Public Engagement and Consultation Standards Panel Launch of Consultation/Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel to sign off Consultation Plans for all options which have a high or medium impact on the service users/stakeholders • Formal Launch of Public Consultation and Engagement – activity, including website go live date with link to e-consult • Formal recruitment of e-panel to commence
27 th October	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve options for immediate progression contained in the report to Cabinet 13th October
10 th November	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on internal consultation • Recommend any budget savings for implementation where consultation is complete
24 th November	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider Cabinet recommendations on internal consultation
8 th December	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report
14 th December	Public Engagement and Consultation Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim update reports
15 th December	Risk Assessment & Prioritisation Event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk Assessment • Prioritisation of “Other” Services
19 th January	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritisation of “Other” Services
2 nd February	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on consultation and engagement activity • Recommend any budget savings for implementation
16 th February	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend any budget savings for implementation
16 th February	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing to Council on outcome of consultation and engagement activity on options • Recommend any budget savings for implementation
21 st February	Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Framework” Budget for 2012/13 for comment
1 st March	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No budget activity scheduled
1 st March	Budget Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Budget and Council Tax
16 th March	Public Engagement and Consultation Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Libraries ○ Leisure Activity ○ 24 Hour Response

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Street Lighting
29 th March	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve options for immediate progression or consultation and engagement
12 th April	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No budget activity scheduled
26 th April	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve options for immediate progression or consultation and engagement
10 th May	Annual Council Meeting	

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex D

E4 Street Scene

Ref	Service Area	Option
E 4.4	Highways Maintenance	A further reduction in Highways Grounds Maintenance Works Budgets which will be delivered by a reduction in the number of cuts to all highway grassed areas

E6 Other

Ref	Service Area	Option
E 6.6	Public Conveniences	Public Conveniences – Market Test
E 6.7	Tourism	Review of Service

Reference E4.4

<p>Service Description: Highways Grounds Maintenance – (Highway Grass Cutting) Categorisation: Frontline To maintain the grassed areas of the highway network to maximise the safe passage of people and vehicles. This work forms part the core contract for delivery by Capita Symonds. This is a statutory duty under sections 41 and 58 of Highways Act 1980. Funding has previously been permanently reduced by £200,000 in the previous round of prioritisation. Client is all highway users either residents of Sefton or visitors.</p>
<p>Consultation has commenced on the following – A further reduction in Highways Grounds Maintenance Works Budgets which will be delivered by a reduction in the number of cuts to all highway grassed areas. The combination of new contracts (coming into force in July 2011) and the MTFP addressing other significant budget black holes, it is now recommended to further reduce the Highways Grounds Maintenance Budget.</p>
<p>Rationale for service change proposal – Council is under a statutory duty (sections 41 and 58 of Highways Act 1980) to ensure a safe highway network. Grass, were it allowed to grow unchecked, would create visual and physical obstructions to vehicle drivers and pedestrians. The level of cutting can be reduced without causing such obstructions and the Council would still be able to meet its' statutory duty.</p>
<p>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce – Delivery of the Highway Grounds Maintenance service will be revised by reducing the number of cuts per annum to 8 (The current level is 11 cuts). These will be programmed throughout the growing season for maximum impact.</p>
<p>Impact of Service Change – Service Users – Reduced visual impact across the borough. Partners – This is a works contract; reduction of the budget would impact upon the contractor and would result in less supervision work undertaken by Capita Symonds. Council – Whilst works-related expenditure can be reduced there are contractual obligations under the agreement with the external partner, Capita Symonds, It is not proposed to consider any reduction to the core-payment under that agreement as part of this change proposal. There are legal and financial implications with reduction of the agreement with the external partner. Deterioration of the Highway Network infrastructure has a significant reputational risk.</p>
<p>Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary See full consultation report E4.4</p>
<p>Equality Analysis Report – see EAR E4.4</p>

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

Further permanent reduction does carry the risk of short and long-term implications in terms of deteriorating condition of the highways network with increased minor risk of accident and injury on the highway. Disruption to use of the highway network has an associated detrimental economic impact and a reputation impact. Contract price fluctuation and inflation will eventually result in the need to reassess the budget required for this service.

The condition of the highway grassed areas will be monitored to assess the ongoing impact of the reduction to ensure that the detrimental effect to the highway is minimised. The frequency of grass verge mowing will be rescheduled to maximise the effect over the growing season. Grass is likely to be longer at the time of each cut and the contract does not allow for the removal of the cuttings. The cut grass is left on the verges to turn to mulch and it is likely that this will result in the verges being more unsightly for a period however this is not expected to affect the safety of the highway user. With reference to the 'Well-maintained Highways: Code of Practice for Highway Maintenance Management published by Department for Transport in 2005, there are no specific parameters with regard to the frequency of grass cutting.

Advice is as follows:-

- Dealing first with requirements for safety: vegetation on verges should not restrict visibility at junctions, access points and bends. Sight lines and minimum stopping distances should be kept clear and signs, lights, and marker posts should not be obstructed. It may also be necessary for vegetation to be cut back in order to enable inspections or surveys.
- Condition standards and frequency of grass cutting on rural roads should be determined locally from risk assessment.
- In urban areas using the standards for rural roads would deliver safe standards from a visibility perspective, but length of grass, possible concealed debris and the potential for grass cuttings to block gullies, suggests there is a need for a higher frequency of cutting in urban areas. The frequency of cutting needs to balance these priorities in contributing to overall townscape management, taking into account the needs of users and the community.

The Council will continue to meet its' statutory duty in accordance with Highways Act 1980 (section 41) to maintain the highway.

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce – The response to the consultation was very limited, however the majority of respondents were in favour of a reduction in this service. The current financial year has seen this service retendered and a different supplier has been awarded the work. The procurement exercise has seen a change of contract specification to give the Council more control over service delivery. The contract has changed from the previous service contract (where the contractor had to ensure the grass was maintained at a certain height and Capita had to ensure compliance) to a contract with a specific number of cuts. During this year the service has been delivered by two different contractors to two different specifications which have not shown a true reflection of the service delivery for the future. With the new contractor working to the new specification, the current budget will fund 11 cuts of the highway grass verges. The proposed reduction by £50,000 will mean that the new budget will be sufficient to fund 8 cuts. The contract also delivers other items such as hedge trimming and limited maintenance of planted areas. These will continue at the present level. This proposal will continue to meet the recommendations in the code of practice detailed above in risks and mitigating actions

Cost of Highway Grounds Maintenance

Service: £350,000

Staffing: Not Applicable

Other Resources: Capita Symonds

Proposed Cost 2012/13: £300,000

Saving 2012/13: £50,000

Will the saving be full or part year? Full

Saving 2013/14: £ 50,000

Investment Required: Nil at this stage

Staff at Risk: No.

Responses and Analysis to Sefton Council's consultation on the option to reduce the Highway grounds maintenance revenue budget by a further £50,000.

(Ref: E 4.4)

Consultation Period:

21st October 2011 – 16th January 2012

Background

The highway management revenue budget was reduced in 2010/11 by £800,000 for a period of three years. In addition to this, the highway grounds maintenance budget was specifically reduced by £200,000 on a permanent basis.

Members are minded to seek a further temporary reduction of £500,000 for the same budget and have requested that the option be subject to a consultation process.

Consultation Methodology

Information on this option was available on the intranet and on e-Consult, the on-line consultation tool. The public had an opportunity to give comments and feedback via this tool.

A consultation exercise took place with Sefton Youth Advisors who were asked to explore the effects that cuts in the highway management budget might have. Details of this event are included in Appendix 2.

Consultation has also taken place with One Vision Housing and also our professional partner Capita Symonds to assist in the realignment of budgets should the proposed reduction be implemented

The option was also discussed at the Youth Event, organised by the Young Advisors, which took place on 3rd December 2011.

Executive Summary

In total, seven comments were received on the e-consult system. A full listing is included in Appendix 2

Of the seven responses, five (72%) were in favour of the proposal and one (14%) was against it. The other (14%) made a general comment.

The Consultation Analysis

The response to the consultation was extremely limited and insufficient to offer any real guidance or measure of public opinion.

Highway Maintenance Feedback from the Youth Event

Activity	Feedback received
Spider Diagram Activity: 1. Who uses roads and why are they important?	Pedestrians, public transport, cars, parades – protests & Lord Mayors, emergency vehicles, television crews, council services – meals on wheels, horses, cyclists, motorbikes.

2. Who uses paths and why are they important?	Zebra crossings, if you don't drive then you have to use paths, bridges, travelling anywhere/general travel, used to socialise and go shopping, cycle paths for fun and to get to places, national trails, under main roads – subways, parks, access to hospitals, EVERYONE uses them.
3. What hazards/problems could there be with roads and paths?	Litter, Wildlife, Overgrown vegetation, obstructions, narrow ways, should be a clear separation between roads and paths, everyone would be affected equally, uneven road surfaces, poor lit roads, unclear paint on road markings, people are hazards!
4. What would you do if there were no roads or paths?	More accidents, No system, No rules or regulations, Have no specific direction for walking or driving, Less jobs e.g./ lollipop men/ladies, no traffic wardens & traffic police, No stability, no routes to place.
Discussion around importance of roads and paths being looked after and maintained.	Damaged, dangerous roads could cause more accidents and injuries, might slow down or delay emergency vehicles, cost of repairs further down the line would be very high, very important, - councils duty, damage to vehicles would be expensive.

Rank/ order game

- YP were given 9 options and asked to rank them according to importance. Number 1 being the most important. Highway Maintenance – 10/14 YP scored this as a one or two, so highway maintenance was scored very highly. 3 YP scored highway maintenance a 4 and one scored a 6. Overall a fairly important ranking.
- Happy/Sad faces – flipchart and post it note activity. YP were asked to comment on positives and negatives of the highway maintenance budget being cut. This activity focused on their feelings and how they would be affected by cuts to this budget.

Appendix 1 – Excerpt from a letter to The Leader and the Chief Executive from One Vision Housing

To the Leader and Chief Executive Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council,

Thank you for the opportunity provided to partner organisations such as ourselves to consult on the proposed budgetary cuts within SMBC.

Having assessed the options being consulted upon we have responded where we feel there is a potential significant negative impact on the lives of our residents, the long term sustainability of the Borough of Sefton and on our business.

Whilst appreciating the immensely difficult task facing the Council, we worry that some of the cuts proposed, particularly to the Supporting People Programme will put many vulnerable people across the borough at risk and will provide a false saving which will result in higher costs to the public purse in future years.

Not all the options we have responded to are formally open for public consultation, however, we feel the impact will be such on our tenants that we ask the Leader and Chief Executive to consider all of the comments we have made below.

Roy Williams
Chief Executive
One Vision Housing

Section E4: Street Scene

E4.2 Highways Maintenance

Sefton's spend on maintenance of principal roads per head at £2.28 (2009/10) is already in the lowest 20% amongst statistical nearest neighbours (Audit Commission Value for Money Profiles), the average amongst statistical nearest neighbours is £11.35/head. Whilst the proportion of principal roads where maintenance should be considered is currently average, we would ask SMBC to guarantee that this is a temporary budget cut. A permanent budget cut of this proportion will lead to an increased percentage of the principal and non principal road network in need of maintenance and reduce the long term sustainability of the borough. A well maintained network will facilitate employment, industry freight traffic and is key to reducing the number road traffic accidents. In 2009, 87 people were killed or seriously injured on Sefton's Roads. We would ask the Council to ensure accident hot spots are prioritised in the 3years where reduced budgets are in place to ensure the safety of all residents

Appendix 2 – Detailed Responses

- 1 A lot of the central carriage ways should be tarmacked as the grass is only a collector for the rubbish that is either blown there or discarded
- 2 Cutting the grass is not important reduce to minimum
- 3 Grass cutting can be reduced where it is not a Health & Safety issue i.e. Major Routes & Junctions where long grass & over grown hedges & shrubs reduce visibility. Residential areas could be looked at to either pave or tarmac over what is often a small rutted patch that residence use for off road parking. This would incur a cost that would / could be offset by the need for no further maintenance.
- 4 How can you save money when the grass verges on the Northern Road/South Parade, Crosby are hardly cut anyway. They have not been touched since August 2011.
- 5 Grass verges are cut too frequently anyway. It would be better to cut them in the autumn and leave them the rest of the year to encourage wild flowers and insects. The litter should still be collected from them though. However the growth around road signs should be cleared so they are visible at all times.
- 6 Agree as long as doesn't affect visibility.....for road safety.
- 7 most of the time when the grass slows down it only needs to be cut because of the height of the weed growth sticking up above grass canopy, If the grass verges etc were sprayed with a selective weed killer you would be able alter the frequency of the regime. then you would be able recover the initial cost of the spray because of a lesser frequency of cuts.

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.4

Details of proposal:

Grass cutting.

A further reduction in Highways Grounds Maintenance Works Budgets which will be delivered by a reduction in the number of cuts to all highway grassed areas.

Delivery of the Highway Grounds Maintenance service will be revised by reducing the number of cuts per annum to 8 (The current level is 11 cuts). The cuts will be programmed for maximum effect and benefit during the growing season.

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': No

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': Yes

Reduced grass cutting will increase the grass length before each cut however the effect is deemed to be minimal as the proposed 8 cuts per annum will still deliver a sustainable, albeit reduced, service.

Expectation is that it will not materially increase the risk to any elderly, young or disabled people by impeding wheeled/supported access (egg prams/push chairs/wheel chairs/walking sticks etc) .

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

Yes Concerns for disabled/mobility

If grass grows unchecked it can create access issues for people with disabilities /mobility problems.

We will identify 'hot spots' but also ensure that notification of such obstructions will be prioritised to ensure access and participation in public life - however this is a very low risk due to the proposal to continue to mow highway grass, albeit at a reduced frequency.

Consultation- results need inserting

In total, seven comments were received on the e-consult system. A full listing is included in Appendix 2

Of the seven responses, five (72%) were in favour of the proposal and one (14%) was against it. The other (14%) made a general comment.

The young advisors discussion around importance of roads and paths being looked after and maintained. Damaged, dangerous roads could cause more accidents and injuries, might slow down or delay emergency vehicles, cost of repairs further down the line would be very high, very important, - councils duty, damage to vehicles would be expensive

During the young people event they played a Rank/ order game

- YP were given 9 options and asked to rank them according to importance. Number 1 being the most important. Highway Maintenance – 10/14 YP scored this as a one or two, so highway maintenance was scored very highly. 3 YP scored highway maintenance a 4 and one scored a 6. Overall a fairly important ranking.
- Happy/Sad faces – flipchart and post it note activity. YP were asked to comment on positives

and negatives of the highway maintenance budget being cut. This activity focused on their feelings and how they would be affected by cuts to this budget.

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

Yes: This proposal seeks to reduce the level of service which is universally provided for all residents and users of the highway. Despite the reduction, the service will continue to be delivered with no to minimal impact on the highway user. Procedures are in place to identify and respond to disability and mobility issues.

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

- 1) **Reschedule work plans**
- 2) **Continue to liaise with disability groups**
- 3) **Monitor**

Reference 6.6

Service Description: Cleansing Services – Public Conveniences – Market Test
Categorisation: Frontline

The Council currently operates a number of public conveniences across the Borough as follows:

6 x 'pay-to-use' units: 4 in Southport (Promenade, Eastbank Street(2), Hill Street)
1 in Blundellsands (Burbo Bank)
1 in Waterloo (South Road).

'Free-to-use' toilets: Maghull (Leighton Avenue)
Crosby (Moor Lane)
Southport (Hesketh Park)
Churchtown (Preston New Road).

Static Attendants were removed from toilets last year as part of savings proposals. There are currently two attendants who clean toilets on a mobile basis.

The service currently costs £256k per annum.

The 'pay-to-use' units were funded via Prudential Borrowing in 2006 over a ten year period. Funds for this prudential borrowing (£78k) are not included in the above sum.

Consultation has closed on the following option – It is proposed to visit the market place to determine if there are private sector companies or other organisations that are interested in operating all of the public conveniences in Sefton. A soft market consultation exercise could be used to identify if there is sufficient interest within the private sector which would allow the Council to establish a specification that would enable the current level of service to continue to be provided whilst achieving an overall efficiency saving. An output specification would be developed which would see all current toilets continuing to remain available for public use, but with the operator being responsible for full operational service delivery.

Original rationale for service change proposal – The six 'pay-to-use' units are subject to prudential borrowing and therefore costs of £78k per year will still be incurred until 2016. NNDR and 'mothballing' costs would also be incurred if the facilities were closed.

In order to maintain the provision of the current public conveniences it may be possible to operate the service more efficiently via an external organisation.

Some 'soft consultation' has taken place with a number of providers of such services and it is unlikely that the Council could outsource the operation to include the repayment of the prudential borrowing, the NNDR, full utility costs, and the full maintenance of all facilities.

However, it is felt that an organisation may be prepared to undertake the daily cleansing of all facilities, the general small scale maintenance jobs to the level currently undertaken and the collection of income from the 'pay-to-use' units. It is felt that the current level of income plus an annual 'fee' would enable a contractor to operate the facilities accordingly.

Therefore, even though the Council would still be responsible for the prudential borrowing repayment, NNDR and utilities, there would still be an efficiency saving.

Legislation Considered – There are no legislative implications

Anticipated Impact of Service Change –

Service Users - No Change.

Partners - Sefton Council currently has an agreement with Arriva to operate a toilet in Southport and a toilet in Crosby for the use of Arriva Drivers. This proposal would allow the arrangement with Arriva to continue unaltered.

Council –

The Council would need to ensure that appropriate monitoring of the service takes place to ensure that

acceptable standards are achieved via a contractual arrangement. This would be achieved via the existing management resource within the Cleansing section of Street Scene and would be augmented by independent reports from scheduled maintenance visits.

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

Only three responses were received during the consultation exercise; one person was in favour of this service being provided by a private organisation, another complained about a lack of public conveniences in Sefton and the third made no comment in relation to commissioning this service.

This option was included in the community consultation telephone survey. 54% of respondents agreed with the proposal to find an external provider to manage the operation of the public toilets. 32% disagreed. (14% neither agreed or disagreed).

As a result of market testing it has now been established that there is local interest in providing this service.

Equality Analysis – see EAR E6.6

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

This process would obviously be subject to a tender/contractual arrangement with suitable protections and monitoring arrangements in place to maintain the level of service currently enjoyed by users of public conveniences.

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce – There would be no change in the provision of public conveniences across the Borough.

Cost of Public Conveniences: £256,000

Proposed Cost 2012/13: £156k

Staffing: 2

Budget Reduction 2012/13: £100k

Other Resources: None

Council Staff at Risk: No
Number of Posts at Risk: None

Consultation Report –

See above (Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary)

EAR E6.6

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E6.6

Details of proposal: The Council currently operates a number of public toilets across the Borough. It is proposed to seek a contractor who will undertake the cleaning element of the public toilet provision and ensure that the toilets are clean and presentable each day whilst also ensuring that there are adequate stocks of toilet rolls, soap, etc, available.

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to ‘Threshold’: NO

Is there a consequence to ‘Capacity’: No

There will be no service reduction. All existing toilets will remain open. They will just be cleaned by an external organisation. In addition to current service provision, ‘Dunes Splash World’ in Southport and ‘Meadows Leisure Centre’ in Maghull have both also been registered as having fully accessible toilet facilities for use by members of the public. These facilities include

changing beds, mechanical hoist, showering and toilet facilities.

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

No : Whilst some people may need public toilets more than others, especially pregnant women, people with medical conditions – which may include some people with disabilities. The proposal will not have any impact on these more than others as there is no reduction to service provision. It's important to note, that public toilets can be a key instrument for allowing some people with disabilities to have a 'public life'.

Consultation .

Service providers were consulted. Provision to ensure that needs under the Equality Act are contained within service specifications.

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

Yes: The public toilet provisions cater for all members of society and are a necessary component to ensure that disabled community have access to services that enable them to have a 'public life'. Service contracts with service providers ensure that the Equality Act is adhered to.

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

- Procurement process started
- Identify provider

- Continue to monitor performance.

Proposal Reference E6.7

Service Description: **Sefton Tourism Service** **Categorisation: Other**

The Tourism Service supports the Sefton Visitor Economy (worth £374 million), of which 74% (£278 million) is spent in Southport Classic Resort and generates 5,300 jobs in the town (source: STEAM 2008; Sheffield Hallam University 2010).

The Service provides a Conference Bureau which drives business into the destination. Conferencing generated £19.2 million of direct & indirect expenditure in 2009/10.

Destination Marketing promotes Southport as a destination to multiple markets, both generic and targeted e.g. day trip, leisure, nature, golf. Southport attracted 13.7 million tourist visitor days in 2008 (source: STEAM). For example – Southport Holiday Guide is cost neutral, but the economic impact of staying visitors resulting from their seeing the guide is estimated at £2.27 million (source: conversion research 2009).

The Events team delivers a programme of events such as Southport Airshow. The events programme in 2009/10 attracted 200,000+ visitors and generated an economic impact of £10 million

Tourism leads the management and support of the Southport Tourism Business Network, a public/private marketing partnership that pools marketing budgets to promote the town as a whole and thereby grow the market for everyone.

Operational management of Southport Seafront attractions and Southport Market Hall rests with the Service and generates income from leases, concessions, car parking contributions

The Tourism service was cut by 50% in 2011/12. The current estimate for 2012/13 is net controllable costs of £239,000 with a workforce of 24, and this is the baseline for any subsequent savings.

Consultation has closed on the following option - It is proposed to review the service and implement the following change – To reduce the Tourism Service to a minimum feasible level of service, focused on a core events programme, destination marketing and support for conferences.

This review has the potential to deliver gross savings of £90,000:

- Transfer the Tourism Information Centre into the Cultural Centre when the venue reopens to be effective from the 13/14 financial year.
- Delete vacant post in Conference Team £22,000
- Savings to be made in Tourism Marketing of £27,000 and Admin of £3,000
- A one off saving of the Event reserve of £38,000 in 12/13 which is covered by savings in 13/14 from the transfer of the TIC into the Cultural Centre

Original rationale for service change proposal –The market is very competitive and Southport therefore has to remain visible as a destination if it is to continue to function as a visitor destination to other than local markets.

The proposal set out above ensures the cost to the Council of the Tourism Service is minimised at a low and sustainable level, while the core business-generating potential is preserved.

The core business generating functions comprise a reduced and refocused conference bureau, major events, and destination marketing. In addition, smaller income-earning functions such as management of leases & concessions are retained whose income reduces the net cost of the service.

The reduction of the Tourism Service to a minimum feasible level is the express alternative to cessation of the service.

Cessation would allow a modest net saving of around £200,000 per annum, while generating additional costs for the Council because leaving the resort without a Destination Management Organisation will precipitate a “spiral of decline”.

Without destination marketing, fewer visitors will come to Southport, there will be no events to provide added value, and the share of high-spending conference and niche market visitors will reduce.

At least 22% of Southport’s tourism expenditure is directly enabled by Council destination marketing, events, conference sales and contracts – and is therefore at risk if the Tourism service ceases.

This equates to approx 1,000 jobs at risk, with a cost to the Exchequer of £7m per annum and to the Council of £1m per annum (council tax rebates, housing benefit etc).

Other losses include:

- Income forgone – European & UK funding streams
- Income forgone – private sector investment
- Lost ability to make money from sales, rents and licences.

Finally, gross savings must net off costs incurred from restrictions on public use of Council-owned tourism assets (to satisfy insurers, and prevent hazards from non-maintenance etc), and for breach of contract (concessionaires etc).

Given the absence of alternative private sector funding, the extreme sensitivity of visitor spend to reductions in Tourism activity, and the massive contribution the visitor economy makes to Sefton and Merseyside’s prosperity and jobs, the higher risk is to cease the service than to maintain it at a low and affordable level (option PL029b – minimum feasible level of service).

Legislation Considered No statutory duty is breached by ceasing support for TIC or events.

Anticipated Impact of Service Change –

Service Users - Principal impact on users of the existing TIC will be limited as the existing service will remain in its present location until the Cultural Centre opens in early 2013 at which point it will be merged into the box office function of that venue.

Partners – In 2012/13 there will only be limited and minor impact on partners and transfer into the Cultural Centre box office role will be managed to minimise any impact.

Council – Financial saving.

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

Consultation and engagement on the impact of a closure option took place using on line, digital and paper questionnaires which were available at the Tourist Information Centre and distributed to residents, visitors, stakeholders and businesses. A number of meetings took place with business networks and partners.

See full consultation report E6.7b – Tourist Information Centre

Equality Analysis – see EAR E6.7

Risks & Mitigating Actions– Factors to take into account include:

- Merseytravel have recently signed an agreement to relocate their travel service to the TIC and have indicated interest in a further move to the new Cultural Centre upon its opening, therefore there is a third party agreement to consider if the service is to cease.

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce

- Transfer the Tourism Information Centre service into the Cultural Centre box office when the venue reopens to be effective from the 13/14 financial year
- Delete vacant post in Conference Team £22,000
- Savings to be made in Tourism Marketing of £27,000 and Admin of £3,000
- A one off saving of the Event reserve of £38,000 in 12/13 which is covered by savings in 13/14 onwards from the transfer of the TIC into the Cultural Centre

Cost of Tourism Service: £239,000 (net controllable costs – inc already taken savings of £36k)	Proposed Cost 2012/13: £149,000
Staffing: 24 staff	Budget Reduction 2012/13: £90,000
Other Resources: ERDF via TMP	Council Staff at Risk: Yes
	Number of Posts at Risk: 0 if proposal accepted

Consultation Report E6.7

Report on the Outcomes of the Consultation on E6.7b Tourism – Closure of Tourism Information Centre and Cessation of Associated Services

21st October 2011 – 16th January 2012

1. Introduction

This report summarises the outcomes from the consultation with residents, visitors, businesses and organisations that have responded to the consultation on the Budget Option E6.7b to review Tourism in Southport and Sefton about the possible closure of the Tourist Information Centre and associated services.

Due to the governments financial settlement for the Council there was a reduction in the annual budget by £44m for the year 2011/2012 and the Tourism Service's budget was halved to £363k. In seeking to set a balanced budget for 2012/12013, on the 13th October 2011 Cabinet agreed to open consultation on the review of the Tourism Service in order for Elected Members to make informed and balanced judgements in setting the Council's budget.

2. Executive Summary

The consultation took place between 21st October 2011 and 16th Jan 2012 and this report provides details of the feedback from service users, general public, partners and other stakeholders. The key messages from the consultation and engagement process are that respondents:

- Overwhelmingly value their Tourist Information Centre and the services it offers,
- Do not wish to lose it
- Clearly believe it will be damaging to Southport and Sefton if it is lost

The report provides responses to each of the questions asked and includes all the comments received, these are at Appendix 1

The consultation process resulted in 550 individuals and businesses completing the questionnaire, 281 via e-Consult and 269 via hard copies of the questionnaire.

The council's standard equal opportunities questions were also asked and the results form part of this report.

3. Methodology

A Consultation and Engagement Plan was agreed by Sefton's Public Engagement and Consultation Panel on the 21st October 2011. The following steps were undertaken to ensure the process was robust:

- Identification of audiences
- Devising and agreeing of questionnaires
- Distribution via e-Consult and other methods including hard copy and digital means
- Marketed via existing contact databases and local and social media

There are in practical terms two broad groups of interested parties

- Residents of and visitors to Sefton
- Businesses and organisations with interests in tourism activity in Sefton

For this consultation both groups completed the same questionnaire.

In consideration of the broad interest in this service area the consultation was structured around an online and hard copy questionnaire to the respective audiences.

There was also a free-text box in order for respondents to offer additional input, 56% (401) of the respondents took advantage of this option. A full schedule of these responses is provided as appendix 1.

The questionnaire was made available in a range of formats to ensure as many potential respondents as possible were able to input into the process. As well as the e-Consult option for the questionnaire a digital version was also emailed to service users on request and a paper version was available in the Tourist Information Centre. The paper version was also mailed out to those the Tourism Department communicates with via mail and to anyone else requesting a hard copy in order to enable those with limited or no internet access to participate.

The link to the e-Consult version was provided via email databases of residents, visitors, businesses and other organisations the Tourism Department works with. The link was also highlighted via Tourism Facebook and Twitter pages. Local media also assisted by reporting the consultation opportunity and including web link URLs direct to e-Consult.

The opportunity to respond to the consultation was promoted to a wide variety of groups including:

- Residents of Southport / Sefton
- Visitors to Southport / Sefton
- Businesses within Southport / Sefton including Southport Tourism Business Network (STBN) members
- Travel trade partners (coach operators / group travel organisers) outside Sefton

Awareness of the consultation process was also raised via business tourism fora (STBN Destination Marketing Group, Southport Restaurateurs Association, SBE etc.). Additionally Tourism attended the 'Have Your Say' day organized by the Learning Disability Information Team.

4. Results


A total of 550 visitors, residents and businesses completed the questionnaire (281 via e-Consult, 269 via hard copy). The response was generated by contacting regular visitors to the town and residents who have subscribed to the Visit Southport e-newsletter as well as local tourism businesses. There was also a paper questionnaire option provided in the Tourist Information Centre.

In terms of Equal Opportunities monitoring the Council's approved monitoring questions were appended to the questionnaire and the results are shown in section 7 of the report

5. Visitor / Resident Response


The responses to the questions were as follows:

1. Do you feel the Tourist Information Centre (TIC) is important to the tourism future of Southport & Sefton?




Over 96% of visitors & residents felt that the TIC was very or significantly important to Southport with less than 1% thinking it was of minimal or of no importance

2. If the TIC were to close, do you believe this would negatively impact Southport / Sefton?




Almost 95% of visitors & residents said that the closure of the TIC would have a severe or significant negative impact on Southport/Sefton. Just over 2% said it would have minimal or no effect.

3. If you believe this would affect Southport/Sefton in what way do you think it would be noticed? Respondents could tick more than one option.



This question indicates the high degree of concern visitors, residents & businesses have regarding the closure of the TIC across a range of areas. Less than 5% of respondents thought that the closure of the TIC would not be noticed.

4. If the TIC were to be closed, do you believe this would potentially result in social, economic and environmental effects in Southport / Sefton e.g. concerns about potential closures of shops and restaurants, not being as good a place to live in, less reasons to visit, less reasons to remain here, etc?



Less than 3% of visitors & residents would have negligible or no concerns over the closure of the TIC

6. Free Text Response

As well as the pre-set questions asked of all respondents, there was an opportunity to add additional comments via a free text box and over half (401 or 56%) of respondents elected to do this.

All comments are attached as appendix 1. These are unedited (no change to language, typographical errors etc.).

7. Equal Opportunities

The standard equal opportunities questions formed part of the questionnaire for the TIC consultation. Results were as follows:

Baseline – 550 questionnaires completed. Not all the sections of the monitoring form were completed by all respondents.

Disability: Do you have any of the following? (please select all that apply)

	Number of responses	Percentage	
Physical impairment	19	22.9	The total number of responses to this question was 86 which is 15.6% of respondents to the baseline figure (550)
Visual impairment	15	17.44	
Learning difficulty	9	10.47	
Hearing impairment/deaf	21	24.42	
Mental health/mental distress	4	4.64	
Long term illness that affects your daily activity	18	20.93	

Disability: Do you consider yourself to be disabled?

	Number of responses	Percentage	The total number of responses to this question

Yes	41	11.58	was 354 which is 64.4% of respondents to the baseline figure (550)
No	313	88.42	

Which of these options best describes your ethnic background? (note options are listed alphabetically)

	Number of responses	Percentage	
Asian – Bangladeshi	0	0	The total number of responses to this question was 450 which is 81.8% of respondents to the baseline figure (550)
Asian – Indian	0	0	
Asian – Pakistani	0	0	
Asian other background	2	0.44	
Black – African	2	0.44	
Black – Caribbean	1	0.22	
Black – other black background	0	0	
Chinese – Chinese	0	0	
Chinese – other Chinese background	1	0.22	
Mixed ethnic background – Asian & White	5	1.11	
Mixed ethnic background – black African & White	0	0	
Mixed ethnic background – black Caribbean & White	0	0	
Mixed ethnic background – other mixed Ethnic Background	1	0.22	
White – British	167	37.11	
White – English	238	52.89	
White – Irish	10	2.22	
White – Scottish	12	2.67	
White – Welsh	5	1.11	
White – Polish	1	0.22	
White – Latvian	0	0	
White – Gypsy/Traveller	0	0	
White – other white background	5	1.11	

Do you have a religion or belief?

	Number of responses	Percentage	The total number of responses to this question was 406 which is 73.8% of respondents to the baseline figure (550)
Yes	263	64.78	
No	143	35.22	

If 'Yes', please select one of the options below:

	Number of responses	Percentage	
Buddhist	4	1.56	The total number of responses to this question was 256 which is 46.5% of respondents to the baseline figure (550)
Christian	245	95.70	
Hindu	0	0	
Jewish	3	1.17	
Muslim	4	1.56	
Sikh	0	0	

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

	Number of responses	Percentage	
Heterosexual	368	96.59	The total number of responses to this question was 381 which is 69.3% of respondents to the baseline figure (550)
Gay	6	1.57	
Lesbian	2	0.52	
Bisexual	5	1.31	

Do you currently live in the gender you were given at birth?

	Number of responses	Percentage	
Yes	402	98.77	The total number of responses to this question was 407 which is 74% of respondents to the baseline figure (550)
No	5	1.23	

Appendices

1. Respondent comments

The table of additional comments received relating to E6.7b Tourism – closure of Tourist Information Centre and associated services.

Nb comments are as received, typographical errors etc. have not been altered.

We need a bus station as well as this tourist information centre.
I live here and use the TIC to keep up to date with what's going on, buying tickets for events, trips out for relatives when they come to stay with me. Not everyone has a computer.
Southport needs a TIC as residents and visitors alike need a 'hub' to go to to find out what's on in Southport.
The tourist information centre is the closest thing we have to improving reserve and economic commence in such a small town that Southport is.
I use this service regularly to book. My tickets and buy my beach pass and go on day trips with my mother I find the staff very friendly and helpful.

As a travelling salesman I often use the TIC to secure accommodation for myself, who might assist with this role if they go?
For a seaside/tourist resort not to have a tourist info centre is sheer madness. I notified the diversity of material available + the most helpful staff.
many older generations visit southport and these people don't have access to internet etc, therefore the TIC is a very important place for them to gain information etc. when visiting Southport.
sack some councillors
Think that the centre provides a vital service and it's loss would have a real affect on people coming to Southport and finding out information
That woman, head of council should take a wage cut herself, she gets more than Prime Minister I understand? That would save some jobs!?
This is a ridiculous idea, Get rid of some councillors!!
This is a very short sighted money saving measure that is extremely petty considering the rates paid by local businesses.
Who ever comes up with these stupid ideas needs a pay cut and stop giving themselves a bonus after making savings, we need TIC in Southport.
It is a vital amenity, focal point for visitors + locals like us, central to the town centre and easily seen.
Having a buoyant tourist info centre is a sign of growth + prosperity, closure is not an option.
Having worked in the UK Travel Industry from 1958 to 1991 in various parts of the Sefton Area (my career started in Southport), I obviously feel strongly about the general need for Tourist Information to be widely available. I was involved with the former Steamport Museum in Southport, and the Tourist Information Centre was a useful centre for getting our operation known to the public. Though Steamport eventually relocated to the Preston Docklands Area in 1998 largely because of an expanding collection, and the opportunity to run a major railway operation (which includes freight traffic) at the Preston Docklands area, the Southport Tourist Office remains for us a valuable source for dissemination of information on our activities.
I don't live in Southport so unsure about council activities. TIC is first place we went to to get information when arriving in Southport and I use my own local TIC regularly.
If people can't go to a central location for information then they won't go to certain shops or cafes. Tourists will be seriously inconvenienced, everyone expects a tourist destination to have an information centre.
I have worked for 10years as a coach host operating out of the TIC Lord Street, over the years the numbers of coach visitors has increased consequently should the Tourist Office close many coach companies will choose not to visit Southport. The TIC offer many additional facilities for these coach passengers, this location being so accessible for local amenities (i.e. toilets) and shops, apart from offering help and information about our lovely town! I think it would be absolutely UNTHINKABLE to close our Tourist Office, Southport is a seaside resort, reliant on it's visitors all year round. PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS! ps. (we did win the most coach friendly town in UK and EU last year - doesn't that count for something?). [Name Omitted]
As a visitor this is our first stop - just leaflets are not the same as a friendly face + a knowledgeable person.
NO TIC = NO TOURISTS = NO MONEY
Less Councillors, big saving
Reduce money instead on silly money spent on red tape and 'performance management' functions.

people who are strangers always look for a TIC
The closure of the TIC would make it significantly more difficult for the visitor to find out about local attraction. It is also a good central location for Merseytravel information.
How can a seaside town manage without a Tourist Information Centre, where will they be able to pick up information? Visitors will be deterred from seeking advice/info.
The TIC is Southport's shop window. It would be highly counter productive to close part of the tourist marketing facilities. Where else can potential tourists gain information re events and accommodation?
The TIC should remain open even if shorter hours. After all Southport is a Tourism Town. To save money it is usually the (backroom) staff that have most wastage. so would be far better to cut down on this and leave the TIC open.
Tourist Town needs TIC
Southport relies on visitors so must be kept open
Yet again Sefton Council looking at reductions within the wrong area. As a tourist town a TIC is essential. Make your cuts within the city were the bulk of Southports revenue is exported!
The TIC is a focal point for all visitors who wish to find out about events or make bookings, or just general information about shops etc, and as such is the human face of Sefton Council. If people are made welcome, they will spend money in the area and if the TIC closes, then they will go elsewhere.
Southport is built on Tourism. The tourist information is vital to the town.
I requested info on Accommodation, received in 3 days and here we are for a week, without info service it would not work.
Ridiculous idea - wake up Sefton Council.
I personally think it is ridiculous to close the TIC when we live in a tourist town.
Southport is a town for tourists, it is it's only industry. The TIC is one of the most important offices in this town people in charge (council) have to make cuts elsewhere.
Southport is supposed to be a "seaside" town. People need a focal point to find out what is going on! Where to stay, sell Southport!
Recent visitors to Southport I have spoken to have been greatly impressed with the positive development since their last visit the TIC was mentioned as a valued aid to them during their visits.
Whenever I book my national express tickets I always find the staff friendly, helpful and very knowledgeable. To lose this service would be a cut too far.
Nice pleasant and relaxing place clean and tidy plenty to do.
I always find the information staff extremely helpful and knowledgeable about the area and local history, lose this centre lose this service forever.
Closure of this centre sends out the wrong message to would be visitors to Southport. That it's council thinks nothing of them.
Very helpful place for people to know what is going on in the area eg.attraction, shows, coach excursions.
I went with my mum to the lights and parade + as you do got chatting to a couple who said they had come from yorkshire to see the parade and had found out about it through the tourism board! We don't all have computers - what about the elderly + there are alot of them who just phone up + use this means to help them go on trips and get out and about!

<p>Southport is known all over the country as a classic Victorian/Edwardian resort for holidays, shopping + day visits, without TIC services there would be a lack of advance information about attractions, activities + hotel bookings, and a lack of current information to visitors arriving. The humblest of places in the country (and in Europe) have some kind of TIC to help visitors. Southport TIC acts as an information collection centre for local + area events and activities, and deals with enquiries + coach bookings to other parts of the country and into Europe. The loss of these facilities would adversely affect local people + Southport would decline in importance as a regional and national tourist destination. We recently marked the 150th anniversary of the opening of Southport Pier (the 2nd longest in the country) and we do not want 2011/12 to mark the beginning of Southports decline after 150 years of success. TIC services cannot adequately be replaced by referring people to the internet. many visitors (+ residents) do not have the Internet, and would in any case prefer to talk to a person who has the flexibility to deal with individual queries, please find somewhere else to save money.</p>
<p>I think that the coach tourism side of business would be affected.</p>
<p>Southport is supposed to be a holiday resort. How can it function to full potential without a TIC for visitors + locals alike.</p>
<p>Southport needs tourists, there is room in the present TIC for Merseytravel to share hence both under one "umbrella" Much needed is also a bus interchange, smaller towns like Chorley put Southport to shame, wake up Southport Council make Southport the top resort in the North West.</p>
<p>If closed who sees to the needs of the outside visitors, who need info on local travel, day trips, places of interest to visit, etc. Closing the TIC would be counter productive, just as Southport is increasing in popularity. Southport would only suffer financially.</p>
<p>Southport should not be without a tourist information centre, it is a very important part of a town which attracts many visitors, I am a resident and I find it very useful. The loss of the TIC could result in more money being lost, than what it costs to run. There have been many services taken away from Southport eg. the planning office, county court and magistrates court. Southport is a good sized town with many young families and senior citizens. We need these services here in the town. As Sefton Council has spent millions on the new Cultural Centre and Library why can't the TIC be housed in there when it is finished. It would be a central place for visitors and residents alike.</p>
<p>At this time of economic downturn, Southport needs to be doing all it can to encourage spending visitors. Any service that aids this is vital. Without the cash from visitors we'll end up as just another dead seaside resort. With lost jobs, lost businesses and all the good work that has been done promoting Southport as a classic resort being undone.</p>
<p>Where will you be able to get Stagecoach tickets, bus timetables etc</p>
<p>Typical Sefton Council mentality cut off the hands that feed you!! Idiots</p>
<p>Sefton Councillors couldn't run a bath</p>
<p>If Tourism supports over 200,000 visitors, why are you even considering the closure of the TIC.</p>
<p>Southport as a tourist resort essentially needs a tourist office to advise any visitors and residents alike, I use the Tourist Office on a regular basis throughout the year as a resident (and mother of 3 young children) and it's closure would be a major impact on my enjoyment and informed choice on what is on offer in this town and surrounding area.</p>
<p>Resorts such as Southport need a tourist office 365 days a year!!</p>
<p>Tourism is a large part of Southports income and to suggest closing a related office which encourages visitors who spend! is short sighted.</p>
<p>The closure of the TIC would be a barmy decision given the importance of tourism to the district, the people served who visit and seek quality info, the money it brings in.</p>
<p>Southports profile is about tourism! Madness to lose the office!</p>
<p>I believe the TIC is most important for visitors. Where else will they go to enquire about the local facilities</p>

<p>and how to get from place to place. When I go to other towns the first thing I want to know is. Where is the TIC? This town will be the poorer without it, and I can't believe what is happening to our lovely southport. I am disgusted.</p>
<p>It is absurd for a holiday town not to have a Tourist Information Centre.</p>
<p>A holiday town without a TIC is unbelievable.</p>
<p>Most if not all visitors to the town would expect at the least a Tourist Information Centre in a Central position in the resort.</p>
<p>It would be a false economy to close the Information Office in Southport which is know and recognised by all the Coach Drivers in Britain. National Holidays Driver</p>
<p>Many times over the last years, we as a family have used the Tourist Information Centre. We have also been asked in town where the Centre is by visitors. How can it be right for a town such as Southport which relies on Tourism to lose yet another important facility.</p>
<p>To close to the public such an important facility is appalling, we have no other means of information. The main library closed along with other buildings, as a past employee of Sefton Council and a resident, the rape of our services is a heinous crime. To attract tourism in all it's forms needs a point of reference as the TIC brings. Tourism must not be allowed to diminish by lack of facilities as the TIC. To know that the TIC will be turned into yet another "wine bar" is incomprehensible.</p>
<p>A visitor dependant location has to support + help visitors to enjoy their visit.</p>
<p>Southport is a classic Seaside Resort, the TIC is vital for it's continued success, with the amount of visitors calling in, plus verbal and email contact it shows how vital it is to the economy of Southport and Sefton. The staff are knowledgeable and hard working and encourage people to return, this bringing even more income to the area.</p>
<p>The idea of closing the TIC in a tourist resort defies belief. The majority of the visitors using the TIC are not in the main, computer literate and can not go "online" the acquire info. They are of a generation which is used to talking to people and not to machines. Maybe when looking for cuts, the senior echelons of Sefton Council should be looked at in order to keep people actually doing a worthwhile job, in a job and stop parachuting people into positions of authority in order to protect their pensions so that they can retire on a far higher pension than the vast majority of workers.</p>
<p>Every tourist resort has a TIC, where would all the coaches from Scotland etc. stop and call in. Also people coming into the town, where would they get a tourist map, to close it down would be a disaster, they do a very good job for Southport. If you are not careful people will stop coming to Southport + it will end up like Morecambe, a hell hole.</p>
<p>This is a seaside resort we aim to attract visitors. How can we do that without a TIC wake up councillors!!</p>
<p>Again the North West is being singled out by this government for cuts far in excess of those in the South East. Whether we like it or not, the North West is subsidising the South East, the olympics, cross rail, road widening the M25 towards the olympic site and a host of other S.E schemes. Let us organise an email campaign to raise this parliament, written by an englishman lifelong resident of Sefton whose father fought on the somme and in flanders field for four years.</p>
<p>To close the TIC office which is the first port of call for thousands of visitors is ludicrous to the poinr of self defeating. the loss of this facility would have a very serious effect on Southport trade. At a time of imposed austerity the loss of revenue which this would cause could be catastrophic for the towns businesses. Maybe some of the very highly paid chief execs could look at taking a cut in their salaries to fund those on 1/10th if their income.</p>
<p>Tourism plays an important part in securing a vibrant local economy. TIC is often a first port of call for visitors and potential visitors. Its loss would inevitably damage the local economy. Presumably, someone is going to read the questionnaire overleaf. I would suggest THEY be redeployed in the interests of saving money!!!</p>
<p>As I need help with leaflets etc I find the tourist information center and the staff invaluable. How can you</p>

possibly consider closing such a valuable service - I am not alone in needing this extra help with everyday things that are so important.
I use the information office reguarly as I am responsible for relocating people into the area for a large organisation. without this office where would people turn to for advice and reservations for hotels, conferences, etc, etc, Not everyone has a computer!
End up like Morecambe!!
The TIC is in comparison to Sefton MBC in general a tiny proportion of the budget, and delivers a service for in excess in benefit, to the relative cost. When Sefton is trying to promote it's Golf Coast, Grand National, and other International attractions one can't help but feel if there attractions where in the South East money would be found?
Where would visitors go to get information?
Tourism is the major source of income for Southport. To cease advertising, promotions + answering questions about it's facilities would severly affect it's future + cause potential investors to go elsewhere.
I have friends from Zurich (Swiss) they love Southport, they will be astonished if the TIC is closed! The TIC is always full. I sold my greetings cards [Name Omitted] there, I will be sorry to see it close. [Name Omitted]
Having witnessed the result of TIC closures in Durham + Stratford upon Avon, I would consider this a financial and commercial loss not worth the effort. Southport is a tourist destination and the TIC provides a significant service.
I find it unthinkable that a town that is based around tourism could close it's Tourist Information. People visiting will likely go elsewhere if there is no point of contact for info on amenities, accommodation, purchasing tickets for events and coach trips etc. I personally visited a town in the Cotswolds in the Spring who's TIC had closed and we were left feeling a bit lost so moved on to another town!
Now the bus office is in the information centre it is so much easier to get all information needed at the same time in the same place.
it's quite ridiculous, the idea of shutting this office down, where would we get information from?!
TIC is housed in a beautiful building enhancing the service and the town. It should be obtained for advertising and dealing with tourist concerns and information. I have used them for tourist questions and found it indispensable and the staff helpful.
The TIC provides an excellent service and is a focal point for visitors. It would be a serious loss for Southport and it's surrounding area if it closed.
The TIC is the focal point for obtaining information/literature about Southport/Sefton. Local press and media are no substitute for this. It should be totally unthinkable to consider closing this valuable asset.
Cutting frontline staff is not an option. Southport needs an information centre for it's visitors.
The idea of closing the information centre in a seaside resort is complete lunacy!!
This is a tourist destination, we rely on tourism here in Southport. This is just the most ridiculous idea ever heard.
When will these cuts ever end. Say no to this closure.
Keep TIC open and get rid of all councillors not elected and we save more money.
I cannot believe Sefton would even consider closing the centre.
Cut councillors + senior managers.

TIC are a vital source of information to strangers in any town. Can you put a price on this.
It is a great source of information and I come in on a monthly basis to check is what is happening in the town. Also to book coach tickets, and check bus times.
It would be a big mistake to close the TIC. Many visitors use the TIC when visiting the area for their first visit.
The TIC acts as a introduction to visitors who need a good starting point to their discovery of what Southport offers. It is also ideally placed in the centre of Lord St.
As the TIC is for very many visitors and holidaying families the first port of call in order to obtain information on the resort and its amenities, it surely follows that the TIC should be one of the final cuts to be considered.
You cannot be serious!!
Keep office open. We always come in when we are staying here and staff are most helpful and informative.
As a resident I often use this service to buy my coach tickets and go on days out. Please don't take this service away from us.
End up a ghost town like Morecambe.
200,000 visitors, 17,500 calls (phone) not closure - the staff need a pay rise.
In a Town like Southport this service is essential for both local users and visitors.
Southport has a large tourist influence, so it is absolute madness to have no TIC. Even as a local, I have had recourse to use the Southport TIC many, many times, when friends have asked me for area information. Frequent visitors often need a direction on what to do or what is happening. Visitors who are first-timers to the town normally make it their 1st stop. Local knowledge from a TIC short-cuts the search, so preventing time wasting on restricted visits. Every tourist destination in New Zealand has a TIC and their awareness of a local TIC's value has to be seen to be believed. Southport needs an active TIC and kept in it's current position.
It strikes me as a ridiculous policy to close a TIC when one of Southport's main investments must be tourism. Seaside towns tend to depend on high regular profiles through advertising and information from TIC's. Who will carry out this role if the TIC closes, very short sighted in terms of future economic potential.
We need the TIC because it's a focal point of information plus people will also need information on the local bus travel where will people book national express tickets! TIC is a must Southport is losing jobs as it is what with Pizzahut gone on Lord St what next if the TIC closed more people may be without a job. It is totally unfair to keep closing businesses. Sefton must get their priorities right, stop the cut backs it's not fair. I myself was involved in a project that was cut!
Southport relies on tourism as it's main industry, without the income from all the visitors to the town, business's will close + people will be out of work. The staff have won accolades for their work with the coaches, every other town in the Northwest has a TIC to close it is very short-sighted.
TIC's are important to any town/city to attract more people visiting I have visited many places home + abroad where the first point of call is the TIC - what better place place to give out info about our town.
Southport is primarily a holiday town and reliant upon visitors especially the Southport Flower Show and sporting events like golf. Take away the TIC and this would appear participants in these main events from finding accommodation and other necessities.
Typical Sefton Council go for the lunatic left option why oh why are you planning to close the most successful of your offices, barking mad I tell you.

<p>As a major seaside resort, a tourist office is essential, closure will have a serious impact on business and tourism in Southport.</p>
<p>Southport has lost a lot of shops in the town already and needs tourism to survive as much needed income will be lost without it as well as much needed job's. The tourism information office should also stay on Lord Street as people would not expect it to be hidden away down the Cambridge Arcade. Also when we lose these services they will be hard to get back when times get better!!!</p>
<p>Because Southport relies so heavily on Tourism the proposed closure of the TIC is likely to have a significantly negative effect on Southport income!</p>
<p>Give the town "tourism" the only business we all benefit from the young, old + children. Make sure this industry survives for a town which history 1792 to present day shopping leisure, from Napoleon to Sutton and wonderful village around for beauty, Churchtown + Ormskirk the trade amd money will be lost forever.</p>
<p>Such a ridiculous idea to close the TIC when thousands of people arriving from coaches from all over the country rely on the TIC to give them the information on the towns leisure, events + general info on day to day activities to win awards year on year for friendliest place in the country how ridiculous you will never get back what disappears.</p>
<p>As a regular user of this office where else would i go, the TIC is unique there is nothing else quite like it.</p>
<p>A bouyant TIC represents all that is good in a town, Thus is a very busy centre.</p>
<p>Could only happen in Sefton thinking of closing a successful operation</p>
<p>Why close something that so many people rely on, madness.</p>
<p>with all these cutbacks does this mean a refund on my council tax.</p>
<p>To consider this is madness!</p>
<p>The information centre is located in the perfect place for coaches arriving into town, to move it or close it completely would have an immense negative impact on the local economy and I doubt the town will recieve anymore "coach friendly" awards in the future if this service goes.</p>
<p>Tourist destinations (especially as large as Southport) need an information centre!!</p>
<p>A town that closes it's Tourist Information Office is no longer a tourist friendly town and not worth visiting!!!!</p>
<p>We need the TIC in Southport as without it Southport would become a ghost town, we need the tourists to come in the town to make money. We need the coach hosts like [Name Ommitted] and [Name Ommitted]who do a very good job in the town they are needed and do alot for southport. We need all Tourism activity as people need things to do in Southport as it is a holiday resort and makes money. Without the town would dead and boring.</p>
<p>Unanimously agreed by all members of Southport Civic Society (Dec 2011). We believe it would disastrously affect the future of Southport, if the TIC was closed. We also believe it is a dreadful decision to move it. We think Sefton MBC have already decided to downgrade and marginalise Southport in favour of Bootle. Southport - Classic Resort much trumpeted by Sefton and considerable sums of money spent promoting the Classic Resort of Southport recently - and now a proposal to remove the TIC function. The workings of Sefton Council - Officers and Councillors should be investigated by the Ombudsman. Hon Sec, Southport Civic Society.</p>
<p>Southport relies on tourism. To curtail the TIC is akin to shooting yourself in the foot! The only reason we come to Southport every year is that the Tourist Department enables so many varied shows/festivals/happenings/etc. The TIC is the outward face of all their efforts and is essential to help visitors get the most out of their visit. (Every single visit we hav made to Southport has included at least one visit to the TIC for information - and hence more money spent in the town). So please, keep the money coming in to the area - keep the TIC open. Thank you.</p>

How can a holiday resort not have a tourist information centre.
Also we would have to go to Liverpool to access National Express tickets as we do not have "internet" The Tourist Information Office is extremely important for information for Sefton residents as well as visitors.
ATIC is vital to Southport.
Enjoy coming to the shop, very convenient to get literature on local events, days out, etc.
At a time of budgetary cuts throughout the public sector all efforts to protect employment throughout the country should be maintained. Tourism is a vital component in the Southport economy. if you have to, go and rob a bank, after all the bankers rob banks and have got us in this mess!
Closure of TIC not an option - unreasonable + unjustified, having spent sums of money in advertising + on the building itself + promoting Southport as a Classic Tourist Resort it would have disastrous repercussions economically etc. Cuts are painful, but more painful in some areas than others. Focus on less expenditure + shelve future projects such as introducing electronic signs across the borough (ref Champion Newspaper). Temporarily suspend Councillors salaries + reduce expenses allowances, and, in future, reduce the number of councillors. Reduce the amount of stack in admin in Sefton Council management. Examine more closely contracts to agencies + monitor the standard of work completed to ensure that costs are justified. To cease all tourism activity is also not an option - it should be tossed into the long grass also, with a great deal of force.
I live in Preston but visit regularly with my family. A town like Southport needs a TIC with trained and knowledgeable staff.
This would have a severe impact on Southport as a whole. The TIC should certainly remain open.
I Can't believe, or envisage Southport, a major tourist town, not having a Tourist Information Centre. In a few years we will have become a dull and unvisited and shabby town - perhaps like Morecambe.
Will we be able to air our views in a questionnaire about the number of councillors and their expenses anytime soon? I don't think so somehow.
Sefton councillors award themselves a pay rise whilst making these ridiculous decisions to cut our services and revenue raising ones at that?! You could not make it up!!
With the addition of Merseytravel to the services available in the information office on Eastbank Street it is more than ever a vital facility for the locals and visitors alike.
As I do actually PAY my council tax. I suggest the council collect all the millions it appears to be owed and STOP cutting services that the rest of us PAY FOR!!! That is the point is it not.
Only Sefton could consider cutting off the hand that feeds it.
Stop penalizing us rate payers by cutting our services - that we rely on. Collect what's owing - it's disgusting that 25million owed?? get a grip.
So? Will the councillors be 1) Booking accommodation for visitors? 2) Booking Day trips for visitors? 3) Selling Southport Souvenirs. 4) Advising visitors where to go? 5) Giving directions to lost people? 6) Distributing the publicity leaflets? 7) Giving informed information on our a) restaurants b) Attractions c) Events d) Theatre Show e) Parking f) Hotels.
The closure of the TIC will ring the death knoll for Southport as a holiday resort. Think again!
We DO need the Tourist Information Centre. However, we do not need so many councillors. Tourism earns money for this town. Councillors cost money we do not need to spend.
I cannot believe this is even a suggestion for a "Tourist Town"!
Not all of us have computers, Information Centres are a lifeline to some of us.

Sefton Councillors will not be happy until Southport has been completely destroyed.
Is this to be another nail in Southports coffin??
The Tourist Information Centre is invaluable 200,00 day visitors cannot be wrong.
Southport relies heavily on tourism. Southport is a tourist resort. Tourist resorts have tourist information centres it must not be closed.
After reading the facts and figures of what the Info Centre does and delivers one has to ask why this is even an option.
I always use the centre when I visit Southport on business they have proved to be invaluable to me, re booking my hotel etc. How can you consider closing such a crucial service?
Cut councillors wages and numbers, why are they never up for cuts? How can they award themselves a payrise whilst cutting our services and jobs. Start at the top as they say.
If the Tourist Info Centre were to close, people wouldn't be able to get all the information that visitors require to be aware of. Personally, we believe the TIC is necessary especially as we have a daughter with a disability (in a wheelchair) and need to have the relevant information for accessibility to shops, cafes, etc. Personally I believe the visitors wouldn't be so inclined to visit Southport if the TIC were to close as they wouldn't be able to gain access to information on where to stay and what events are available during the year to decide when is the best time for a visit.
Your parking fee's stop visitor's, traffic wardens drive visitor's away none of them have a nice attitude. Why not stop charging after 3pm or make Sunday free parking. Start supporting the shop's to attract customers. Otherwise they continue to go to L'pool or the Trafford Centre free parking. Free parking will encourage visitors.
Both tourists, which you market to visit the town, and local people use this service for many forms of information both local and out of town information. The closure will affect Southport directly. It will have no effect on Bootle, Crosby or Sefton as a whole as a walk in service. It will affect local business from shops to hotels and attractions. These businesses pay towards this service through their taxes as do the local people. A Seaside town with no information service at all does not give a good public image. It is as if the council don't value the town as an asset to Sefton.
During a period of recession more and more families and individuals are looking at alternatives to holidays abroad. Investment and encouragement of local tourism activities is a vital part of local job creation. By reducing investment in the information facilities for visitors and potential holidaymakers is short-sighted and does not focus on a long term growth strategy for the town of Southport and outlying villages. By investing in local tourism it demonstrates a commitment to potential new business providers. Southport has an enviable reputation as a family resort which is continuing to thrive despite other holiday destinations in the UK declining slowly. Therefore I would respectfully ask the members of the Council to see into the future of the area rather than be responsible for its slow decline.
Being an hotelier we have already some complaints about the TIC not being opened on Sunday then if it closes totally I really think it will be a mistake for Southport.
If the Tourist Information Centre were to be closed this would result in a loss in service to customers planning a visit to the town, all the telephone enquiries from customers about accommodation, restaurants, events, theatre etc would have no one providing the information. Once visitors arrive in the town, they would then receive no service or assistance or advice in matters such as booking accommodation, event tickets, attraction tickets, travel, directions - what a great welcome that would be - the message being sent out to prospective customers is very negative and we might as well just tell people not to bother coming to Southport as it's closed!
Given the destinations tendency to attract a significant 'grey' market I feel it would be foolish to completely close the TIC as this demographic are less likely to research areas online before visiting. Could the council not look at ways of making the TIC more profitable through partnerships with suppliers/providers e.g. co-location with a branded coffee shop?
Southport/Seftons only industry is Tourism. Closure of this facility would be the death knell for local

businesses, Hotels & leisure activities.
Seftons only industry is Tourism Close this centre may as well close Sefton
Southports only industry is Tourism this centre provides residents and visitors to the town a pletherer of information on places to go things to do and where to eat as well as sourcng accommodation this centre is the first port of call to all wishing to access other council services.
Reduce the number of councillors that will save money, not by cutting invaluable services like the information centre.
The TIC provides a much needed information point for both Visitors and residents
working in the town centre and passing by the Tourist Information Centre most days, I'm amazed that it's closure is being even considered. It's been in the press that Southport has just won an international award for it's services to the coach industry and as coaches drop off outside the building, that's the first place where all the passengers go when they arrive. They also sell coach trips for people who live in Southport (been on a couple myself) and they sell tickets for the Flower Show and Air Show, so they're not there just for visitors but for locals too. Please don't close it!
This is a crucial part of a tourist town. Where else can you go to get the information required. This centre is not just for tourists it also of benefit to local residents. What's the alternative? clutter up the place with signage, posters, leaflets, all of which must be regularly updated. This would cost not only in financial terms but also detract from the aesthetics of a beautiful town.
As a visitor to the area it has been an invaluable service to me and many others without this the area will be much poorer
The TIC provides vital information for visitors who do not have computers or the skills to use them,(as people are expected to these days). The monies spent on needless statues and other sculptures could have been put towards the running of the TIC providing a much needed service for visitors who come to the town and surrounding area to spend cash.
[Name Ommitted]has been trying to close TIC for a long time why they ever made him a lord nobody knows never done any good for this town or his puppit [Name Ommitted].
I visit many towns in the UK. I make decisions on places to visit by evaluating information on accommodation, what's on, where to eat etc. Indeed this exercise is part of the pleasure of my trips. Whilst the web can provide dry facts, the best place at which to garner information about a place and to get a 'feel' for the area is from the local knowledge available only from a TIC. People only go where they're made welcome, REMEMBER NEW BRIGHTON.
Cutting off the hand that feeds yet again !
I've seen the decline in prosperity of other seaside resorts who chose to close their Visitor centres. Seftons only industry is Tourism and they need to be serviced once here to ensure repeat visits.
The TIC is an important focal point for visitors when they come to Southport. When people visit any town or city, the first place you will go to is TIC for information about the town, places of interest, places to eat & general information about the place. I think it would be ridiculus to close the TIC.
If we don't encourage people to visit Southport it will end up a ghost town - people's morale will suffer and the low-lifes will take over.
As the most significant and in fact only facility of this nature located at the most central road interchange and visitor drop off and collection point in Southport it,s closure would be bureaucratic lunacy to impact upon our town in this way.
A town like Southport should retain all resources like this, it's what people expect when they visit. If I were a visitor to any tourist resort I'd be very disapppointed if this facility was not available. Am also very surprised at the decision to reduce lifeguard cover at Dunes Leisure at times when it is most needed ie early mornings when more elderly people swim and weekends in the learner pool - crazy!

<p>The visitors and the residents of Southport are primarily OAP's, who are not necessarily ofay with the internet and find the tourist information centre essential. Further, before any hasty decisions are made, the council should look at who bookscoach travel and buys tickets etc from the tourist information centre, I am not a gambler but I would bet that it would be OAP's. With this in mind, I do not think that I am being impertinent, when I say that the council needs to bear in mind, the very often unrepresented pentioners in our society and not be discriminatory to their needs, or their families. Furthermore people still value the very friendly interaction that is recieved from the tourist information, which is a much loved a valued part of Southport.</p>
<p>Southport without a TIC is ridiculous; this entity brings visitors business and jobs to Southport as well as providing a valuable service to the general public; residents and visitors alike. There are a lot of people who rely on this service which in my view justifies it's very existance and continuance.</p>
<p>I feel strongly that local, personal, friendly interaction is preferential to virtual,cold advice lines via the internet. Could i enquire as to why this questionnaire later asks about sexual gender/ change of gender? as I do not see the relevance of this question???</p>
<p>If this were to happen it would affect all business also the local economy.</p>
<p>Save the TIC</p>
<p>Visitors and local people need to be able to get information from the Tourist Information all year round!! If they don't have access to the Centre to gain information then the event's in the town won't be worth haveing as nobody will come!! Shops cafe's and retail will all suffer. Southport will turn into a ghost town.</p>
<p>The TICis an integral part of the Tourism industry helping not just visitors to the Borough but also the many residents and businesses. Without the TIC were will the people who do not rely on computers go to find out information. It should not be closed !</p>
<p>A TIC is there to SELL Southport to potential visitors when they call, and then it is a frequent port of call for both new and regular visitors once in town, wanting more info on activities in the area. No TIC would in the medium term effectively close Southport as a tourist destination.</p>
<p>If this did happen it would affect every business in Southport, hotels guest house, restaurants, shops, etc.</p>
<p>Without the TIC my various trips to Southport would definitely not have been as enjoyable as they were. The TIC provided excellent assistance on where to go, what to do, where to eat, how to travel and what to see. All TIC recommendations helped to turn my holidays into a most enjoyable and relaxing time. I am certain, the greater Southport area will loose a lot of tourism without the TIC - that includes me and my family.</p>
<p>The Information Centre is the shop window of Sefton. It is unique in its own right to the borough of Sefton residents & visitors alike. Its closure would send out a clear message that the council doesnt think servicing visitors to the town very important.</p>
<p>Closure of this centre is definatley a vote loser.</p>
<p>As a business I see the service the TIC provides as invaluable. The team proactively sell admission tickets on our behalf to interested visitors and closure will be a significant loss to Chester Zoo. The team are an asset to you and the service provided should not be disregarded.</p>
<p>Although I am not a stranger to Southport, I use the Tourism Infn Centre to help plan my visits. The excellent events would not be properly advertised without a Tourism Dept and my professional Society (the Society for Radiological Protection) would not have held its International Symposium there in 1999, nor subsequently returned for other conferences, without the considerable input and help from that Dept. Southport needs its tourism and that tourism needs good support from the Council for their mutual advantage.</p>
<p>I am sure there could be scope to move tourism in with the library or somewhere else but to remove from Southport would be suicidal for Southport!</p>
<p>In a town that depends on visitors to close the Tourism Information office is insanity!</p>

<p>As a Southport resident my main use of the TIC is booking trips/tickets and the meeting point for such trips. If I couldn't book tickets here I would probably book them at out of town sites and do my shopping wherever that may be. I come into the town centre less and less as it is (mainly because of poor parking amenities) and I am not alone in believing that the less you have to visit the town centre for the worse it is for the local economy.</p>
<p>In a Victorian seaside resort like Southport it is imperative visitors have a point of information of what the town has to offer a shop window if you like take this away you may as well take the visitors away.</p>
<p>The TIC is a valuable source of information for local people as well as visitors. Visitors who have visited Southport before will still come, but many of those, as well as those who visit for the first time in the future, need to be able to find current information about the area and events. Any tourist destination, and particularly one which describes itself as "England's Classic Resort" needs to have a fully functional TIC and to even consider this resource as being under threat is totally unacceptable and not properly thought through.</p>
<p>This service may be classed as a non essential but as far as enonomic stability and as a safeguard to this popular resort this center MUST stay open</p>
<p>This is an absolutely ridiculous idea thought up by a bunch of morons who have the audacity to think they have the right to close down this once wonderful town to the level of level of a ghost town in the American Mid-west. Give us back the pride we once had in our town - GET US OUT OF SEFTON!!!!!!!</p>
<p>Southport i feel you are cutting services in the wrong area,TIC helps people learn and discover what Southport as to offer</p>
<p>Today i came to town shopping, i went to TIC for panto info. It was reccommended to me by the lady on the counter that i should not miss the xmas market. What market i asked, there were no leaflets advertising the event nor was there any signage on Lord St to advertise the fact this event was even taking place. I am sure i am not the only who got to attend this event via these means. Point being. get rid of the TIC at your peril event organisers!!</p>
<p>We are dependent on visitors here in Sefton. We need to promote our assets all year round! Please recreate the parks and gardens again-they are definitely a crowd puller.</p>
<p>We are dependent on visitors here in Sefton. We need to promote our assets all year round! Please recreate the parks and gardens again-they are definitely a crowd puller. I also think the area would be more welcoming if all the roads were neat and tidy and welcoming, especially the Formby By-Pass which mostly looks tatty, littered and untidy. When I was little I was used to seeing roads approaching seaside towns with well cut verges and well cut hedges and flowers along the way too. and therefore welcoming and promising of a good day out. We seem to be going backwards.</p>
<p>Southport relays on econmic tourism for its mainstay business, if not in a visible place how will visitors purchase tickets for the flower show, panto, air show, day trips, book at bed etc. it is inconvievable to have a tourism town without a visible local information centre.Its bad enough having the Arts centre shut for so long. Maybe the role can be shared between another council service. ie the Town Library when it re-opens or the convention centre (maybe alittle to out of town)</p>
<p>Unthinkable where a town relies heavily on tourism to close this office sends out the message we dont want you here.</p>
<p>Close this office is like telling visitors to the town they are not wanted. Morecambe springs to mind. Ghost town with no tourism.</p>
<p>The Tourist information centre provides essential information for people considering visiting Southport compared to other destinations. It closure would mean this information was not available to people considering Southport as a possible option. in resort it would be more difficult for visitors to find out about what is going on and as a result are less likely to spend money on non essential spending, or travel out of resort The TIC should maximise it's income potential by providing commercial services</p>
<p>I think the closure of the tourist information centre will bring a very negative impact to our town, we are a seaside resort that relies heavily on tourists coming whether it be for a day trip or a weeks holiday. The tourist information centre is the main cog in the engine and plays a very important role advising holiday</p>

<p>makers and taking bookings for hotels. The staff play a vital role and are the face of our town - the first port of call when on holiday is to find out where this is situated, then go along and see what the town offers. I think the council must keep this open it's a must. If our councilors want to see Southport become another Blackpool then closing down this centre will be the start of the negative impact to come.</p>
<p>It would be unthinkable not to have a Tourist Information Office in Southport as it is the first point of contact for visitors as potential customers to the many and varied attractions and businesses of Southport.</p>
<p>May Be A REDUCTION IN STAFF OR OPENING TIMES WOULD SAVE MONEY ?</p>
<p>New comers coming to the town all know to head for their local TIC who will give those people the information that they need if not the TIC people wont come again as they would miss out on many activities and would have to plan a lot more in advance maybe they wouldn't be bothered</p>
<p>The TIC is usually the first point of contact to visitors in the town. They provide a friendly face and are a great source of information on the town and surrounding areas. They also provide ticket sales for local attractions. It would be a real shame to see this service led facility go.</p>
<p>Merseytravel can provide these services - aren't they based in southport?</p>
<p>Just the thought of a seaside resort without this vital service beggars belief.</p>
<p>Who would promote our business, restaurants hotels etc when visitors arrive?????</p>
<p>This service is used by everyone visitors and residents and should not be closed.</p>
<p>The money spent on this facility is money well spent when you consider the amount of economic activity generated by Tourism</p>
<p>This questionnaire is noticeably written to only generate positive support for the TIC. This is not a balanced structured questionnaire and does not provide an opportunity for those who may consider a positive impact to the closure or cuts. For every closure opportunity is created. The recent private adoption of the Comedy Week is a good example of where private enterprise can step in a provide a new refreshing approach. There are no suggestions here regarding the sub options. Eg close the events team and restructure the remaining tourism department. Very poorly structured questionnaire and does not obtain genuine unbiased consultation. I would like to see this redesigned or at least this observation brought to the attention of the Council Members.</p>
<p>The closure of the Tourist Information Centre I believe would have a knock on effect on businesses and would stop tourists coming to the town because they would believe the resort is in decline.</p>
<p>i think it would be detrimental to close the TIC. It is a great source of information for tourism which is vital for the area in the recession.Would have impact on local businesses, entertainment venues and accommodation providers.</p>
<p>Tourism promotes the town and in doing so benefits us all. This is in the ways described above in this survey. Consider having the elected officials take a cut in expenses/Salaries to show their concern and also to show we are all in the same boat ! The only better way to stave off this STUPID suggestion is for members of Sefton Council (elected and non- elected) to follow the intentions of Messrs.Berlusconi and Papandreous.</p>
<p>Southport is currently marketed as a classic resort and any resort needs to be publicised. Tourism is important to the town. I feel visitors to any town will always look for tourist information for varying types of information about the town. Southport will lose out if this office is closed. I feel more money should be used to promote the service so that visitors want to come back again and thereby put more money into the local economy. I also feel strongly that street lighting should remain at its current levels. I think the Council has a responsibility to ensure that the local community lives in a safe and clean environment and is failing in its duty if it turns the lights off!!</p>
<p>We still need and prefer a tourist information centre where we can speak face to face with a local helpful person. Internet information is not and never will be the same.</p>

<p>The centre serves as an important source of information for tourists and local tax payers. Closing this service will make little impact on council budget, but will harm the image of the town greatly.</p>
<p>we visit Southport as a holiday and when we have gone to TIC all the staff have been very helpful, we book coach tours to see your countryside, cannot understand why they need to close this information centre, surely there are other ways to save money</p>
<p>This would effect all business in the area, hotels, shops, restaurants,taxis etc.</p>
<p>Tourist Information Centres in any 'seaside' resort has to be important. Are other local authorities closing theirs?</p>
<p>Coaches come into Southport are welcomed at the tourist office and visitors are given vouchers and any quiries answered plus coach drivers are also made to feel welcome and enjoy bringing their coaches here. It is a good place to find leaflets for forthcoming events, buy tickets , make enquiries and advertise local events.</p>
<p>Any money available should be used to keep the TIC open, it serves a valuable role for the community and visitors alike. I oppose it's closure 110% and feel any such closure would be a grave mistake on the part of the council.</p>
<p>You must be mad even to contemplate closure. Its as if your sticking two fingers up at residents and visitors to Southport. Close the Information centre down and you may as well say Southport is CLOSED</p>
<p>please listen, if we wer lookiing for cuts in a taxi company you would not sack the drivers, why do the counциll want to kill off the only income the town has, we need to continue to generate the income for the town this comes from the amazing job the tourists information centers provide for the town, I am in the business, i am very aware from the many coaches that have links with our hotel how important the TIC is please donot kill off the the very department that provides income and a future for all of us</p>
<p>We had a short break in Southport for the firework competition this year after quite a number of years since our last visit. One of our first ports of call was the TIC for a map, directions and advice on places to eat. Within a few minutes we received all the information we needed to make our stay enjoyable without wasting valuable time wandering round aimlessly. It would be sheer lunacy to close such a valuable service.</p>
<p>any way that generates £4m or5000 jobs,you tell me a better way of supporting Southport/sefton ?</p>
<p>I understand that some cuts will have to be made in Southport, but look at what generates the income in the town and keeps jobs open. Tourism. With out this life line what employment is in the town.!</p>
<p>We are a business producing the Official Trans Pennine Trail guide so we know that the thousands of people who do the TPT walk or ride each year would have a much less interesting and convenient start to their trip if the TIC was shut</p>
<p>TIC is first port of call for many visitors who seek information as to location of businesses and What's On. The TIC is a good marketing tool for many local businesses.</p>
<p>Yet another short sighted proposal put forward by a council who hasn't got a clue on economical viability. Reduce the number of senior management to make your savings not the front line staff who at this office are providing an essential and impeccable service.</p>
<p>Never has there been a more ridiculous idea. Has anybody in the council any idea how many different services this office offers? Its not just a case of handing out leaflets!!!!</p>
<p>Very short sighted by Sefton Council pull the plug on some other Qwango and hands off our beloved TIC</p>
<p>would that last one out of southport please turn the light off..... Thats what it will be like here soon if these crazy ideas get to fruition.</p>
<p>This is an outrageous proposal, to even think about the closure of the Tourism office. We are a tourist town!!</p>

<p>As frequent visitors to resorts/attractions in the North West we rely on TIC's for reasons to visit a particular places. They provide local knowledge born of years of service that is often not available on the web or elsewhere. And a welcoming smile and reassurance only real people can provide. Closure of your TIC would send a 'can't be bothered if you come or not' message to prospective visitors who have many alternative choices available.</p>
<p>I live in Ormskirk and visit Southport for shopping and pleasure. I like to visit the Information Centre to pick up brochures for local events. Often I find something I'd like to visit/see that I would not have otherwise known about. The Information Centre has everything in one place as opposed to searching the internet for different venues that I might not even know about. Not living in Southport means that my local paper carries some but not all forthcoming events or interesting places to visit.</p>
<p>why would you want to close the one place which can help make the visitors stay easier and make them feel appreciated. people including myself like to come and browse the leaflets and find out about future events,get a souvenir and speak to some one with local knowledge!!</p>
<p>The TIC should have money spent on it to make it more noticeable and attractive. People who live in the area use the TIC as a resource, visitors to the area use it for information, businesses use it to assist in conference planning. Rather than close the TIC, expand it.</p>
<p>as visitors from Coventry I have used the TIC over a number of years.You should be encouraging visitors to the area.not making it harder to find info out.</p>
<p>I am retired, but having worked for over 40 years in Southport's (later Sefton's) Libraries & having spent a large percentage of that time in the Atkinson Library, Lord St) I am not just guessing on this impact, I am SURE! The Library was swamped in the Summer with visitors wanting local tourist info. Indeed, when the TI Centre was closed in the evenings & the Library open, there were many visitors wanting & needing assistance.</p>
<p>This is madness on the part of Sefton. They do not understand Southport at all. I for one would be looking for the resignation of the Chief Executive and many of the senior officers for what they are proposing. Clueless in the extreme...</p>
<p>AS A CHILD WE SPENT MANY A HOLIDAY IN SOUTHPORT.AS DID LOTS OF MY FAMILY(.AND MANY SENIOR MEMBERS STIILL DO) THE TIC WAS A MAJOR PORT OF CALL TO AID OUR WEEKS ACTIVITIES AND ENTERTAINMENT. VISITORS NEED THIS SERVICE TO HELP KEEP THEM COMING BACK TO THE AREA, AND YOU NEED THEM FOR THE AREA TO SERVIVE.</p>
<p>The TIC in Southport is a big help to coach parties visiting the resort and closing the TIC would result in coach parties visiting other resorts in the north instead of Southport.</p>
<p>Tourism is the mainstay of Southport. Closing the TIC would certainly result in a loss of jobs, closure of business and fewer people coming to Southport. So much investment has been made in the town, it has so much to offer, if you do not make the most of it and promote it to tourists and conference organisers, the town will be ruined. I will be devastated if that happens.</p>
<p>As a tourist area, it is vital there is a TIC for visitors.</p>
<p>Catch 22....sefton proposes to axe toursim so therefore no need for TIC....clever or what. Whenever I visit another town or district I find TIC invaluable as a signpost to what's on, where to stay and what to do where.</p>
<p>We are advertised as a tourist resort; therefore to close the centre would be clearly foolish because people would be shocked, and individuals confused because they would no longer be able to access information about the town's facilities.</p>
<p>Absolutley ridiculous. A vibrant tourist information centre reflects a vibrant growing town where people would want to come and visit and to reside. Councillors close the TIC at your peril!</p>
<p>crazy idea, understandable that cuts need to be made but surely they should be made from higher up departments and not front line staff who's job it is to promote the resort. Southport is a seaside resort advertising itself a "classic" resort, if anything the government should be investing in this lovely town to</p>

generate it's future prosperity not helping it to turn into a ghost town..
Yet another short sighted consideration by a council run by Bootle. Save our TIC Save our Town
I have been coming to Southport from boy to man and have always used this office to find out about local events and where to eat and places to visit, I buy my tickets for the airshow and the fireworks and find the staff very friendly and helpful and have good local knowlege of the area and all its history.
Sefton council trying to fix something thats not broken. Hands off our TIC
As a resident my friends and I regularly use this office and find it very busy and well used by locals and visitors alike, I dont understand the need to rid us of this service.
This office is unique to Sefton/Southport and judging by the service figures is very successful, ther is no logic in closure.
What are you thinking of, a classic seaside resort needs a TIC
One of the successful Tourist Information Centres in the country and you want to close it, unthinkable.
A good tourist office signifies a healthy wealthy town. No to closure
The TIC is vital in Southport as a focal centre for visitors and residents for buying tickets for local attractions and events, general information and promotion of our town and also to promote local accommodation and businesses. It is ideally placed as a meeting place for visitors and is essential in these difficult times when we need to remain as a lovely town for holidays. If we lose it what is the point in being a holiday destination without a tourist centre.? Please consider the TIC as an essential element to our tourist industry, for without we are nothing. Thank you.
I called today to find out what's happening over Christmas, I could not believe it was already shut for the Christmas period and to make the matter worse shut completely between Christmas and New Year!!! The first time I can ever remember. How are people going to find out what is going on in the town??? Absolutely ridiculous!
this service is invaluable, it's always good to have a tourist information centre, i use them when i arrive at destinations around the country, the staff seem dedicated and knowledgeable.
Wherever I go I always use these centres for information on local events amenities advice etc I find them invaluable
I live in Blakpool and we rely heavily on Tourism, we have two TIC's and they are invaluable in promoting local businesses and attractions. Southport TIC is our first port of call when visiting the town.
Our party of 50+ come on regular coach trips to Southport and are dropped off right outside the TIC where we find local information most helpful on places to visit , opening times , where to eat and on our way home buy souvenirs of our visit from its well stocked shelves.
As southports industry is built mainly on tourism it's seems ludicrous to even contemplate closing the TIC!!!!
you need to get information for visitors and the centre is a perfect place where everybody knows.
As a foreigner in the UK on a 2 year visa I found the TIC in Southport very informative and directed me to places I would not have visited/known about otherwise. While on route to some of these locations I passed many business' which I believe would notice the impact of only having locals walking by instead of tourists.
Have you all gone mad !
Why don't Sefton Council just pay less to the executives on the council. The people who do all the work are absolutely sick and tired of living under persistent uncertainty while those with huge salaries and tenuous job descriptions are lavished with status and money. It just doesn't make any sense. Thank you

for consulting on this, I hope everyone's comments are listened to.
As a staying visitor I cannot believe that Southport/Sefton Council are thinking of closing the TIC, their help is invaluable when planning our holidays, and the first place we visit when we arrive in Southport is the TIC, to obtain leaflets/information about events etc, the staff are always helpful and efficient. The Council should be working to encourage tourism, not kill it, you have a lovely Town, and excellent for people like my Husband and myself who use mobility scooters because of disability. What of people who come on coaches for day trips, what is their first port of call, the TIC as the coach drop off point is right outside. And the larger events, Flower Show, Air Show, Firework Display. what impact would the closure of the TIC have on these events regarding tickets and advice to prospective visitors?
cut the amount of councillors or dock the pay and expenses that they receive
If a small town like Ormskirk can keep its TIC why are we even contemplating closing Southports. Madness I say, madness.
Monies should be spent where needed and not on needless statues and other use less tat.
Art gallery closed, museum closed, thinking of closing the aviary at the botanic gardens. What next? There will be nothing left in southport for people to visit.
Southport's becoming a ghost town.
I used to come to southport as a little girl, I love it. But it's going down hill fast. The councillors need to pull their fingers out and do something about it, NOT MORE CLOSURES!
Yet again more short-sighted thinking by the men in suits, you haven't got a clue as to the devastation caused if this facility was to close. You morons
it's bad enough that this facility is now closed every Sunday but to close it completely is an absolutely ludicrous idea in a tourist destination, make your cuts elsewhere.
how can a tourist town not have a tourist information centre? not everyone has internet and even those who do need a contact point when they arrive in a destination to get info, recommendations on local places to eat, stay, go, etc.
Coach tourism would be adversely affected - the "meet and greet" service is invaluable. I think Southport would be in danger of losing its "Coach Friendly" award.
A busy Tourist Information center is a sign of prosperity and economic stability in the town. Looking at these figures this is a very busy office and manned by only four people, that's incredible!
Looking at the work this office its workforce of four deserves a pay rise if anything.
As I understand this office falls into the non-essential service category non-essential to who. The 200,000 visitors, 17,500 phone calls etc Essential to Southport and its businesses essential to Sefton as tourism is its main stay of income and you need an office to service.
Come on Sefton Council you know how ridiculous this is.
This office could be run by pixies and elves and fairys from the bottom of the garden.
I am concerned that the only TIC being considered is the one located in Southport. Is this Sefton's only TIC? If so, it is immensely important, if not Sefton MBC needs to consider its position
Other towns have made the mistake of closing their TIC at a cost not a saving.
The TIC is an essential ingredient for Visitors, giving information and assisting with accommodation. It also provides residents with information on a myriad of subjects.
Don't be short-sighted a cut in supporting Tourism may not have an immediate effect but in the long term Southport will become another Morecambe or Rhyl.

<p>As a self employed resident of Southport I'd be horrified if our town`s TIC closed, as it would certainly impact on visitor numbers and seriously affect many businesses. The knowledgeable staff recommend local services and businesses to visitors which is vital to the local economy ! Reduce this service and Southport`s income will suffer and lead to further decline as in many other seaside resorts !</p>
<p>We visit Southport regularly, especially for events. If we are not aware of something happening in Southport where would we find out the information? Not everyone has access to the internet, and why would you go to an internet cafe in Southport to find the information out when you are there, the Information Centre is the obvious place, but without one you will be making it very difficult for visitors and also local people.</p>
<p>Given the business of this office closure will spell out impending doom for visitor services in Sefton.</p>
<p>Southport is supposed to be a tourist town and is already being affected by the economic downturn (closure of shops, etc) and other negative factors (increasing cost of parking, dismal pedestrianisation of Chapel Street for example). For any visitors to any town, the TIC is usually the first point of call to see what is available, to get information about hotels, restaurants, etc. If Sefton are serious about Southport being a tourist venue, they must keep the TIC and, in addition, look at other ways of attracting people to the town, otherwise it is going to die on it's feet and the subsequent loss of revenue to the Council (loss of business rates income, etc) will cause an additional financial headache that the Council will not be able to recover from very easily.</p>
<p>REDUCE WAGES OF SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM AT COUNCIL AND STOP BONUSES</p>
<p>Hands off our beloved TIC</p>
<p>I think it is appallingly short-sighted that a resort that relies on year-round tourism is even considering shutting its Tourist Information Centre. I spend a lot of holidays in the UK and TICs are an invaluable source of information in terms of planning holidays, booking accommodation and planning days out. They are also incredibly useful sources of information about public transport, good walks etc. Southport needs to be expanding its tourism department, not closing it, if the town is to continue having good shopping and restaurants.</p>
<p>Southport has already lost a lot of its own identity, there used to be far more specialist shops and not just the usual High Street shops. We had something different as a posed to be just like any other town. if there is nowhere for people to ask and get advise on what there is to do and where to go, people will stop visiting the town altogether. Local businesses will then have to close, making more people unemployed and putting even greater economic strain on an already over stretch benefits budget. May some of those higher end employees across all of Sefton's services could help save a lot of money by having their expenses budget cut. Look at the unnecessary expenditure rather than a reasonable expenditure. Please do not close the Tourist Office it will have such a negative impact on an already struggling town.</p>
<p>I buy all my tickets from the Information Centre, Flower Show, Air Show, Woodvale Rally and day trip tickets. I can get them all in one place, by closing the Centre this will obviously mean I will have to go to several places to buy any tickets, which is more travelling and expense. I am sure i am not the only one that buys their tickets there, where will the visitors go?. I think it is utter madness not to have a visitor centre in a supposed 'Tourist Town'!!!</p>
<p>A large seaside town needs a customer service focal point. Tourist Information Centre is just that.</p>
<p>This service is the only one who promotes local businesses and activities in the area, if this office closes who will answer the 200k enquiries or the 17k phone calls or the 5k e-mails</p>
<p>How can you call Southport a tourist destination when you are not catering for the tourists by closing the tourist information centre and not providing a service????</p>
<p>I use the tourist centre in Ormskirk and Southport. Ormskirk only has a population of about 24,000. Southport has about 98,000 what are the councillors thinking about??? Maybe Southport should go back into Lancashire as the councillors seem to have more of an idea about Tourism and how important it is!!</p>
<p>this doesn't make sense, if the 1st part of this questionnaire is true why would the council even begin to</p>

think of closing something so lucrative?
Understandably savings have to be made but not at such a successful TIC such as this. A more hard working and dedicated team of four you will ever find. Hands off our TIC
Great local information , local history , local/national bus information the TIC is a shop window for the whole of Sefton. Close this office and all will be lost.
I think the TIC is an invaluable resource for the community of Southport. I think its closure would have a detrimental effect on tourism. I have used this facility on many occasions for booking coach trips. Advice regarding hotels etc with disability access. The staff are always so helpful and knowledgeable and are a credit to Southport and Sefton council.
Southport is most famous for being a holiday/ tourist town. Without this, why would people come and visit? What else does southport have to offer? And if anything, how would visitors find out where to go/ or what southport has to offer?. I think the council should consider these very facts very carefully! As without the tourism what is Southport? A residential area? Well how many of those do we have in sefton- alot and that is what Southport would become!!!!
An essential service in a seaside resort its closure would send out the message that Southport is closed.
Hands off our TIC this isnt Morecambe!!
You could reroute the money previously allocated to TIC; it depends upon how important one considers the leisure industry to be. Doesn't every town have a TIC whether rich with tourist attractions or not?? Southport is a holiday resort
it will turn into a ghost town.
For a town that depends on visitors as much as Southport NOT to have a tourist information would be utterly short-sighted and - frankly - bizarre. You would not be able to claw back the lost visitors when the economy improves, as people will have developed new patterns of behaviour, including where they visit. We look back on the days when we nearly lost our pier (saved by only 1 vote) with a certain degree of amazement - a holiday/tourist town demolishing its pier? To close the tourist information would in future be seen as just as stupid.

Excerpt from a letter to the Leader and Chief Executive from One Vision Housing.

To the Leader and Chief Executive Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council,

Thank you for the opportunity provided to partner organisations such as ourselves to consult on the proposed budgetary cuts within SMBC.

Having assessed the options being consulted upon we have responded where we feel there is a potential significant negative impact on the lives of our residents, the long term sustainability of the Borough of Sefton and on our business.

Whilst appreciating the immensely difficult task facing the Council, we worry that some of the cuts proposed, particularly to the Supporting People Programme will put many vulnerable people across the borough at risk and will provide a false saving which will result in higher costs to the public purse in future years.

Not all the options we have responded to are formally open for public consultation, however, we feel the impact will be such on our tenants that we ask the Leader and Chief Executive to consider all of the comments we have made below.

Roy Williams
 Chief Executive
 One Vision Housing

E4.12 Coast and Countryside Service / E 6.7 Tourism

Sefton's own research has shown that Tourism is worth over £400m to the local economy through 10m tourist days and through supporting 5000 jobs. Cuts proposed to the tourism budget and to the Environmental Conservation and Coast Management

Budget will have a direct impact on the ability of Sefton to maintain its appeal to tourists though:

- Inaccessible beaches and parks if sand is not removed consistently
- Loss of habitat and wildlife
- Lack of support to tourists through removal of the tourist offices

Cuts to the Tourism budget will also have significant impact on Sefton's ability to deliver upon the City region priorities laid out in the Liverpool City Region Visitor Economy Strategy to 2020 including the regeneration of Southport and the promotion of Sefton's Coast. Cuts to this budget will provide a short term saving which will have long term negative economic impacts on the borough as a whole making Sefton a less attractive place to visit and live.

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E6.7

Details of proposal:

To review the Tourism Service and merge the Tourist Information service into the Box Office service of the Cultural Centre following the completion of the refurbishment works.

This review has the potential to deliver savings of £90,000.

- Transfer the Tourism Information Centre into the Cultural Centre when refurbishment is completed.
- Delete vacant post in Conference Team £22,000
- Savings to be made in the Tourism Marketing £27,000 and Admin. £3,000
- A one off saving of the Event reserve of £38,000

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': No

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

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

No. There will be less Marketing activity however this will not impact disproportionately as access to events and conferences that are held will ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010. – Events and conferences in the Borough are open to all sections of the community.

Consultation

Consultation has taken place and there is a full report available. The vast majority of those consulted felt that closing and reducing tourist activities would negatively impact on tourism.

No equality issue where identified in the consultation.

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

Yes. The tourism service will work to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and promote understanding across protected characteristics in accordance with the Councils Policies and guidance.

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

- a) Tourist Information Centre will transfer into the Cultural Centre when refurbishment is complete
- b) Delete vacant post in Conference team.
- c) Reduction of budgets accordingly

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex E

Review of the Role and Function of Community Care Practitioners

1. Scope and Content of the Review

1.1 Review objective

To critically and impartially examine the role of Community Care Practitioners (CCP's), taking into account the original definition of the function and the work currently undertaken.

Review Background:

The role and function of CCP's has been subject to a full management review based on the requirement of the council to review all areas of spending to identify options and also the implications and risks of making potential savings.

Scope:

The review will focus solely on the role and function of CCP's within care management, occupational therapy and hospital discharge teams. Because CCP's roles vary considerably, the report will set out to review roles within all disciplines with particular regard to the varying roles in each team.

Assumptions & Constraints:

The review will explore the original definition of the CCP role and explore if this definition has changed and the reasons why.

Review commencement date and timescale:

The review commenced on November 1st 2011 with submission to the People Leadership Team in January 2012.

Resources: -

Report Author: Lou Fashioni (Business Manager)

Supporting Information from: Mark Waterhouse, Margaret Milne and Derek Jones (Service Managers)

Staff and Officers engaged: Managers and Community Care Practitioners from:

- Adult Social Care Teams (North and South)
- Independence Teams (North and South)
- EMI Teams (North and South)
- Hospital Social Work Teams (North and South)
- Occupational Therapy Team
- Occupational Therapy Mobile Assessment Team

Authorising Officer: Robina Critchley, Director of Older People

1.2 Legislative Background

The NHS and Community Care Act 1990 states that it is a duty for [local authorities](#) to assess people for social care and support. This is to ensure that people who need [community care](#) services or other types of support get the services that they are entitled to. Service users have their needs and circumstances assessed to determine whether or not care will be provided.

The Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) framework was introduced in 2003. This provides councils with the eligibility criteria for adult social care, to identify whether or not the duty to provide services under legislation is triggered.

This developed further in 2007 with both the government paper 'Putting People First – a shared vision and commitment to the transformation of adult social care' and again in 2010 with 'Think Local, Act Personal'.

Other legislation relevant to the role and function of care management teams is historical and laid down within the National Assistance Act 1948, the Local Authority Act 1970 and Sick and Chronically Disabled Act of 1971.

1.3 Brief History

Prior to the introduction of the Community Care Practitioner role in 1995, Assistant Social Workers worked alongside qualified staff. The CCP role resulted in changes to the job description and brought it into line with the Community Care Act of 1990. The CCP job description was subsequently updated in 1997, 2000 and 2003 respectively, however, these updates were specific to the teams CCP's worked in and veered away from the original generic description.

1.4 The Current Position

There are currently 29 CCP's within the Adult Social Care Teams North and South, the Independence Teams, The Occupational Therapy Team, The Mobile Assessment Team and the Hospital Teams North and South.

However, the numbers in each team vary from one to seven, as there has not been a standard calculation or ratio for required numbers. This has produced some inconsistency between teams as workloads vary.

Some teams have more CCP's as SW posts were converted to CCP posts to increase available resources to meet the demands of the service.

Job descriptions have been interpreted to meet the exigencies of the services. Also, as services have developed, job descriptions have not been amended to reflect changes in roles. This is particularly relevant to CCP's within the Occupational Therapy Mobile Assessment Service, who despite having a role far removed from other CCP's, their job descriptions do not reflect the (very) specific tasks they undertake.

2. Community Care Practitioners - Adult Social Care & Independence Teams

2.1 Assessments

CCP's in the Adult Social Care Teams undertake community care assessments with service users, carers and relevant professionals. They have knowledge of government legislation and the Directorates Community Care policies and procedures to enable them to work effectively. CCP's can operate independently with guidance and supervision from assistant team managers and team managers.

Assessments are more often than not multi disciplinary, involving other professionals e.g. doctors, district nurses, hospital staff, community psychiatric nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, sensory impairment officers, environmental health, housing, care providers, advocates etc.

Service users can have chronic, multiple health problems and the assessment process can often be lengthy and complicated. Good verbal and written communication skills are necessary, with an ability to empathise with service users and their carers.

All assessments undertaken are person centred and focus on choice and control, working in partnership with service users and their carers and subsequently creating self-directed support plans.

CCP's also work to identify risks within any assessment process and look for ways to eliminate or minimise risks where possible. An integral part of the CCP role is that of an 'alerter' within the safeguarding procedures and they are also required to co-work within safeguarding cases. In most cases CCP's work closely with the Contract and Commissioning team to ensure that care and support provision is appropriate to users needs.

Once a community care assessment has been completed, CCP's are required to make decisions about whether the FACS criteria has been met and whether to provide service users with support services or not in conjunction with the assistant team manager or team manager.

If a service user is eligible for a service, CCP's complete and submit a panel application to apply for funding. These submissions are screened by team managers. Panel funding decisions are made by Service Managers, who ultimately agree or reject requests.

Examples of requests to panel may include funding for:

- **Care packages:** to assist service users with personal care, continence care, pressure care, meals, medication etc.
- **Respite care:** to enable carers to have a break.
- **Long-term residential or nursing care:** when a service user is no longer able to remain in their own homes and communities safely.
- **Day care:** to enable service users to have social interaction and their carers to have a break.
- **Carer's Direct Payments:** to enable carers to arrange for someone to assist them on an ad-hoc basis when they need additional support.
- **Direct payments:** to provide service users with a cash payment to buy in their own care.

CCP's often manage conflict with service users, carers, family members and other professionals

CCP's may be required to re-submit an application to panel with further information to support requests and may have to suggest alternative services or assist service users through an appeal or the complaints procedure.

Once panel has agreed funding, CCP's commission services and complete self-directed support plans, liaise with service users, family, carers and appropriate agencies and co-ordinate appropriate care and support.

CCP's will schedule a review of service after 4 to 6 weeks, depending on the service that has been provided.

2.2 Reviews

CCP's may organise reviews with service users, family, carers, relevant health professionals and any support services that are involved in providing care.

The review process is followed in line with the NHS and Community Care Act 1990 and the within the guidance of the 'personalisation agenda'.

CCP's may chair reviews and make long-term plans with the service user and their carers.

As circumstances change the level of care may need to be adjusted to meet identified needs. Services may need to be increased and CCP's can apply to the funding panel again to make a further application for funding.

Assessments / Reviews undertaken by CCPs Jan –Dec 2011	678
---	------------

2.3 Carers

In addition to assessing service users, CCP's identify the needs of carers. With the implementation of the Carers and Disabled Children Act 2000, the Local Authority has powers to provide services for carers following a carer's assessment.

CCP's assist carers to complete an assessment of their needs and / or refer carers to the Carer's Centre. They also submit applications to the Carer's Panel, to enable carers to have a one-off item or service to assist them to continue in their caring role.

2.4 Duty

In addition to having a caseload (approx 15-20 cases per worker), CCP's also participate in a duty rota on a weekly basis. This can consist of rota duties being undertaken.

There are five workers on duty every day, comprising of social workers and CCP's. Some assessments are completed by telephone; however there are many occasions when a duty visit is necessary. Work on duty means that the full assessment process is undertaken.

If staff are absent from the office, due to sickness, annual leave or training, any issues arising within their caseload that will not wait for their return are also dealt with on duty.

Duty can take priority over all other work. If there are insufficient workers on duty, CCP staff may be called upon at any time to cover the duty rota.

2.5 Hospital Discharge

The hospital social work teams only cover the hospitals located in Sefton. If a Sefton resident has been admitted to a hospital outside the borough, CCP's within the Adult Social Care Teams will facilitate the discharge from a variety of hospitals including Renacres Hall, Wrightington and Clatterbridge, however potentially they may have to organise a discharge from anywhere in the country.

CCP's may have a set timescale to put together a discharge plan for the service user. If they fail to achieve this, or discharge has been delayed because services are not in place, the local authority has to make a payment to the relevant NHS body.

The assessment is often multi-disciplinary. CCP's liaise with the patient, family, carers, ward staff and therapy staff at the hospital. The likelihood is that the assessment would need to be completed in a timely manner and services would need to be arranged to facilitate the service users discharge home. CCP's follow up on carer's issues, which often means several visits to the ward to discuss these with the Patient and or the nursing team. CCPs sometimes have to work outside normal hours in order to fit in with family members who work.

There may be instances where people are discharged from hospital who are not known to the Directorate. In these instances CCP's may be called on to respond immediately, complete an assessment and arrange services.

In addition, CCP's can also be instructed to work within the hospital teams during periods of bad weather, winter pressures or staff shortages. This is to ensure that patients are discharged in a timely manner and hospital beds are not blocked. During the bad weather conditions or critical situations within the hospital, CCPs work can dramatically increase.

The hospital CCP's may have to go to funding allocation panel for increased funding more than once if service users care requirements increase.

2.6 Independence Teams

The Independence Teams have one CCP allocated to each team and their role is similar to that of colleagues in the Adult Social Care Teams. The role may differ in that, due to the often complex nature of learning disabilities, their involvement in cases may be much longer than for older people for example. This is, in part, due to the nature of person centred planning for people with complex and profound learning disabilities and physical disabilities. The Independence Team CCP's with management support can also facilitate the arrangement of tenancies for service users and these can take a considerable length of time to resolve. However, the description of the role and function of CCP's within Adult teams is closely replicated for CCP's within the Independence teams.

Assessments / Reviews undertaken by CCPs Jan –Dec 2011	76
---	-----------

2.7 Risks of Cessation

- This will significantly reduce care management teams' ability to conduct assessments and timely outcome focused reviews.
- CCP's deal with critical work and urgent referrals on a daily basis. Cessation of CCP's could potentially lead to crisis for service users and potential carer breakdown.
- There could be significant delays in responding to critical needs and a possible increase in the amount of vulnerable adults left at risk and in need of emergency services.
- Potential backlog of assessments and reviews. Pending has increased during 2011 and this has the potential to increase further.
- Awareness and responses to safeguarding issues could be delayed at a time when reforms are taking place within the Care Quality Commission around regulation and compliance of residential providers
- Waiting lists for assessments and reviews may increase the number of complaints and potentially cause reputational damage for the Council
- Key performance indicator for reviews will significantly reduce in the short term.
- Assessments for users who fall into the 'substantial' category, if pended, could potentially become 'critical' within a short space of time.
- CCP's work contributes towards the increase of personal budgets/ Direct Payments and the choice and control agenda. There is an expectation that the majority of service users will receive self directed support plans and Direct Payments by April 2013.

Team	Number of CCP's
Adult Social Care North	6
Adult Social Care South	7
Independence Team North	1
Independence Team South	1

3. Community Care Practitioners – Hospital Teams

CCP's based within Southport & Formby District General Hospital and Aintree Hospital work alongside qualified staff. Hospital CCP's have direct contact with a variety of medical disciplines and liaise with medical practitioners and therapy staff on a daily basis. This type of liaison requires a theoretical knowledge of medical procedures, medical conditions and mental capacity issues and in some cases, the needs of post operative service users and the identification of risks of discharge. CCP's regularly take part in Multi Disciplinary Team (MDT), Continuing Health Care (CHC) and Intermediate Care meetings.

CCP's have direct contact with patients and their carers/families and assist to find appropriate care and support post discharge, sometimes at very short notice. Hospital discharge policy can create challenges for CCP's in arranging care, with negotiation required to resolve issues with service users and their families.

Most work is increasingly carried out in the context of the personalisation agenda, with care plans; person centred self directed support plans, personal budgets and direct payments. Although this method of supporting service users to exercise choice and control must be done in a very short timescale to facilitate timely hospital discharges. This can considerably adds to the workload of hospital CCP's, where an average caseload can be up to 25 cases at any one time with an increased number at times of winter pressures.

Under the delayed discharge act 2004, once the hospital has issued a referral (called a section 2), teams have a minimum of 72 hours to complete their assessment and then a section 5 is issued giving notice for discharge within a 24 hour timescale. If discharge has been delayed because services are not in place, the local authority must make a payment to that NHS body.

Other tasks for hospital CCP's include ensuring that service users properties and belongings are secure whilst they are in hospital, making sure arrangements to house and feed pets when users have no-one else to assist. CCP's also have access to hardship payments that allow them to purchase essentials (food/toiletries/bedding etc) for people returning home. This is compliant with the National Assistance Act 1948.

During the bad weather conditions or critical situations within the hospital, CCPs work can increase.

3.1 Assessment

Once a community care assessment has been completed, CCP's need to make decisions about whether the FACS criteria has been met and whether to provide service users with support services with management support. . In most cases CCP's work closely with the Contract and Commissioning team to ensure that care and support provision is appropriate to users needs.

If a service user is eligible for a service, CCP's complete and submit a panel application to apply for the funding. These submissions are screened by team managers. Panel funding decisions are made by Service Managers, who ultimately agree or reject requests.

Examples of requests to panel may include funding for:

- **Care packages:** to assist service users with personal care, continence care, pressure care, meals, medication etc.
- **Respite care:** to enable carers to have a break.
- **Long-term residential or nursing care:** when a service user can no longer remain in hospital and meets criteria for long term care.
- **Day care:** to enable service users to have social interaction and their carers to have a break.
- **Carer's Direct Payments:** to enable carers to arrange for someone to assist them on an ad-hoc basis when they need additional support.
- **Direct payments:** to provide service users with a cash payment to purchase their own care.

3.2 Reviews

CCP's complete outcome focussed reviews with service users and their families six weeks after discharge from hospital to ensure that there is continuity of care and support where necessary or post review to restart care services. CCP's can also give advice and signpost to appropriate services in the community.

The review process is followed in line with the NHS and Community Care Act 1990 and the within the guidance of the 'personalisation agenda'.

CCP's occasionally chair reviews and make long-term plans with service users and their carers.

CCP's often manage conflict from service users, carers, family members and other professionals

CCP's may need to re-submit an application to panel with further information to support requests and may have to suggest alternative services or assist our service users through an appeal or the complaints procedure.

Once panel has agreed the funding, CCP's are responsible for the commissioning of services and complete self-directed support plans, liaise with service users, family, carers and appropriate agencies and co-ordinate appropriate care and support. This work is completed with management support.

Assessments / Reviews undertaken by CCPs Jan –Dec 2011	390
---	------------

3.3 Risks of Cessation

- This will significantly reduce hospital teams' ability to conduct assessments and timely outcome focused reviews
- Hospital CCP's work towards appropriate and timely discharge planning, thus avoiding the current delayed hospital discharge financial penalty. (There has been one instance of a delayed discharge fee applied to the Directorate since the introduction of the Community Care Delayed Discharge Act in 2003).
- Urgent referrals may not be acted upon in a timely manner, creating a backlog of patients waiting to be discharged (especially in times of winter pressures).
- ***A backlog of work could potentially cause hospitals to go on red alert and have to divert patients to other hospitals***
- Risk of communication breakdown, poor working relationships and reputational damage for the Council with the Acute Hospitals Trusts.
- To cease posts within the Hospital Discharge Teams would present risks to the sustainability of the Community Care Panel budget and to service users themselves as the potential for unsafe discharges and financial penalties to the Directorate are potentially very high.
- To cease posts within the Hospital Discharge Team in the north would effectively reduce the staffing by 30%.
- Key performance indicator for reviews will significantly reduce in the short term.

Team	Number of CCP's
Hospital Team North	6
Hospital Team South	1

4. Community Care Practitioners – Sensory CCP's & the Mobile Assessment Team

4.1 The Mobile Assessment Team

4.1.1 History

In 2007, the Occupational Therapy teams north and south were amalgamated into one central team. The O/T service visits service users in their own homes with equipment provided from the Joint Community Equipment Store.

The Mobile Assessment Clinic began as pilot scheme in late 2007. The service is staffed by one manager, three Occupational Therapists, three full time and two part time Community Care Practitioners with a shared administrative support from the O/T admin team.

4.1.2 Current Functions

The Mobile Assessment Team take referrals from a variety of sources including, G.P's, Physiotherapists, District Nurses, Hospital Discharge Planners, Health Occupational Therapists, Hospices, Social Workers, Housing Scheme Managers, Housing Associations, Carers and self Referrals.

CCP's perform assessments for minor equipment and minor works and signpost and advise service users to other services. Occupational Therapists can perform the above tasks in addition to assessments for major adaptations' and recommendations for major works to Housing Associations.

The CCP's also staff drop-in clinics in Southport and Aintree. These clinics allow the public to call in for an assessment of need with most types of equipment available from the centre on the same day. The Mobile Assessment Team complete up to 80 assessments per week.

CCP's also undertake assessments of service users with more additional needs that are not suitable for mobile visits for example people with restricted mobility or complex health needs.

CCP's based within the Mobile Assessment Team also work within the principles of choice and control, assisting service users to remain safe and independent within their own homes and communities by providing equipment to ensure daily living tasks can be carried out safely. This contributes to savings for the Directorate by negating the need for residential or domiciliary care, where daily living tasks such as bathing and dressing would be assessed under Fair Access to Care criteria as 'substantial'. By providing bathing equipment and minor adaptations, the amount of DFG referrals for major adaptations is prevented (DFG referrals have recently significantly reduced because of this). This type of early intervention has been successful in the re-enablement of service users.

Within the scope of a mobile assessment visit, CCP's also perform a full holistic assessment of need, to maximise the safety and independence of users in their own homes and make referrals to other statutory organisations, partner organisations and voluntary sector services. As with other CCP's, they perform a safeguarding alerter function.

Assessments / Reviews undertaken by CCPs Jan –Dec 2011	1,501
---	--------------

4.2 Sensory CCP's

There are two members of staff who conduct work in the Occupational Therapy Team based around assessment and advice to people with sensory impairments. These CCP's have direct contact with service users around the provision of advice and signposting to other services. They also provide safety assessments and can provide specialist audio/ visual equipment for the home. Sensory CCP's liaise with other agencies in the statutory and Voluntary, Faith and Community sector regarding the provision of smoke alarms, visual and auditory equipment and information such as Braille, talking books and other equipment and materials.

Sensory CCP's assess, demonstrate and provide services to users and need a good knowledge of associated health conditions that may impact or affect users with sensory deprivation. The CCP's also visit users in their own homes where necessary and provide drop-in clinics in the north of the borough, at Southport and Formby DGH. These clinics receive referrals from the Audiology Department and work on an average of 5 appointments/ assessments per day.

Sensory CCP's can also order specialist equipment directly from the Equipment Stores and book appointments for technicians to install in users homes with management support. CCP's also signpost service users for welfare benefit checks to ensure that users with sensory impairments are not financially disadvantaged. The CCP's visit users in their homes and perform environmental safety checks and provide equipment to maximise users independence. This assists to keep people in their own homes and communities whilst preventing unnecessary admissions to long term care and costly packages of care.

4.3 Risks of Cessation

- The Mobile Assessment Team service would cease as it is solely staffed by CCP's.
- This would significantly reduce the ability to conduct assessments and timely outcome focused reviews
- Failure to complete assessments and equipment deliveries would result in a waiting list as there wouldn't be capacity within the Occupational Therapy team to run a Mobile Assessment Team.
- Referrals to the Mobile Assessment Team are generated from a variety of sources (medical/professional/personal), there is potential for users who are unsupported by the provision of equipment to become substantial /critical and require a package of care in the home.
- The number of complaints from users waiting for assessments /equipment could increase causing reputational damage for the Council.
- To cease CCP posts with the Occupational Therapy and Mobile Assessment Team could present a very high risk to the sustainability of the Community Care Panel budget, as the service these CCP's provide are entirely preventative.
- Key performance indicator for reviews will significantly reduce in the short term.

Team	Number of CCP's
Mobile Assessment Team	5
Occupational Therapy Team	2

Summary and Additional Information

Community Care Practitioners within the Adult Social Care, Hospital and Independence Teams perform the role of unqualified social workers in all but complex and safeguarding cases. Although some teams underwent a reconfiguration in early 2011, this was purely based on the requirement to improve processes. There is scope for a further reconfiguration to explore the use of a standard calculation or ratio for required numbers of staff based on volumes of incoming work. This has the capacity to improve effectiveness and efficiency.

CCP's within the Occupational Therapy and Mobile Assessment Teams (MAST) perform very different roles with regard to Sensory assessments / reviews / advice clinics and in the case of the MAST, assessments, provision of equipment and conducting reviews in service users homes. Their remit relies solely on the need to allow users to remain in their own homes and communities, utilising equipment and adaptations in a way that helps to prevent admissions to hospital, short and long term care and minimising the need for domiciliary care. The only similarity to CCP's in other teams is in name only. The MAST is solely staffed by CCP's, so the service would become unviable if the option to cease the role is taken forward.

5. Recommendations

Option One:

Reconfigure the ratio of CCP's per team to target resources more effectively with no change to current staffing levels.

Option Two:

Cease all CCP posts at an estimated saving of approximately £607,200. This is now less than was originally quoted in the Options Paper (£750,000), as since October 2011, five CCP's from the Occupational Therapy Team have taken VR/VER at a saving of £142,800.

Option Three:

Re-organise CCP staffing to target resources more effectively and realise efficiencies. This could entail an immediate reduction in the levels of CCP's within the Adult Social Care Teams by four posts, resulting in a saving of approximately £114,240 with further efficiencies possible post reconfigurations of teams in 2012/13.

It is recommended that Option 3 be taken forward, as this will allow the Council to realise financial savings and reconfigure the Adult Social Care teams to provide a more efficient service. By calculating the ratio of Community Care Practitioners and aligning this with current and forecast demands for assessments and reviews, will give the Council a sound basis to re-evaluate the service and explore further options for the future.

Annex F

Report of Sefton Council's Consultation on the Review of the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (Ref:E6.4)

Consultation Period:

August 2011 – 16th January 2012

Background

Following the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review and settlement the Council forecast a significant budget gap over the three years 2011-2014.

An initial package of potential budget options was approved by Cabinet, 13th October 2011, to commence consultation and engagement. In relation to these, consultation activity continues with service users, the general public, partners, key stakeholders, staff and Trade Unions.

The consultation on the budget options closed on Monday 16th January 2012.

This report details the outcomes from the consultation for the option on E6.4 Review of funding to the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector. The consultation was focused on the providers of the services delivered by the voluntary, community and faith sector on behalf of the Council. It is important to note that this review commenced in 2009 and as a consequence the consultation and engagement has been undertaken on an on-going basis since that time. This report details the outcomes of the consultation processes from August 2001.

Consultation Methodology

The second stage consultation plan was agreed by the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel on the 21st October 2011. The consultation period ran from August 2011 and in accordance with the standards adopted by the Panel, and the Council, exceeds the 12 week standard. The following methods were used to consult with the sector:

- The proposal was loaded on the e-consult to enable the public, providers of services in the voluntary, community and faith sector and users of the services to give feedback
- Letters to the sector, both funded and unfunded
- One to one meetings with providers of services in the sector that may be impacted by budget reductions
- Events with the sector
- Meetings with networks, groups and under-represented groups, including users of services

Executive Summary

The budget options were loaded on to e-consult where the public, voluntary sector groups and service users had the opportunity to feed back their views. This resulted in 2 comments which agreed with the proposal.

Engagement with the sector has been undertaken using a wide variety of methods. The review on the sector commenced in 2009 and this review is the second stage of that process. Stage two commenced with a letter from the Chief Executive to the sector, supported by a terms of reference and details of how the sector could get involved. An event with the sector and Chairs of the networks was held in October at which the Chief Executive outlined the process for consultation on all budget options. Over 30 meetings / network events have been attended by the Chief Executive and Officers of the Council to ensure the maintenance of open and transparent communication and to take feedback on budget options. One to one meetings with groups and organisations have been convened to discuss self assessments, performance, quality and as part of the day to day commissioning and procurement processes, and may budget impacts there may be on specific groups.

The overall feedback from the sector has been positive in terms of having an open and transparent dialogue from which more effective commissioning of the sector can take place.

The Outcomes of the Consultation

- The sector wants good communication between themselves and the Council. This includes the provision of clear and timely information about what is happening and why and ideally having one point of contact.
- Confirmation is needed as to whether funding will be available post March 2012 and if so what organisations will be required to do. Organisations have said they need to know this as soon as possible.
- In order to provide needs led services that are also responsive to change organisations need longer-term contracts, ideally for 3 years. It has been made clear that whilst any funding is gratefully received it does not help a service to plan for the future, nor is it conducive to building and maintaining staff and service user relationships, which are an essential part of what community based services provide. In addition short term funding results in job insecurity, which can create instability within the sector through the loss of staff and subsequent loss of knowledge and investment in training. Short term, particularly yearly, contracts make planning difficult
- Organisations would like Council priorities to be clear and understand how any funding they receive ties back to these so they can ensure their delivery provides what the Council wants.
- Organisations want an agreed measurement for capturing social value outcomes – a consistent approach that is simple and can be made part of their day to day collection of evidence
- Support on commissioning and tender processes would be of great benefit. More local VCF organisations could potentially deliver more services if they were supported to become tender ready.
- Support to explore consortium working would also be of benefit, which also links to organisations being able to consider tender opportunities through partnership working.

- Organisations would like the Council's commissioning process to be clear, open, and transparent. They would also like appropriate timescales to be built in to allow VCF organisations the opportunity to respond properly.

APPENDIX ONE: VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY, FAITH SECTOR REVIEW



Chief Executive's Department

Town Hall
Lord Street
Southport
Merseyside
PR8 1DA

Date: 12 August 2011

Our Ref: CE/JMO'F

Your Ref:

Please contact: [Name Omitted]

Contact Number: 0151 934 3485

E-mail: [Name Omitted] [@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:[Name Omitted]@sefton.gov.uk)

Dear

RE: VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY & FAITH SECTOR REVIEW

You should already be aware that as part of Sefton Council's Transformation Programme the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector Review was established to consider how the Council supports, commissions and procures services through this sector. As well as reviewing the resources allocated to VCF organisations this year this piece of work will also directly inform the development of the Council's Commissioning Framework.

In a time of reducing resources we need to make sure we get the best value for services delivered for, and in, our communities and that they are delivered against local needs and the Council's priorities. The VCF sector is an integral partner in this process so we want local organisations such as yourselves to be as involved as much as possible to ensure your views and ideas are taken into account.

The VCF review encompasses a number of pieces of work:

- Youth Service Redesign
- Youth and Community Centre Review
- Citizens Advice Bureau Review
- Sefton CVS Review
- Interim funding review using self and officer assessments
- VCF Service Review -led by Corporate Commissioning Department

Detailed information on how the review will take place, and most importantly how you can get involved, is attached to this letter. **[Name Omitted]**, the Head of Corporate Commissioning & Neighbourhood Coordination, is leading on the review so if you have any questions please don't hesitate in contacting her or a member of her team. Contact details are on the information attached.

Yours sincerely

MARGARET CARNEY
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector Review

Background Information

Why do we need a review?

- As part of Sefton Council's Transformation Programme the Voluntary, Community and Faith (VCF) Sector Review was established to consider how the Council supports, commissions and procures services through this sector. One year's interim funding has been agreed until 31 March 2012 to allow for this review to take place. We now need to establish what elements of the previous commissioning processes have worked well and what evidence we have to show the impacts of the work delivered by the VCF sector.
- The VCF Review will encompass a number of pieces of work:
 - Youth Service Redesign – led by People Directorate
 - Youth and Community Centre Review – led by People Directorate
 - CAB Review – led by Corporate Commissioning
 - CVS Review – led by Corporate Commissioning
 - Interim funding review using self and officer assessments -led by Corporate Commissioning Department
 - VCF Service Review -led by Corporate Commissioning Department

All information collected will be shared with the relevant departments to ensure a comprehensive view of the sector is achieved.

- This is part of a bigger piece of work to review commissioning arrangements across the Council. We need to ensure all Council departments and potential partners are in the right position to be commissioned to deliver the best possible services based on need. We also need to make sure services being delivered by the Council, or on behalf of the Council, are addressing or contributing to the Council's priorities. These are:

Critical services that have been determined as a priority for supporting our vulnerable residents - these can be considered in simple terms as life or death issues.

Frontline services that are deemed essential to residents across the borough. These are the things our Council Tax Payers expect us, as the Council, to deliver.

Regulatory services that must be carried out by the Council to ensure we are fulfilling our legal requirements. They include the regulation of certain aspects of day-to-day life to ensure the safety, health and wellbeing of people in Sefton.

Why should you be involved?

- This review is the opportunity for you to influence the reshaping of how Council services and resources are commissioned in future.
- The VCF sector is an important partner in delivering local services throughout Sefton. Therefore it is important we involve this sector in these decisions. We want to know what organisations provide in the borough, why they do this, what gaps they think exist, and what they would like to deliver in future so we can gain a full picture of what this sector looks like.

How can you get involved?

- This will be an ongoing process this year and there will be a variety ways you can be involved.
- The VCF Review will be an item on the agenda of the Sefton Community Centre Network workshop meeting on 23 August 2011. A short questionnaire will be sent out to members of this group in advance of this meeting.
- A service review questionnaire will also be circulated to wider VCF organisations across the borough. This will be followed up with the option for individual face to face discussions.
- Sefton Youth Service is planning a joint workshop with VCF providers of young people activities to discuss the Youth Service redesign proposals.
- Organisations receiving funding from the Council or NHS Sefton this year (2011/12) will be asked to complete a monitoring assessment towards the end of the financial year. Further information will be circulated to the appropriate organisations.

If you require any more information about how this will work and who should be involved, you can contact:

[Name Omitted] on 934 3603 or email [Name Omitted] @sefton.gov.uk

[Name Omitted] 934 3488 or email [Name Omitted] @sefton.gov.uk

[Name Omitted] 934 2015 or email [Name Omitted] @sefton.gov.uk

[Name Omitted] 934 3488 email [Name Omitted] @sefton.gov.uk

Terms of Reference

Purpose

- Review how funding given to the Voluntary, Community and Faith (VCF) sector in 2011/12 has been delivered, taking forward any good practice and lessons learned into future commissioning arrangements.
- Gather views from the VCF sector on their needs and consider how this fits with the priorities of the Council, and use this to influence how the Council's Commissioning Framework will be developed.

Process

Neighbourhoods will carry this part of the review in two stages:

1. Review all VCF funding allocated by the Council and NHS Sefton in 2011/12
 - Map all funding currently given to VCF providers from the Council and NHS Sefton to include:
 - Level of resources
 - Funding source
 - Organisation funded
 - Delivery outline
 - Type of monitoring

To be carried out August – September 2011.

- Using the mapping information, review the delivery of each intervention to include:
 - What is delivered and why
 - Assessment of whether delivery matches what was commissioned
 - Assessment of whether there are any overlaps in delivery with other services
 - Identification of any gaps or additional needs within current delivery
 - Performance against any commissioned targets
 - Identification and assessment of any social value benefits related to the intervention

This will take the form of an organisation self-assessment and an officer review. Self-assessments will be required to submit evidence to back up their statements. These responses will then be compiled by the Neighbourhoods Division to give an overall outcome for each intervention.

- To be completed by January 2012.
2. VCF consultation and service review
 - A wider service review will also be carried out with VCF organisations across the borough to include:
 - The aims and objectives of each organisation
 - The types of services they currently deliver
 - Their sources of funding
 - Any services they would like to deliver in future
 - Assessment of whether they are in a position to be commissioned

This information will be used to assess the current market in terms of VCF provision in Sefton, and to help identify the future need for services that could be supported by the Council and NHS Sefton.

- The consultation with organisations will be carried out August – November 2011. The information will be collated November – December 2011.

Outcomes

- The outcomes from these two stages will be consolidated to give an overall report.
- Information will also be fed into the other sections of the VCF review where appropriate.
- Findings will be reported back to all organisations and partners who have taken part in the review process

LETTER TO THE UNFUNDED SECTOR THROUGH SEFTON CVS DATA BASE



Chief Executive's Department

Town Hall
Lord Street
Southport
Merseyside
PR8 1DA

Date: 19 October 2011

Our Ref:

Your Ref:

Please contact: [Name Omitted]
Contact Number: 0151 934 3485
E-mail: [Name Omitted][@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:[Name Omitted]@sefton.gov.uk)

Dear local organisation

RE: VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY & FAITH SECTOR REVIEW

As part of Sefton Council's Transformation Programme the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector Review was established to consider how the Council supports, commissions and procures services through this sector. It will directly inform the development of the Council's Commissioning Framework.

In a time of reducing resources we need to make sure we get the best value for services delivered for, and in, our communities and that they are delivered against local needs and the Council's priorities. The VCF sector is an integral partner in this process so we want local organisations such as yourselves to be as involved as much as possible to ensure your views and ideas are taken into account.

The VCF review encompasses a number of pieces of work:

- Youth Service Redesign
- Youth and Community Centre Review
- Citizens Advice Bureau Review
- Sefton CVS Review
- Interim funding review using self and officer assessments
- VCF Service Review

Detailed information on how the review will take place, and most importantly how you can get involved, is attached to this letter. **(As above)** Steph Prewett, the Head of Corporate Commissioning & Neighbourhood Coordination, is leading on the review so if you have any questions please don't hesitate in contacting her or a member of her team. Contact details are on the information attached.

Yours sincerely

MARGARET CARNEY
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Organisations / Groups invited to participate in the review and attend events
in October 2011 / January 2012

12
13
408
Addaction
Age Concern
Age Concern Crosby
Ainsdale Community Centre
Alzheimers society
Arena Housing
Bosco Society
Bradbury Fields
Brighter Living Partnership
British Red Cross
Brunswick Youth Centre
Catch 22
CHART
Children's Trust, Health Sub Group - Deputy
Christchurch Youth & Community Centre
Citizens Advice Bureau
Crosby Older Persons Luncheon Club
DISC
Expect Excellence
Forum Housing
Galloways (previously Southport Blind Aid)
Gordon Youth Centre
Home-start Formby
Imagine
L30 Centre (FUN4KIDZ)
Leo Project

Light for Life
Litherland Youth Club
The MS Society
Maghull Coffee Bar Youth Club
Making Space
Merseyside Society for Deaf People
Merseyside Youth Association
MSDP
Mystery Shopping Lead
MYA Space
Netherton Feelgood Factory
Netherton Park Neighbourhood Centre
Nugent Care
One Vision Housing
OPERA
Parenting 2000
People First
Plaza Community Cinema
Pride of Sefton Narrow Boat
PSS
Queens Road Neighbourhood Centre
River Mersey Inshore Rescue
Riverside ECHG
Rotary Club of Formby
Salvation Army Bootle
Sefton Access Forum
Sefton Advocacy
Sefton CVS
Sefton Cancer Support Group
Sefton Carers
Sefton Helping Hand
Chairs of Sefton Community Empowerment Network Groups and Forums
Sefton Pensioners Advocacy
Sefton Partnership for Older Citizens
Sefton Play Council
Sefton Stars Basketball Team
Sefton Women & Children's Aid
South Sefton Helping Hand
South Sefton Visually Impaired group
Southport Anti Cuts Coalition
Southport Macular Support Group
St Leonards Youth & Community Centre
Stroke Association
SWAN Centre
Venus Resource Centre
Anthony Walker Foundation
Waterloo Community Centre
Woodvale Community Centre
Y Kids

To All VCF Network Representatives and VCF Organisations funded by the Council

Dear All

RE: OUTCOMES OF VCF EVENT 31 OCTOBER 2011

We are just writing to thank you for giving up your time to attend the above event and to update you on things that you asked about on the day.

Firstly, there were some concerns about making sure that the Council made the information about potential saving options as accessible as possible. Andy Woods from Sefton CVS is kindly assisting the Council to make sure that this is happening. If you still have any concerns, please can you let us know.

Secondly, hopefully any confusion about the questionnaire for the VCF Review has now been sorted out. The questionnaire has been resent to those organisations funded by the Council to double check that they have had it. We have already had some really good information sent back in. The questionnaire is also being circulated wider to those organisations that are Sefton based. This is going to about 200 groups and so please encourage people to fill it in and be as open and honest as possible.

Thirdly, issues were raised about the funding for VCF sector from NHS Sefton. We are currently pulling together a list of all those organisations affected and setting out the key issues that would impact on the sector. CVS will be in touch with you to talk about how we take these key messages to the joint meeting of senior staff in the Council and NHS Sefton as promised at the meeting.

Finally, we agreed that we would have a proper discussion about how we become a Commissioning Council and how VCF can influence its development and its

implementation. We will be in touch with a date for this in January 2012, but it would be really good if you could let us have any ideas about what you want to get from the session, ways of doing it, etc to influence the planning of this. Key things that came up on the day included the importance of social value, innovation and involvement in service redesign at an early stage e. g Youth Service Redesign.

Hopefully, this has covered the key points raised and you should all have had a copy of the presentations. Please let us know if we have missed anything out or you have any further questions.

We look forward to hearing from you. To avoid any confusion, feel free to share information with either of us as we will be working closely together on this.

Yours sincerely,

Steph and Angela

Head of Corporate Commissioning and Neighbourhood Co-ordination, Sefton MBC

Chief Executive, Sefton CVS

Excerpt from a letter to the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive from One Vision Housing

To the Leader and Chief Executive Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council,

Thank you for the opportunity provided to partner organisations such as ourselves to consult on the proposed budgetary cuts within SMBC.

Having assessed the options being consulted upon we have responded where we feel there is a potential significant negative impact on the lives of our residents, the long term sustainability of the Borough of Sefton and on our business.

Whilst appreciating the immensely difficult task facing the Council, we worry that some of the cuts proposed, particularly to the Supporting People Programme will put many vulnerable people across the borough at risk and will provide a false saving which will result in higher costs to the public purse in future years. Not all the options we have responded to are formally open for public consultation, however, we feel the impact will be such on our tenants that we ask the Leader and Chief Executive to consider all of the comments we have made below.

Roy Williams

Chief Executive

One Vision Housing

Section E6: Other

E6.4 Voluntary, Community and Faith

The Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector provide a number of vital services to residents in Sefton. As an organisation we work alongside VCF groups including:

Local churches

- Sefton Advocacy
- Sefton Partnership for Older Citizens
- Sefton Opera
- CHART

These groups support our communities, developing and building community networks, supporting residents and keeping them from becoming isolated and providing community events. The steer from central government is 'Big Society', 'Localism' and a drive for Local Authorities to become effective commissioners rather than directly delivering services. By reducing the budget to the VCF SMBC will undermine the long term ability of the VCF in Sefton to build capacity and to develop to a point where they can independently bid to deliver services across the borough.

PROJECT	TOTAL 11 12	Reduc tion 12/13	BUILT IN 12/13	TOTAL 12 13	DESCRIPTION	Reason	WHY BUILT BACK IN
Beechpark	8,408	8,408		0	For centre running costs	Centre closed	
Sefton Play Council	40,000	20,000		20,000	For organisation running costs	Decision taken by Cabinet Corporate Services Dec 09 to reduce grant over 3 years 10/11 60k 11/12 40k 12/13 20k. Continuation of this agreement so 12/13 will be last year of funding. Consortium has been established within the voluntary sector – this will mean a change of premises, 4 staff will be transferred over and will retain many of the functions of the Play Council such as Arts and Crafts shop and a focus on training. This will be from April 2012	
Sefton CVS - Young Advisors	115,587	30,587		85,000	Involved in a broad range of activity throughout Sefton including advising agencies on how to involve C&YP in meaningful decision making, youth proofing documents, and developing and delivering training to adult professionals with an interest in working alongside C&YP	Actual spend has always been maximum of £85,000 for the year. Sefton CVS have been informed of this.	
Sefton CVS - Parent Forums	20,000	20,000		0	Parent Engagement Officer to develop and facilitate 3 area forums and 1 borough wide forum.	Discussions are ongoing with NHS about alternative methods of support. Sefton CVS are aware of Council cessation.	

PROJECT	TOTAL 11 12	Reduction 12/13	BUILT IN 12/13	TOTAL 12 13	DESCRIPTION	Reason	WHY BUILT BACK IN
Sefton CVS - Safeguarding	10,850	10,850		0	Support for the sector in understanding what their responsibilities are for safeguarding by delivering a range of learning/training opportunities	CVS aware of this and are able through reconfiguration of training programmes to continue to offer training.	
Catch 22 - YIP	95,000	33,000		62,000	Youth offending prevention service complimenting prevention and early intervention agenda. Project engages with identified young people, undertaking an assessment based on YJB ONSET, develop an intervention plan with the young person and their parents/cares to reduce their risk factors.	Performance issues led to the services commissioned from this organisation being de-commissioned. The £62k will be used to commission alternative internal services to meet the needs of any identified young people.	
PSS Candlelight	18,000	18,000		0	Counselling service for bereaved children. Funds one member of staff	Children whose bereavement becomes a mental health issue can be picked up within CAMHs (Community mental health for children).	
British Red Cross	35,200	35,200		0	Supports re-enablement of individual in own home after leaving hospital to avoid bed blocking. Funds Coordinator and admin costs	Reduced demand since NHS hospital discharge support service introduced - duplication of service. Organisation has been informed.	
Making Space Carers Support	34,900	34,900		0	This intervention has already stopped	This wasn't recommissioned in 11/12 budget reduction not taken yet	
Making Space Family Support	53,200	53,200		0	3 PT Family Support Workers seconded to Mental Health Team: North and South. Mental health support	Organisation no longer to be commissioned due to possible duplication in roles of Merseycare support	

PROJECT	TOTAL 11 12	Reduction 12/13	BUILT IN 12/13	TOTAL 12 13	DESCRIPTION	Reason	WHY BUILT BACK IN
Sefton Carers - Saturday Club	2,450	2,450		0	Beamsley Project. Saturday Club and holiday once a year for young people with learning disabilities (with parents). Subsidises coach holiday and hall hire for club	Can apply for small grants	
Galloways	5,200	5,200		0	Contribution to running of drop in centre	Can apply for small grants	
CHART	1,000	1,000		0	Room hire costs	Can apply for small grants instead	
MS Society	4,600	4,600		0	Carers breaks	Carers can apply for breaks through carers direct payments.	
Light for Life	32,895	0	25,000	25,000	Learning opportunities targeted at hard to reach vulnerable people with a range of issues including homelessness, debt, offending or at risk of offending, drug and/or alcohol issues in specific deprivation areas in Southport. Close links with Councils ASB Unit and offender management approaches.		Should have been built into budget but mistakenly missed out. Funded through one off WNF underspend in 11/12 with view of adding to budget the following year subject to performance. Performance has continued to be good. No consultation has been done with provider about ending the project - means we have not complied with Best

PROJECT	TOTAL 11 12	Reduction 12/13	BUILT IN 12/13	TOTAL 12 13	DESCRIPTION	Reason	WHY BUILT BACK IN
							Value Duty to Involve if service was decommissioned. Also as it works with vulnerable YP would be high risk to community to end this provision. Resource has already been reduced by £7,895
Shop Mobility	35,000	0	25,000	25,000	One stop shop service in Southport available to people with disabilities, long term conditions and their carers resident throughout the borough of Sefton. Staffing and running costs. Among other things provides training, welfare benefits advice and mobility scooter hire.		Should have been built into budget but mistakenly missed out. Funded through one off WNF underspend in 11/12 with view of adding to budget the following year subject to performance. Performance has continued to be good. No consultation has been done with provider about ending the project - means we have not complied with Best Value Duty to Involve if service was

PROJECT	TOTAL 11 12	Reduction 12/13	BUILT IN 12/13	TOTAL 12 13	DESCRIPTION	Reason	WHY BUILT BACK IN
							decommissioned. Also as it works with vulnerable people in Sefton would be high risk to community to end this provision. Resource has already been reduced by 50% over the past two years
SWACA	49,900	0	49,900	49,900	Support for children affected by domestic violence		Potential mistake that this was included as savings option in Cabinet Report on VCF - 27 Jan 2011. Provides essential high risk service. No consultation has been done with provider about ending the project - means we have not complied with Best Value Duty to Involve if service was decommissioned. Also as it works with vulnerable people in Sefton would be high risk to community to end

PROJECT	TOTAL 11 12	Reduction 12/13	BUILT IN 12/13	TOTAL 12 13	DESCRIPTION	Reason	WHY BUILT BACK IN
							this provision. Conversation taking place about re-including this in budgets as a solution.
Anthony Walker Foundation	6,358	0	6,358	6,358	Work with Sefton MBC and partners during Diversity, Inter-faith and Hate Crime weeks		Admin mistake in Cabinet report that this should stop at end 11/12. Is the only provider to deliver this type of work for Sefton Council. No consultation has been done with provider about ending the project - means we have not complied with Best Value Duty to Involve if service was decommissioned. Also as it works with vulnerable people in Sefton would be high risk to community to end this provision

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E6.4

Details of proposal:

The purpose of the VCF review was to understand what resources the Council give to the VCF sector and what the outcomes of this are.

In the financial year 10/11 £13.5 million funding was invested in the voluntary sector to deliver service on behalf of the council.

In January 2011 Cabinet agreed a package of reduction of funding that was ratified by Council of £3.1 million. £2.9 million was the withdrawal of Nation Government Grants and programmes..

In the financial year 2011/12 £10.4 million from Core Budgets was allocated to the VCF Sector. On the 13 October 2011 Cabinet agrees to consult with the Voluntary sector on the role and place within Sefton, and as part of this a potential saving target was put forward of £300,000 . After consultation with the sector and through the day to day commissioning processes, savings were identified at £170,000.

Ramifications of Proposal:

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': **No**

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': **No**

All the VCF groups impacted by this proposal will either continue to deliver their work or their service users will have alternate service provision and any adjustments in funding have been agreed with the organisation/ group concerned and are made up from efficiency savings; such as , under spend, projects ending, tapering due to existing contracted arrangements and switching some work to alternative providers or funding streams due to national changes with NHS responsibilities, regards Hospital discharge / support for older people / women with mental health problems/ Short breaks and training support for carers.

Some organisations that service these areas may have had a drop in commissioned funding from the Council however opportunities to secure NHS funding are being explored by the organisations themselves.

Some organisations that received small amounts of funding, on a ad hoc basis outside standard SLAs, can still apply through the new small grants system for support.

Project	Reason for reduction	Mitigation
Catch 22	Contractual adjustments	Alternate viable services
PSS Candlelight	Contractual adjustments	Alternate viable services will be provided should

		children/young people be assessed as requiring counselling and/or bereavement support
British Red Cross	Change in funder from Council to NHS	Opportunity for NHS funding to replace
Making space (carers support)	Contractual arrangements ended	Other commissioned services to support carers are available to meet the needs of service users
Making Space Family Support	Contract adjustment and ended	Mersey care commissioned services will meet needs of service users
Sefton Carers – Saturday club	Limited period funding	Can still apply under new small grants system Carers can also apply for direct payments depending on thresholds.
Galloway	Limited project funding	Can apply via new small grants system
Beech park	Centre closed.	Alternate viable service available
Sefton Play Council	Contractual adjustments	Limited funded programme coming to an end
Sefton CVS –young advisors	under spend	Continues to deliver services
Sefton CVS parent forum	Potential Change in Funder from Council to NHS	Opportunities for NHS funding being explored
Sefton CVS - safeguarding	Limited term project funding	CVS to absorb within reconfiguration of training programmes.
MS society	Shift in service users funding mechanism	Carers can apply via carers direct payment system Thresholds have to be met for qualifying.
CHART	Limited period funding	Can still apply under new small grants system

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

Many of the voluntary sector services target their services at disadvantage community members and people with protected characteristics and play an important and vital role. Mapping shows that all protected characteristics have service provision. It is an ongoing process to keep this under review.

The total budget spend in the sector is £10.4m and under this proposal the reduction in funding will only be £170,000.

Within this proposal there are recommendations to continue resourcing those agencies that deliver services to groups that suffer discrimination in society because of their protected characteristics.

Consultation

E-consult and general public

The budget options were placed on e-consult – where the public, voluntary sector groups and service users had the opportunity to feed back their views. This resulted in 2 comments which agreed with the proposal.

Officer Contact with groups and organisations

Engagement with the sector has been undertaken using a wide variety of methods. The review commenced with a letter from the Chief Executive to the Sector, supported by a Self Assessment to be completed by groups / organisations. An event with the sector and Chairs of the networks was held in October at which the Chief Executive outlined the process for consultation on all budget options. Over 30 meetings / network events have been attended by the Chief Executive and Officers of the Council to ensure the maintenance of open and transparent communication and to take feedback on budget options. One to one meetings with groups and organisations have been convened to discuss self assessments, performance, quality and as part of the day to day commissioning and procurement processes. .

A full report is available on request.

Feedback from Consultation

- The sector wants good communication between themselves and the Council. This includes the provision of clear and timely information about what is happening and why and ideally having one point of contact.
- Confirmation is needed as to whether funding will be available post March 2012 and if so what organisations will be required to do. Organisations have said they need to know this as soon as possible.
- Organisations would like Council priorities to be clear and understand how any funding they receive ties back to these so they can ensure their delivery provides what the Council wants.
- Organisations want an agreed measurement for capturing social value outcomes – a consistent approach that is simple and can be made part of their day to day collection of evidence
- Support on commissioning and tender processes would be of great benefit. More local VCF organisations could potentially deliver more services if they were supported to become tender ready.
- Support to explore consortium working would also be of benefit, which also links to organisations being able to consider tender opportunities through partnership working.
- Organisations would like the Council's commissioning process to be clear, open, and transparent. They would also like appropriate timescales to built in to allow VCF organisations the opportunity to respond properly.

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

met?

Yes: Maintaining a VCF sector is part of the Councils strategy in meeting Public Sector Equality Duty.

The Council keeps under review services being delivered to ensure that they are meeting needs of the most vulnerable and excluded.

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

- 1) Inform/ confirm with organisations their funding levels.
- 2) Continue to develop strong working relations with the sector and progress the outcomes from the consultation
- 3) Monitor

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex G

Library review terms of reference, process and timescale

Background to library review

The library review follows on from the work of the Libraries Asset Management Review Overview and Scrutiny Working Group. This recognised that the current network of libraries was unsustainable, given the amount of investment that would be needed in the infrastructure of the buildings. The library review is now set in the context of diminishing resources for Sefton Council.

Terms of reference for library review

- a. To ensure a sustainable network of libraries within the context of available resources
- b. To further develop the work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny for the Libraries Asset Management Review
- c. To determine future sufficiency for library provision that meets the needs of those who live, work and study in Sefton
- d. To explore the potential for further cost efficiencies
- e. To examine and gain best practice from other library authorities
- f. To explore the opportunities for co-location with other Council services, community facilities, retail outlets.
- g. To determine the library offer reflecting national and local priorities, investigating options for new services
- h. To explore models of governance and alternative methods of service delivery
- i. To foster and strengthen partnership particularly in relation to Customer Access, Children's and Older People's Services and Health
- j. To demonstrate Value for Money in relation to future proposals
- k. To ensure that following the review any future service recommendations meet the continuing obligation as set out under the Legislative requirements for the service (1964 Act) and other generic legislative requirements such as the Equality Act 2010. The review will take on board outcomes from other library reviews undertaken nationally, particularly where they have been the subject of judicial review.

Outline timescale for library review

Stage 1 February to June 2012

- Terms of reference, scope of review agreed
- Data gathering

- Initial consultation and analysis of results
- Stage 2 July 2012
- Report with findings and options to Cabinet. Decision taken
- Stage 3 Sept to November 2012
- Follow up consultation for preferred option, as decided by Cabinet
 - Analysis of results
- Stage 4 November/December 2012
- Final decision, following consultation taken by Cabinet
- Stage 5 January 2013
- Prepare implementation plan
- Stage 6 April 2013
- Implement changes identified and agreed

Consultation process for library review

Subject to approval by the Sefton's Consultation Panel consultation will be in two stages:

- 1) To gain information and people's views to form options to go forward
- 2) To consult on preferred option and way forward

This follows good practice that has been adopted in other Local Authorities that have held library reviews and implemented them.

Consultation will involve questionnaires available on line and on paper, public meetings including Area Committees, media publicity, meetings with partners and stakeholders as appropriate.

Resources required for library review

- Officer time (including library service plus others e.g. Finance, Economic Regeneration, Corporate Commissioning). Significant amounts of time from Officers at different stages of review
- External challenge
- Costs of consultation – printing, travel etc

Key stakeholders

- Those who work, live or study in Sefton
- Library Service customers
- Friends of library groups
- Leadership of Sefton Council – Officers and Elected Members
- Library staff
- Trade Unions
- Volunteers delivering library services
- Departments/services within Sefton Council
- Schools
- NHS Sefton, Merseycare
- People/organisations that use library buildings for activities
- Adult education providers
- HMP Kennet
- External organisations e.g. Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP), Society of Chief Librarians (SCL), Arts Council, Booktrust.

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex H

Leisure Activity review terms of reference, process and timescale

Terms of reference for leisure activity review

- a) To ensure a sustainable network of Leisure Centres and activities within the context of available resources
- b) Review existing private sector contractual obligations and explore the potential for further cost efficiencies
- c) To determine future sufficiency for leisure provision that meets the needs of those who live, work and visit Sefton
- d) To ensure that all possible funding streams are accessed, where possible.
- e) To compare Sefton's leisure provision against others and gain best practice from within the sector.
- f) To explore the opportunities for co-location with other Council services, community facilities, retail outlets.
- g) To review working patterns to ensure that the Council's leisure operation remains viable.
- h) To explore models of governance and alternative methods of service delivery
- i) To foster and strengthen partnership particularly in relation to Customer Access, Children's and Older People's Services and Health.
- j) To demonstrate Value for Money in relation to future proposals
- k) To deliver services in accordance with Equality Act 2010 and subsequent equality legislation
- l) To ensure that services fulfil statutory provisions where necessary and appropriate

Outline timescale for leisure activity review

Stage 1 - April to August 2012

- Terms of reference, scope of review agreed
- Data gathering
- Liaison with Sefton Access Forum.
- Liaison with Sefton Sports Council
- Development of E Consult questionnaire
- E Consult consultation goes live.

Stage 2 - September 2012 to November 2012

- Results collected and analysed.
- Strategy for 2013-14 onwards developed with any associated savings highlighted.
- Follow up consultation if required,
- Analysis of results
- Report with findings and possible options to Cabinet Member. Decision taken to recommend to Cabinet

Stage 3 - December 2012/January 2013

- Report with findings and options to Cabinet Member. Decision taken
- Final decision, following consultation taken by Cabinet

Stage 5 - February 2013

- Prepare implementation plan

Stage 6 - April to May 2013

- Implement changes identified and agreed

Consultation process for leisure review

Subject to approval by the Sefton's Consultation Panel consultation will be in two stages:

1. To gain information and people's views to form options to go forward
2. To consult on preferred option and way forward

This follows good practice that has been adopted in other Local Authorities that have held reviews and implemented them.

Consultation will involve questionnaires available on line and on paper, public meetings including Area Committees, media publicity, meetings with partners and stakeholders as appropriate.

Resources required for leisure activity review

- Officer time (including Sport & Recreation staff plus others e.g. Finance, Economic Regeneration, Corporate Commissioning). Significant amounts of time from Officers at different stages of review
- External challenge
- Costs of consultation – printing, travel etc

Key stakeholders

- Those who work, live or visit in Sefton
- Leisure Centre customers
- User Forums
- Leadership of Sefton Council – Officers and Elected Members
- Leisure Centre staff
- Trade Unions
- Departments/services within Sefton Council
- Schools
- NHS Sefton
- People/organisations that use leisure centre buildings for activities
- External partners / organisations e.g. Sport England, Merseyside Sport, Waterfront Leisure, Formby Land Trust.

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex I

24 Hours Response Review

Background

- The Emergency Duty Team is made up of a Manager and a small number of staff who are on duty as qualified social workers during evenings, weekends and Bank Holidays.
- The Social Care Customer Access Team deals with calls from members of the public and partner agencies on issues of concern regarding vulnerable children and adults.
- These contacts can be direct to SCCAT or via Sefton Plus or members of the public are signposted to voluntary or third sector organisation from a menu of services.
- Sefton Council also delivers a Careline service, which responds to emergency calls from vulnerable service users. A telephone line is used to connect to a 24 hour, 365 day a year call centre. If assistance is required there are trained operators available who can contact family or friends or the emergency services on behalf of the user.

Outline Review

A review of the 24hr Response services will enable officers to ascertain specific I.T solutions including the use of e-forms, the CRM system, back office integration and a benefits calculator.

Initially the Review Board will focus on the current context as well as demographics and funding issues impacting on a 24 hour response service including:

- Current call rate/type
- Funding profiles
- The 24 response service 'Offer'
- External partnerships
- A full risk assessment will be undertaken as part of the review
- To explore other options and support available

Terms of Reference

- a. To ensure a sustainable response service to vulnerable members of the community within the context of available resources.
- b. To determine future sufficiency for '24 Hour Response' provision.
- c. To develop a funding model that meets emerging national and local priorities, including the potential for cost efficiencies.

- d. To determine the future '24 Hour Response' offer reflecting national guidance and local priorities.
- e. To foster and strengthen partnership, particularly in relation to Health and other referring agencies with a focus on quality of referral, understanding and interpretation of local thresholds
- f. To deliver services in accordance with Equality Act 2010 and subsequent equality legislation.
- g. To demonstrate Value for Money in relation to future proposals.
- h. To consider any statutory requirements and ensure that any outcomes of the review meet those requirements if necessary.

In drawing together the proposed membership of the Review Board, the range of key stakeholders within the development of a '24 Hour Response' service have been included. The Review Group would meet on a monthly basis during the term of the review and an outline timescale is set out below.

Proposed Membership of Review Board

Marlyn Banham – Head of Service (Vulnerable Children and Young People); Wayne Leatherbarrow – Service Manager (Business Development); Tina Wilkins – Head of Service (Vulnerable Adults); Mark Waterhouse – Service Manager (Adults Assessment); Tyra Pether - Service Manager (Children's Contact Referral and Assessment); Kurt Goldman - Corporate Customer Services Manager (Sefton Plus); Andrew Walker - Careline/technology/internal challenge (Place Directorate); Strategic Business Support (People Directorate); Sharon Lees – SCCAT Manager; Darin McCrystal - Project Lead; Staff representative from EDT; NHS Sefton representative; Police representative; LSCB representative

Business Support will be provided by the People Directorate Business Team

Outline Timescale

February 2012 –Inaugural meeting

- Context & principles
- Current customer response models: purpose, staffing, funding

April 2012 -Review Process Stage 1

- Data & quality performance
- Future core purpose

May 2012 – Review Process stage 2

- Community needs and expectations
- Strengthening partnerships
- Scoping future models

June 2012 – Review Process Stage 3

- Final review reports
- Approve Consultation and Communication Plan

July – September 2012 – Consultation process

November 2012 - Implementation

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex J

Revisions to Street Lighting Service

Terms of Reference

- a. To ensure compliance with the Sefton Carbon Management Plan target of a 25% reduction in emissions of the gasses that cause climate change by 2016.
- b. To determine future sufficiency for effective and efficient management of Street Lighting, illuminated Bollards & traffic signs, as required by the Highways Act 1980 with reference to the Department for Transport published 'Well-maintained Highways Code of Practice for Highway Maintenance Management'.
- c. To develop a funding model that delivers long term cost efficiencies in terms of energy usage and reduced maintenance requirements.
- d. To foster and strengthen partnerships, particularly in relation to SALIX* (Salix Finance Ltd is an independent, not for profit company, funded by The Department for Energy and Climate Change, who's aim is Driving Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector), in future networks with a focus on innovation in energy efficient technologies.
- e. To demonstrate Value for Money in relation to future proposals
- f. To ensure that the Council's statutory duty to maintain a highway network which is safe for the highway user is upheld.

Consultation

The Council is currently considering a number of options to reduce electricity consumption, and hence costs, from its lighting stock. These include:

- Installation of more energy efficient bulbs
- Switching to Light Emitting Diode (LED) lighting
- Switching off street lights between certain times

Not all areas maybe suitable for lights being switched off between certain hours and are influenced by factors such as traffic flow, personal safety issues, night-time activity and environmentally sensitive areas.

The aim of the consultation is to present the options for revising the existing street lighting delivery regime by the proposal to switch street lights off at certain times, resulting in subsequent cost and carbon savings. The community would be asked their views with regard to the implementation and under what conditions residents would find the proposed revisions to the street lighting regime acceptable.

Consultation Outline Timescale

January 2012

- Revisions to Street Lighting in Sefton, raised at Public Engagement & Consultation Panel.

February 2012

- Development of E Consult questionnaire.
- Liaison with Sefton Access Forum.

March 2012

- Press release on Consultation of Street Lighting revisions, with reference to recent activities in the delivery of efficient and effective street lighting schemes.
- Finalise E Consult questionnaire.

April 2012 – September 2012

- E Consult consultation goes live.
- Ongoing press releases on Consultation of Street Lighting revisions, with reference to recent activities in the delivery of efficient and effective street lighting schemes.

October 2012 – December 2012

- Results collected and analysed.
- Strategy for 2013-14 onwards developed with associated savings highlighted.
- Report to Cabinet on the consultation results and strategy for approval.

January 2013

- Final press releases on results of the Consultation of Street Lighting revisions

April 2013

- Implementation of proposed Strategy.

'Spend to Save' Schemes

Two scheme proposals on 'spend to save' have been developed by the Street Lighting Section and these relate to illuminated traffic signs & bollards.

These schemes, which have been subject to a previous Cabinet report, will generate a carbon saving of 113 tonnes and 79 tonnes per annum respectively. Whilst this will assist the Council in its carbon saving targets, it will not present any 'cashable' carbon cost savings due to the Council currently having a passive energy supply (as opposed to a dynamic supply).

Schemes Outline Timescale

February 2012 – Schemes approvals

- Ensure energy compliance codes are obtained for units proposed
- Order of LED units – specialist suppliers

March 2012 – July 2012 - Implementation

- Co-ordinated delivery and asset inventory
- Ensure change is registered with energy supplier.

August 2012 – Completion

- Update asset register
- Quality checks on installation
- Review future reduced maintenance strategy

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex K

(As 2nd February 2012 Cabinet Report)

Landscape Services Change Proposals

Purpose/Summary

As Members are aware extensive consultation has been undertaken in order to provide an evidence base of the needs and views of the local communities, together with other data and information relating to the relevant service areas. This part of the report contains further options which relate to the services provided via Street Scene by the following sections; Parks & Green Spaces and Coast & Countryside on which consultation is complete. These options are identified as potentially having complex and far reaching impacts either across all the community or on the most vulnerable.

The options have been amended in the light of the consultation, further analysis and risk assessment and are now presented to Cabinet to give Members the opportunity to carefully consider the information available at this stage.

Recommendation(s)

Cabinet is recommended to:

- a) note and take into account the key messages identified from the results of the consultation
- b) give careful consideration to these proposals
- c) identify any further information required by Members for consideration at the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 in order to inform their recommendation to 1st March 2012 Council based on an understanding of local need
- d) at the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 give further regard to the information contained in this report and any additional information provided and agree which of these proposals, if any, it will recommend for approval by Council
- e) to note that at the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 Members will be authorise officers to prepare for implementation immediately should Members determine to proceed with the option. Such preparation will include the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notifications, (subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions) subject to final decisions of Council.

Implications:

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

Legal LD

The statutory basis for each aspect of these services is set out in the individual annexes.

Human Resources

The staffing implications for each of the options are identified in the Annexes to this report, where relevant.

Regular consultation on proposed changes will continue with the trade unions and employees will be informed of developments by their respective Service Directors. Employees within service areas are aware that their status may change subject to the outcome of these reviews.

Equality See Section 3

The Corporate Commissioning Team holds the responsibility for taking an overview on Equality Analysis Reports and assessing the impact of decisions. These will be published on the Council website.

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

In relation to compliance with the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, Members need to make decisions in an open minded balanced way showing due regard to the impact of the recommendations being presented. Members need to have a full understanding of any risks in terms of people with protected characteristics and any mitigation that has been put in place. Equality Impact Assessments, including consultation, provide a clear process to demonstrate that Cabinet and Council have consciously shown due regard and complied with the duty.

Impact on Service Delivery:

The impact on service delivery of each change proposal is stated in each Annex (B to H) of this report.

What consultations have taken place on the proposals and when?

Regular and ongoing consultations have taken place with Strategic Directors, Director of Street Scene, Director of Older People, Director of Commissioning, Head of Personnel, Head of Corporate Finance & ICT, Head of Legal Services and Trade Unions.

The approach to consultation involving public, service users and all key stakeholders relevant to each specific proposal was approved by the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel on 21st October 2011

Are there any other options available for consideration?

No, the Council is responsible for ensuring that the land concerned is managed appropriately in order to fulfil its responsibilities.

Contact Officers:

Jan McMahon, Head of Transformation Services
 Tel: 0151 934 4431
 Email: jan.mcmahon@sefton.gov.uk

For Equality Analysis Report information
 Sue Holden
 Tel: 0151 934 4722
 Email: sue.holden@sefton.gov.uk

For consultation feedback information
 Mike King
 Tel: 0151 934 2456
 Email: michael.king@sefton.gov.uk

Introduction

1.1 An initial package of change proposals was considered by Cabinet on 13th October 2011. Cabinet approved a consultation and engagement exercise in relation to a number of these change proposals. In relation to these, consultation activity with service users, the general public, partners, key stakeholders, staff and Trade Unions is now complete. As part of this package the following related to a number of activities associated with Landscape Services

Ref	Service Area	Option
E4.5	Parks and Green Spaces	Reductions in the standard of management and maintenance of parks and green spaces Changes in the style of management and general appearance of parks and green spaces Reorganisation of service
E 4.6	Parks and Green Spaces	Recharge formal sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities at pavilions, allotment sites etc
E 4.7	Parks and Green Spaces	Recharge formal sports users the costs of grounds maintenance to provide formal facilities
E 4.8	Parks and Green Spaces	Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park
E 4.10	Parks and Green Spaces	Cessation of Park Ranger functions
E4.11	Coast and Countryside Service/ Parks and Green Spaces	Merger of Parks & Coastal Rangers
E4.12	Coast and Countryside Service	Reduction to site and visitor management activities

- 1.2 The proposal to cease the supply of hanging baskets is now being considered as one of the low/medium impact options. Full details are not included in this report and appear in Part A of the Transformation Programme Report.
- 1.3 This report seeks to provide feedback from the consultation exercise for consideration by the Council prior to making decisions on specific change proposals which may impact upon the final 2012/13 budget. This is included as a separate section under each of the proposals.
- 1.4 Members are asked to identify any further information required for consideration at the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 in order to inform their recommendation to 1st March 2012 Council based on an understanding of local need.
- 1.5 In December 2010 Council prioritised the associated services. . However in January 2012, Cabinet recommended to Council that the category for specific services be changed to reflect the current position and actual service delivery at this time. Descriptions of the services covered under the Landscape Services change proposals are contained in Annex A (within Annex K).

2. Change Proposals Options

- 2.1 Detailed change proposals are contained in the following annexes. They were identified following brief reviews of the services provided by these sections during 2011.
 - Annex B – Reduction in the standard of management and maintenance of parks and green spaces
 - Annex C – Recharge formal sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities at pavilions, allotment sites etc
 - Annex D – Recharge formal sports users the costs of grounds maintenance to provide formal facilities
 - Annex E – Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park
 - Annex F – Cessation of Park Ranger functions
 - Annex G – Merger of Parks & Coastal Rangers
 - Annex H – Reduction to Coast and Countryside site and visitor management activities

3 Consultation and Engagement Overview

- 3.1 The Department's approach to consultation was agreed by the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel on 21st October 2011. The approach included using e-Consult online questionnaires, paper questionnaires, public meetings, meetings with various interest groups, and groups belonging to the Community Empowerment Network (CEN).
- 3.2 A full consultation of residents, service users and interest groups was carried out by the Department between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012.

The results of the consultation are contained within the aforementioned annexes B to H inclusive.

- 3.3 Cabinet is asked to consider the consultation feedback as part of the decision making process.

4. Risk Management

- 4.1 Risks and mitigating actions are contained in the annexes B to H. Cabinet is asked to note the risks associated with each change proposal and to consider the impacts that will arise for any of these proposals that are subsequently approved.

- 1.2 Cabinet is asked to note the mitigating actions, including those identified in the equality analysis reports that will be implemented in relation to each change proposal, if approved.

5. The Options for Consideration and Conclusion

- 5.1 The financial impact for each individual option is outlined in Annexes B-H inclusive. Some of the options can be taken independently of each other (i.e. E4.6, E4.7, E4.8, and E4.9) whereas the others cannot (i.e. E4.5, E4.10, E4.11, and E4.12), as they are linked.

- 5.2 For example, cessation of the Park Ranger Service (E4.10) and the merger of the ranger functions (E4.11) are not independent of each other and will impact on the savings to be achieved in E4.5 (general reduction in standards). This is because greater operational costs may be incurred to deal with the effects of vandalism, anti-social behaviour, and a reduction in volunteer support due to the lack of rangers.

- 5.3 A similar situation arises with E4.11 (merger of the ranger functions) and E4.12 (Coast and Countryside – general reductions in site and visitor management)

- 5.4 The following table summarises which of the options are stand-alone and those which are interdependent:

	Change Proposal	Total saving		Comment
		2012/13	2013/14	
E4.6	Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities	£59,000		This option can be considered as a stand-alone decision.
E4.7	Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance	£61,000	£50,000	This option can be considered as a stand-alone decision.
E4.8	Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park	£50,000		This option can be considered as a stand-alone decision.

	Change Proposal	Total saving		Comment
		2012/13	2013/14	
E.4.5	General Reduction in Parks Management and Maintenance Standards	£380,000	£330,000	<p>These change proposals are linked and are interdependent on each other. They are based on a model of parks / coast management that recognises the interrelationship between managing park, coast and countryside users, and the quality of infrastructure and standard of grounds maintenance. For example, if parks /coast infrastructure is poorer and grounds maintenance is lower, then more interaction is needed with users to deter anti-social behaviour and the perceived fear of crime.</p> <p>It is proposed to re-engineer the Parks and Green Spaces Service and Coast and Countryside Service in order to achieve the phased savings as shown. The details of the savings are to be agreed with the Cabinet Member Leisure and Tourism</p>
E4.10	Cessation of Park Ranger Functions			
E4.11	Merger of Parks and Coastal Ranger functions			
E4.12	Coast and Countryside Site and Visitor Management			
	Total if all options approved	£580,000	£380,000	

5.5 As a result of the interdependencies, the consultation exercises, and in mitigation of the equality analysis reports , the Parks and Green Spaces Service and Coast and Countryside Service can be re-engineered, in order to achieve a saving of £380,000 in 2012/13 and £330,000 in 2013/14 (subject to the extension of the Grounds Maintenance contracts). The details of the savings are to be agreed with the Cabinet Member Leisure and Tourism.

5.6 It was acknowledged, during the review process, that some of the options identified are likely to have a detrimental impact on other aspects of the service if a reduction or cessation is approved. This is because the Parks & Green Spaces section and the Coast & Countryside section use an integrated approach to land-management/service delivery.

5.7 Cabinet is asked to consider the outcome of the consultation exercise, the mitigating actions identified via assessments and suggestions offered by participants.

6. Conclusion

6.1 It is clear from the consultation exercise that none of the options consulted upon are supported. This is because they represent a reduction in the overall level of service provided or have direct financial implications for individuals/groups that use these services. Whilst it is accepted and acknowledged that, if approved, these options do have associated risks and impacts, it is likely that these can, to a limited degree, be mitigated via the actions identified within this report.

6.2 At the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 a decision will be required as to which of these options should be recommended to 1st March 2012 Council based on an understanding of local need for approval.

Part B Annex A

Service Descriptions

Parks and Greenspaces

The services delivered by Parks and Green Spaces Services are as follows:

Introduction

The Parks and Green Spaces Service manages the following:

- Parks and Green Spaces (262)
- Playgrounds (50)
- Golf Courses (2)
- 90,000 trees (including street trees)
- Bowling Greens (18)
- Sports pitches (79) (football and rugby)
- Allotment sites (14)

There are an estimated 12 million visits to parks in Sefton per annum, based on the scale and popularity of parks listed in the Parks and Green Spaces Asset Management Strategy. The service has achieved many nationally recognised benchmarks for quality and performance, including 7 Greens Flags for parks in 2011/12, RoSPA Playground Safety Accreditation, and APSE Service Team of the Year finalists (2009/10/11) and the Green Apple Award for environmental sustainability.

Parks Management

The basic level of Park Management needs to address the following factors:

- Large area of land (788 hectares) in urban areas, spread throughout the Borough;
- Unsupervised, no permanent site staff presence,

- Areas of high deprivation, with Sefton ranked as 92nd most deprived authority out of the 326 English local authorities in the Government's Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010
- Vulnerable to ASB and becoming hot-spots of crime which can affect the well-being of the wider community.
- Unable to close parks as most have permissive rights of way through them; Duty of Care under Occupiers Liability legislation and common law duties to manage in a safe condition, to meet minimum legal requirements.
- Complex management of hard and soft landscape and park users.

There are 4 main areas of Park Management:

- Soft Infrastructure
- Hard Infrastructure
- User Management
- Service Co-ordination & Development

In order to successfully manage parks, each of these elements needs to be resourced. Elements are all inter-connected: changing / reducing one element will affect the others, and the overall end product

Regular maintenance (grass, shrubs, bedding, litter picking, cleansing etc) is carried out through the Grounds Management contract; tree maintenance is carried out through the Arboriculture contract; other work to hard infrastructure (paths, buildings, railings, play areas etc) is procured from various contractors via the Repairs and Maintenance budgets.

User Management is mainly carried out by the Parks Ranger Service. These are the only Front-line staff in parks apart from Contractors' staff (which will be significantly reduced should major savings be made from the Grounds Management contract).

Sports Facilities and Allotments

As part of its wider integrated responsibilities, the Parks and Green Spaces Service also manages several 'paid-for' facilities which are managed for the exclusive use of certain users or groups of users. The total number of users is approximately 7,500. This is effectively providing for people's hobbies or past-times, unlike the wider park facilities which are open to everyone. Although this is a small element of the total service, it is appropriate that it is considered separately.

The 'paid-for' facilities include:

- Formal Football pitches (adult and Junior)
- Cricket wickets
- Formal Rugby pitches (adult and Junior)
- Bowling greens
- Croquet lawns
- Allotment sites

There are currently a number of costs associated with these facilities and their associated pavilions / changing rooms, which include:

- Utilities costs (e.g. power and water for showers, heating and electricity for pavilions, water for allotment sites)
- Grounds maintenance costs (fine turf management, marking out, pitch reinstatement, watering, goal post management etc)
- Repairs and maintenance (relating to pavilions, fencing, parking etc)
- Officer time and administration costs (day to day liaison with user groups, management agreements, leases etc)

The current income to the Council from FEES AND CHARGES for these services is only £65K.

The total spent on just UTILITIES and GROUNDS MAINTENANCE to service these facilities is over £280k.

Botanic Gardens / Hesketh Park

As part of its wider integrated responsibilities, the Parks and Green Spaces Service also has a dedicated team to manage various facilities at Botanic Gardens, and the conservatory at Hesketh Park. Although this is a small element of the total service, it is appropriate that it is considered separately.

The Plant Nursery at Botanic Gardens formerly supplied all the bedding plant material for the Council, and supplied and maintained hanging baskets. As part of the 2011/12 savings, these elements were outsourced, and 7 posts deleted.

Some functions were retained in-house:

- Managing and maintaining the Aviary and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and the Conservatory at Hesketh Park
- Growing plants for and operating a Nursery Shop at Botanic Gardens, which provides an income for the Council.

The net cost to the Council for providing this service is approximately £50,000

Hanging Baskets

In addition to the main functions of the Parks and Greenspace Service, it also provides and maintains hanging baskets which are installed at strategic points around the Borough (mainly the shopping centre areas). As this is a small element of the total service (and unconnected with the main function of the Service), it is appropriate that it is considered separately.

There are currently 556 hanging baskets supplied at strategic locations around the Borough, which are paid for by the Council. In addition, other agencies / organisations choose to sponsor hanging baskets in other locations, which the Council procures and maintains on a charged-for basis (74 in 2011/12).

Park Rangers

The Park Rangers in Sefton are the only Council front-line staff operating in the Borough's parks, open spaces. Their functions are as follows:

- To manage users across 260 urban parks and green spaces (788 hectares)
- To work pro-actively with other agencies (Police, PCSOs, Sefton Security, Community Safety), in helping to deter vandalism and anti-social behaviour by engaging the local community, and promoting proper use of the Borough's parks, and open spaces.
- To liaise with the local community and volunteers Friends of... groups to encourage a greater number and diversity of people to use the Borough's parks and open spaces.
- To provide a visible 'meet and greet' style of presence and to act as the key point of contact on sites.
- To lead on the delivery of a programme of events and activities to widen the user audience.
- Work pro-actively with volunteers Friends of and other groups to promote and facilitate voluntary work in Borough's parks and open spaces
- Liaise with other staff to carry out minor improvements and maintenance operations on sites especially with voluntary helpers
- Lead on enforcement of byelaws and responsible park use e.g. dog fouling, litter etc
- Education, especially of young people, to encourage future respect for Borough's parks and open spaces

Coast and Countryside Service

The services delivered by Coast and Countryside Service are as follows:

The Coast and Countryside Service is responsible for visitor and land management of the Coast and Rimrose Valley Country Park. This includes areas of international, national, regional and local importance for nature conservation and tourism. The service is responsible for managing visitors and addressing anti-social behaviour. Removing sand from promenades at Crosby and Southport and maintaining other points to the beach accessible, clearing litter from beaches and for controlling beach car parking at Southport, Ainsdale and Formby. The Coast & Countryside service also deals with the Council's responsibilities to bring nature conservation areas into 'favourable status' to meet government targets.

The Council is responsible for coastal areas spanning 39 kilometres.

The length of coastline in Council ownership is 22.5k, 10.5k of the coastline is classified as amenity/resort beach

Sefton Council is the largest landowner on the coastal area; including the foreshore, Rimrose Valley Country Park and other areas the total area of responsibility for this service is 5,968 hectares. For comparison, the Borough of Sefton as a whole is 15,210 hectares.

- Manage 3 local nature reserves, 4 tourist beaches along 21 k of coastline (5,968 hectares)
- To work pro-actively with other agencies (Police, PCSOs, Sefton Security, Community Safety, Fire Service), in helping to deter vandalism and anti-social behaviour by engaging the local community, and promoting proper use of the coast and countryside. It also includes working with other emergency services and their declared facilities, including the Coastguard, RNLI and Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authority in the management of incidents such as cockling, emergency planning - oil pollution and fires
- To liaise with the local community and volunteers Friends of and other groups to encourage a greater number and diversity of people to use the Borough's coast and countryside.
- To provide a visible 'meet and greet' style of presence and to act as the key point of contact on sites.
- To lead on the delivery of a programme of events and activities to widen the user audience.
- Work pro-actively with volunteers and other groups to promote and facilitate voluntary work in coast and countryside
- Work as part of the coast and countryside team staff to carry all maintenance and improvements
- Enforcement of byelaws and environmental legislation to encourage responsible use of coast and countryside; dog fouling, litter etc
- Education, especially of young people, to encourage future respect for Borough's coast and countryside

The successful Biodiversity and Access Project is part of the Coast and Countryside Service. The nature of its full integration into the service allows increases the places available for adult with learning disabilities, young people excluded from education, training and employment, apprentices and unemployed schemes.

The Coast and Countryside Service are responsible for the management of the Sefton Coast Landscape Partnership Scheme Heritage Lottery project. A community based access and volunteer project.

The Coast and Countryside Service also manages the rural rights of way network on behalf of the Council, utilising volunteers, unemployed and its inclusion project to carry out this work. It is anticipated the cost will increase significantly if this work has to be carried out by external contractors.

The service carries out reduced work with schools and colleges following the 2011/12 budget reductions. All direct working with local mainstream schools stopped from April 2011, the Natterjack Club (young naturalists out of school scheme) ceased and the guided walks and events programme was not organised and published for the first time in 20 years in 2011. A major reduction in community, volunteer engagement and involvement of young people has already occurred.

The service reduction for 2011/12, which included 6 key posts, is already resulting in a lack of cover at key sites, with no anti-social behaviour deterrence and byelaw enforcement there is a related increase in anti-social behaviour.

Volunteers are being left in a vulnerable position and have indicated their concerns. Any future desire to increase volunteer participation will be difficult as volunteers are fearful of working on sites where staff resources have been removed or reduced; especially on sites that attract large numbers of visitors and have potential for increased crime anti-social behaviour at key sites.

The Coast and Countryside Service is responsible for responding to coastal emergencies and during the last year has had to deal with issues relating to cockling and oil pollution which proved difficult due to the limited resources that are now available following last years approved budgetary reduction.

Following the 2011 budget reduction there has also been a decrease in community and volunteer engagement and involvement of young people; all direct involvement with mainstream schools ceased from April 2011. The Natterjack Club (young naturalists stopped operating and the guided walks and events programme was not organised and published for the first time in 20 years.

The service, aware of the implications of the approved budget reduction has now established an apprenticeship scheme, concentrating on litter management and an employment scheme, centred on estate maintenance. This has helped, to limited degree, to address the shortfall in resource available to deal with such issues at peak times of the year.

Both volunteers and apprentices rely on experienced staff to lead and organise their activities and therefore the effective use of such temporary resource is governed by the capacity of the permanent workforce.

Part B Annex B

E4.5 General Reduction in Parks Management and Maintenance Standards

Change Proposal

Service Description: General Reduction in Parks Management and Maintenance Standards (Parks and Greenspaces Service Review – Option 1)

Consultation has closed on the following option

Significant reductions in the standard of management and maintenance of parks and green spaces

- Changes in the style of management and general appearance of parks and green spaces, to meet the constraints of the reduced budgets
- Reorganisation of service

N.B. These Change Proposals flow from the Review of the Parks and Greenspaces Service

Original Rationale for service change proposal – To achieve a highly significant level of savings overall, and try to minimise the effect on the wider Sefton community as much as possible.

Legislation Considered **Occupiers' Liability** legislation and common law duties. Failure to maintain Council owned land to a reasonable standard could lead to additional claims against the Council's insurance and or prosecution. These proposals seek to reduce but to provide adequate maintenance.

Anticipated Impact of Service Change –

Service Users –

Park users will experience a significant decline in the standards of park maintenance, and a change in the style / character of parks, towards a rougher, less managed and wilder type of landscape. There will be fewer facilities available as smaller play areas, ornamental gardens, etc are removed.

Making such significant savings from the budgets and reducing maintenance standards will increase the incidents of vandalism and anti-social behaviour, and make the parks feel less safe, with a consequential reduction in the number of park users.

Partners –

The current grounds maintenance contracts are 'Partnership' style contracts, where the contractor works with the Council to achieve joint aims. Reductions in the size of the contract will have a significant impact on the contractors operation, and require redundancies in their workforce.

Council -

- 2 redundancies and deletion of 4 currently vacant posts.
- Significant reductions in the value of contracted services will affect staffing levels when the contract is renegotiated / re-tendered, requiring redundancies to be made in the workforce of the Grounds Management Partner / Contractor. This may have a financial implication for the Council under TUPE regulations.

- Slower responses to problems and issues, less flexibility; more reactive and less pro-active management.
- No new Green Flag applications for parks in near future. Current Green Flags to be reviewed with revised budgets and lower standards (may lose some of the existing GF awards)

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

See Consultation and Overview within this Annex

Equality Analysis – see Equality Analysis Report E4.5 within this Annex.

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce – Soft Landscape Management

Significant reduction to Parks Grounds Management and Parks Tree element of the Arboriculture contracts: this will require a change in the style of management in parks and a different appearance (wilder and less ornamental / maintained).

Substantial savings only achieved after re-tendering of Grounds Management contracts from 2013 onwards unless the Council and contractor agree to early renegotiation of contract.

Examples of the impacts of the reduced standards on parks and on users include:

- Most areas of annual bedding (flowers) removed, mostly grassed over
- Most ornamental shrubs, hedges, herbaceous borders and rose beds removed, remaining areas less managed
- Grassed areas longer and looking unkempt – no tidy edges, and may hide litter, glass and dog fouling
- Paths more dirty and littered: sweeping reduced to monthly, frequent flooding where drains get blocked
- Significant increase in litter and dog fouling left on site (unable to respond to seasonal/ high use/ incidents)
- No daily safety inspections of play areas (completely removed) – increased risk of accidents (fortnightly play area inspections to remain (10 working day) and this is considered to be appropriate in terms of managing risk.)
- Minimum tree management (all proactive budget removed): most trees unpruned or unmanaged and trees not replaced if they have to be removed.

This work is undertaken by contract and is contractually committed until April 2013. Limited level of savings only may possibly be secured for 2012/13 by agreement / negotiation with Contractor.

Hard Landscape Management

Reduction in standards of maintenance of hard infrastructure, e.g. footpaths, walls,

railings, furniture, play equipment etc.

Examples of the impacts include:

- Fewer repairs carried out
- Less cared-for appearance
- Increased vandalism
- Increased perception of park being unsafe, increased anti-social behaviour
- Longer response time to incidents of vandalism
- Increase in insurance claims
- Play equipment decommissioned and removed when badly damaged
- Smaller / older play areas closed

User Management

Reduction in the pro-active management of park users, by deleting activities and events budgets and summer fun days programme.

Examples of the impacts include:

- No council-funded activities or events in parks
- Summer fun days deleted, and no support for other groups to provide
- Reduced capacity to work with volunteers and Friends Groups, fewer volunteer hours
- Likely dramatic increase in complaints by users

Service Co-ordination and Management

Reduction in staffing levels involved with all the different aspects of parks management. Reorganisation of service and deletion of 6 posts.

Examples of the impacts include:

Slower response times to correspondence (currently deal with circa 1800 per month) and to requests for works to be undertaken

- Slower response to vandalism, graffiti, and general repairs
- Reduced ability to change/ amend sites to adapt to new maintenance regimes
- Loss of flexibility within service.
- Reduced capacity to deal with new issues as they arise (e.g. to contest new charges by utility companies etc)
- Land management issues

There would be staff placed at risk as a result of these proposals.

Suggested amendments following Consultation

- Most respondents (approx 92%) are **against** the change proposal
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Allow and promote more advertising and sponsorship in and around parks
 - Promote more volunteers
 - Retain a portion of event budget to match fund external events
- As a result of the consultation the following amendments to the proposals need to be considered:
 - Seek to prioritise dealing with dog-fouling, litter, vandalism
 - Seek to prioritise keeping paths clear to enable disabled access.
 - Determine the level of parks promotion / diversionary activities that can be provided via remaining resources.
 - Subject to outcome of change proposals to Ranger Service (E4.10, E4.11); prioritise Park Rangers to promote and co-ordinate further volunteer support for parks maintenance, to reduce anti-social behaviour, pro-active litter and dog-fouling campaigns.
 - Investigate potential part-restructure to generate resource to try and increase income from sponsorship, events and external funding.

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

Risk: Likely to be an increase in vandalism, anti-social behaviour and complaints about fewer front-line staff

Mitigating Action: Subject to outcome of change proposals to Ranger Service (E4.10, E4.11), focus Park Ranger Service on reducing anti-social behaviour; determine what, if any, resource can be used to support diversionary park activities.

Risk: Due to reduced quantities, re-tendering Grounds Maintenance contracts may increase rates and savings may be less than envisaged.

Mitigating Action: Explore feasibility of re-negotiating contracts.

Risk: Reduced maintenance may present access issues for disabled people.

Mitigating Action: Prioritise keeping paths clear; subject to available staff resources, encourage volunteer support and anti-litter / dog-fouling campaigns.

Cost of whole Parks & Greenspaces Service: £3.572M

Staffing: 20 staff (excl. management and admin, externally funded, Park Rangers and Botanic Gardens staff)

Other Resources:

Proposed Cost 2012/13: £3.252M*

Budget Reduction 2012/13: £320,000* (Additional saving in future years)

Council Staff at Risk: Yes

***N.B. Interdependency issue: Full savings cannot be realized if E4.10 / E4.11 taken, and savings profile would change**

Consultation and Engagement Overview

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
<p>e-Consult Feedback</p> <p>(Question responses = 516)</p>		<p>x</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 91.87% of respondents were against this proposal. • The majority of respondents were general parks users (38.1%) • The main concerns are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased anti social behaviour ○ Reduced safety for users ○ Increased litter and dog dirt/negative environmental impact <p>Examples of comments received from the public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the quality of the parks fall with the reduction of the grounds maintenance staff/gardeners the parks that Sefton are famous for will become a thing of the past and will never return, impacting further on the town's economy through lack of visitors • Less safe, more ASB and litter and dog fouling. Become more run down and less pleasant experience more vandalism and less respect for the area as a whole. • If the parks are allowed to run to seed and the planting neglected then I would have no pleasure in visiting the facilities and nor would day trippers etc. • The areas in my opinion are already borderline in respect of service levels and any further reductions would make them unpleasant and not fit for purpose • I have a young child I would not like her to play on unsafe park equipment and would be very concerned regarding litter and dog dirt not being disposed of as often • If they are untidy and unkempt I do not know what my children will come into contact with so would rather avoid • We live in a built up deprived area of our country – reduction in maintenance and standards would be a desperate blow to the upkeep of our local parks and coastal areas • I oppose any reduction in the park litter and dog dirt collection, and in grass cutting. A reduction in the frequency of grass cutting on the road verges, particularly the dual carriageway, would present savings.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
<p>In Bloom Forum Meeting</p> <p>(17 attendees/ 7 organisations)</p>		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents felt that a lot of the good work done would be lost if maintenance standards dropped. • Local Authorities don't put enough importance on environmental services; second only to Social services in their importance. • The 'broken window' syndrome shows that things will go downhill quickly if not maintained properly.
<p>Friends of Parks Forum</p> <p>(30 attendees/ 12 organisations)</p>		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friends will need to increasingly rely on the Council's insurance when organising events if there is no Council funding contribution (e.g. Brass Band concerts at Botanic Gardens).
<p>Mr I H F</p>		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the pace looks a dump it will soon become one. No doubt we volunteers will do more litter-picking ourselves, but only to augment a properly systematic council service, not replace it.
<p>Mr R M</p>		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a father's, and concerned resident's point of view, I fully understand savings and cutbacks are a necessity in the current economic climate. However, I would ask if the effects of reduced maintenance and activities in such areas have been considered carefully enough? And if the impact of these particular cutbacks have been incorporated into future forecasts of the cost of other services? • Just last week, there was broken glass in Ainsdale Park which was cleared away within a very short space of time. With reduced maintenance and general cleansing, it may be predicted that if such a problem was to be in situ for a considerable length of time, it could cause the necessity for people to require hospital or GP services if they were injured on the glass - thus costing more than the existing service of removing it more quickly. Also, if the green spaces and parks become less aesthetically pleasing and, in effect, repel residents and children from attending, which facilities are envisaged to be frequented more often? • Furthermore, our Prime Minister has expressed his idea of the 'big society' via the coalition government. I understand this idea is based upon the institutions of

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			marriage, family, the church and voluntary organisations. I would like to ask the consultation committee, how do the proposed reductions relating to park maintenance standards fit into the 'big society' idea?
<p>Sefton Access Forum/ABILITY</p> <p>(SAF = 16 attendees, ABILITY = 32 attendees)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised with regards to the reduction in overall park maintenance particularly around issues of safety. • It was felt that if there was a movement toward less formal gardens the safety of the public must still be paramount. Therefore the maintenance of any lighting, pathways and steps must still be maintained.
<p>Equal Voice</p> <p>(3 attendees)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a greater analysis of ethnicity and gender around parks and on the coast so that the potential impacts of these changes would be understood • There should be increased monitoring of anti social behaviour on the coast and in parks to compare period after any change is implemented with the current situation, to detect any increase in hate crime against minority communities • Greater use should be made of advertising to support income to the services • Community Payback Teams should be used in parks for parks maintenance
<p>Parents Forum</p> <p>(28 attendees/19 organisations)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely increase of anti-social behaviour, such as graffiti and dog fouling, resulting from a reduction in maintenance in, parks and green spaces • Potential loss of access to parks, through reduced park maintenance, especially for parents with buggies, the disabled, and older people • Cleanliness and safety in parks go together. • The parks are visited by local groups (e.g. children's centres – need to be kept up) • We will lose visitors to the parks and tourism • Concerns over dog fouling – everywhere particularly school sports fields • Could there be provisions in place on a voluntary basis (+ improving services)? • Look at sponsorship options for events in parks (i.e. launches, campaigns)

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
Young Advisers (17 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 83% were against this proposal Parks maintenance was identified as the Young Advisers' highest spending priority Volunteers to cut grass, fix equipment etc. Set up graffiti areas so that community has an outlet for graffiti ... this may help to reduce the amount of untidy graffiti covering park and playground surfaces.
Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens (Written response)	?	?	If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not "get out of the house" there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.
Telephone survey (303 respondents)		x	52% of respondents disagreed with the proposal and 39% agreed. (9% neither agreed or disagreed)

General Summary

- Most respondents are **against** the change proposal
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Allow and promote more advertising and sponsorship in and around parks
 - Promote more volunteers
 - Retain a portion of event budget to match fund external events
- As a result of the consultation the following mitigation/action needs to be considered:
 - Seek to prioritise dealing with dog-fouling, litter, vandalism
 - Determine the level of parks promotion / diversionary activities that can be provided via remaining resources.

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.5

Details of proposal:

The change proposals covered by this equality analysis are:

- E4.5 A general reduction in parks maintenance standards

This proposal will see the reduction of park maintenance, including:

- Significant reduction to Parks Grounds Management and Parks Tree element of the Arboriculture contracts
- Reductions in standards of maintenance of hard infrastructure, e.g. footpaths, walls, railings, furniture, play equipment etc.
- Reduction in the pro-active management of park users, by deleting activities and events budgets and summer fun days programme.
- Reduction in staffing levels involved with all the different aspects of parks management. Reorganisation of service and deletion of 6 posts.

The Parks and Green Spaces Service is a part of Landscape Services, and are located within the Street Scene Directorate. This Equality Analysis covers the above change proposals.

They provide a range of services to both the public and internally within the council:

Service	Provides
Parks and Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Parks & open spaces▪ Playgrounds▪ Grounds maintenance/ contract management▪ Trees and woodland management▪ Golf course provision▪ Outdoor sports pitches and bowling greens

Ramifications of Proposal:

E4.5 A general reduction in parks maintenance standards

The Parks service is responsible for the management of parks, playgrounds, sports pitches, bowling greens, golf courses and allotments; additionally it also manages street-side trees.

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': No

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': Yes

This proposal would result in a reduction in the resources available to carry out this work and to generally reduce maintenance standards. This would include cutting the grass less often and allowing parks to look less managed and wild, planting less flowers, removing ornamental planting such as annual bedding, rose beds etc, less litter picking / general cleansing and less frequent removal of dog dirt, removal (rather than replacement or repair) of Play equipment when badly damaged, not running activities in parks and an increase in response times to vandalism, graffiti, repairs and complaints.

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

Our consultation and research produced the following concerns/ issues:

People with Limited Mobility

Reduction in parks maintenance could lead to a build up of detritus, and delays to maintenance and repair of parks facilities (e.g. footpath repairs). This could have a disproportionate effect on wheelchair users and people with limited mobility, such as some older people, who may be prevented from gaining physical access to these areas. Those who use wheelchairs, or who have limited mobility, may be affected as the presence in parks may be reduced, so assistance would not be readily available to them should they need it.

Sefton Access Forum and ABILITY CEN identified the following issues:

- Concerns were raised with regards to the reduction in overall park maintenance particularly around issues of safety.

Mitigation:

- It was felt that if there was a movement toward less formal gardens the safety of the public must still be paramount. Therefore the maintenance of any lighting, pathways and steps must still be maintained.

Children and Younger People

Play equipment in children's play areas would not be replaced if damaged or beyond serviceable use, and smaller play areas may be closed and equipment removed if it becomes uneconomic to maintain them.

Parents Forum identified the following issues:

- Likely increase of anti-social behaviour, such as graffiti and dog fouling, resulting from a reduction in maintenance in, parks and green spaces
- Potential loss of access to parks, through reduced park maintenance, especially for parents with buggies, the disabled, and older people
- Cleanliness and safety in parks go together.
- The parks are visited by local groups (e.g. children's centres – need to be kept up)

Mitigation:

- It will be the case that some play facilities will be removed from some parks. We will seek to monitor the outcome of this. There will be play facilities provided at other venues
- We will seek to prioritise dealing with dog-fouling, litter, vandalism
- We will seek to determine the level of parks promotion / diversionary activities that can be provided via remaining resources.

Minority Communities

Equal Voice CEN identified the following issues:

- There should be increased monitoring of anti social behaviour on the coast and in parks to compare period after any change is implemented with the current situation, to detect any increase in hate crime against minority communities

Mitigation:

Access: It was felt that these comments have validity but the service could be provided acceptable level of access for disabled users.

Hate crime: there may be a rise of crime but the normal course of action would be to report it to the police. This has not changed. We will work with the police to monitor the situation as normal.

Consultation

Consultation took place between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012, and included the following groups:

- "In Bloom" groups
- Allotment users
- Bowlers
- Equal Voice CEN
- Football League Committees – north and south
- Formal sports pitch clubs and users
- Friends of Parks
- General Park users
- Parents Forum – north, central and south
- Public – via drop-in sessions and electronic questionnaires
- Sefton Access Forum CEN
- Sefton Croquet Club
- Sefton CVS
- Sefton Sports Council
- Southport Flower Show Ltd
- Young Advisers CEN

With regard to those with protected characteristics their views and concerns are reported above.

A full consultation report has been prepared and is available.

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

The possibility of targeting litter and detritus clearance at hot spots, and prioritising complaints from wheelchair users or people with mobility problems can be established.

Parks would be designed to allow for the natural growth of grass and trees in such a way that this would not interfere with disabled access or hinder those with limited movement.

We will work with partners to identify hate crime/vandalism.

Children's swings etc – will be removed from some parks but retained at the larger ones with the biggest catchment area.

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

1. Identify work programme to make changes
2. Notify local community of time table for changes and alternative venues/sites
3. Work with partners (e.g. police) to try to identify / reduce hate crime / vandalism (subject to available staff resources / Park Rangers).

Part B Annex C

E4.6 Service Description: Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities at pavilions, changing rooms and allotments

Change Proposal

Service Description: Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities at pavilions, changing rooms and allotments (Parks and Greenspaces Service Review – Option 2)

Categorisation: Critical, Frontline, Regulatory, Other

Consultation has closed on the following option

Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities at pavilions, changing rooms and allotments. Juniors (under 16s) to be exempt from these charges. Recharges at individual locations to be directly related to consumption.

(N.B. This change proposal flows from the Review of the Parks and Greenspaces Service and should be read in conjunction with other Parks & Greenspaces Service review options)

Original Rationale for service change proposal – To achieve a highly significant level of savings overall, and try to minimise the effect on the wider Sefton community as much as possible.

Those who have more ‘exclusive’ use of facilities will therefore pay for these directly, rather than general park users.

Legislation Considered None

Anticipated Impact of Service Change –

Service Users – Service users will have to pay for utility costs on top of the current fees and charges. The scale of this will depend on the consumption by the users at the different facilities.

Having direct responsibility for utility costs will encourage the users to reduce consumption and conserve energy and water. There is a possibility that paying for utility costs will deter some users and cause a downturn in sports participation, with associated wider health issues.

Partners - Income from facilities is in many cases obtained via management agreements with Leagues, Allotment Associations, Bowling Clubs etc. These partners would need to be involved in the agreements and management of the utility 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 would need to be drawn up with users / user groups to ensure that the payment of utility charges was formally agreed.

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

See the Consultation and Engagement Overview within this Annex

Equality Analysis– see Equality Analysis Reports within this Annex.

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –

All users of 'paid for' leisure facilities (indicated above) to pay for all the utilities they use (i.e. electricity, gas, water and drainage charges for pavilions, changing rooms and allotment sites) in addition to existing fees and charges.

Costs will be calculated at each facility, either by using meters, or based on previous year's consumption as shown on Utility bills. The users of each facility will be responsible for their own costs.

The table below summarises the anticipated average cost to the users (in addition to existing fees and charges).

	No of facilities	Approx. number of users (2010/11)	Current approx average income to the Council per user (existing)	Likely approx average payment to Council per user (including utility costs) i.e. this proposal	Likely approx average payment to Council per user (including utility charges and grounds maintenance costs) (as E4.7)
			See note 1	See note 1	See note 1
Football pitches (adult see note 3):	49	2,500	£5.41 per year per user £0.14 per week per user (over 38 week season)	£11.60 per year per user £0.31 per week per user (over 38 week season)	£38.20 per year per user £1.01 per week per user (over 38 week season)
Cricket wickets (adult – see note 3)	2	150	£2.29 per year per user £0.10 per week per user (over 24 week season)	As existing (currently no utilities provided)	£78.33 per year per user £3.26 per week per user (over 24 week season)
Rugby pitches (adult – see note 3)	2	35	£16.53 per year per user £0.44 per week per	As existing (currently no utilities provided)	£113.57 per year per user £2.99 per week per user

			user (over 38 week season)		(over 38 week season)
Bowling greens:	18	1,000	£7.88 per year per user £0.23 per week per user (over 34 week season)	£42.90 per year per user £1.26 per week per user (over 34 week season)	£119.00 per year per user * £3.53 per week * (over 34 week season)
Croquet lawns:	2 (9 courts)	100	£14.04 per year per user £0.41 per week per user (over 26 week season)	As existing (currently no utilities provided)	£118 per year per user £3.47 per week per user (over 34 week season)
Allotment sites:	13	1,000	£27.00 per year per user £0.52 per week per user	£61.00 per year per user £1.17 per week per user	£61.00 per year per user £1.17 per week per user

Note 1. In most instances the relationship with individual users is via agreements with sports leagues / allotment associations. The fees/charges levied on individual users by sports leagues /allotment associations may be higher than quoted above to cover their other costs and aspirations. If these arrangements are agreed it will be necessary to complete new legal agreements with the various users.

Note 2: The approximate average future payments indicated above are based on retaining the existing number of users. Significant reductions in users would mean higher costs or closure of facilities.

Note 3. Junior sport is not listed above, as it is proposed not to increase charges for juniors

* a subsidy could be applied to the recharges for bowling as this sport, which has additional benefits in relation to park use, is generally played by older people and it may be considered inappropriate to pass on the full cost.

Suggested amendments following Consultation

- Most respondents (approx 76%) are **against** the change proposal
- The majority of those against the proposals are sports users
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Charge juniors as well as adults (either in addition to, or within, the current proposal)
 - Subsidise older people / bowlers
- As a result of the consultation the following mitigation/action needs to be considered:
 - Should juniors be charged, in addition to adults

- Should any subsidies/concessions apply

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

Risk: Increased costs may cause individuals and groups of users to stop using the facilities

Mitigating Action: Members to consider if any subsidies / concessions should apply

Risk: a number of facilities may close down due to lack of use

Mitigating Action: Subject to staff resources, officers to work closely with sports user groups to look at rationalisation of facilities. Users will be encouraged to reduce consumption of utilities.

Cost of utilities for sports / allotment users: £70k

Staffing: N/A

Other Resources:

Proposed Cost 2012/13: 11K

Budget Reduction 2012/13: 59K

Council Staff at Risk: No

Consultation and Engagement Overview

During the consultation process E4.6 and E4.7 were consulted on simultaneously.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
e-Consult Feedback (Question responses: Option 1 = 402 Option 2 = 378 Option 3 = 356)		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 (charge for utilities): 76.12% are against this proposal • Option 2 (charge for grounds maintenance): 87.03% are against this proposal • Option 3 (charge for both): 89.04% are against this proposal. • The majority of respondents to these questions were formal sports users (66.4%) <p>Examples of comments received from the public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would support the recharge proposals for bowls IF they included a limitation in respect of grounds maintenance of 50% of the costs.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Botanic bowling club is of vital importance to the health and well being of its 200+ members. This is a very important source of exercise fresh air and socialization, not only for the older members of the community but also the younger members to. This mix of people forms strong bonds across age ranges and abilities which can only be a good building block for the future of our community. Whilst it is accepted that in these difficult times we all have to accept a little pain, I feel very strongly that if to heavy a financial burden is placed on the bowling club many members will not be able to afford to continue. For the older members who have contributed for countless years to the coffers of Sefton council via council tax this would be a bitter blow. Without this exercise, fresh air and socialization it is likely that many people will become more dependent on other social services supplied by Sefton Council costing significantly more in the long run. I would ask the Council to think long and hard before imposing any draconian increase in charges to the Botanic bowling club and think of this more in terms of an investment in the health and well-being of the community. • Proposed increases for all, at this unstable economic time is unfair for all concerned, we appreciate we have to tighten belts but so many peoples health and wellbeing will be sorely affected by such huge increases • The proposed increase in fees from £400 to approx £1,400 per season half pitch would undoubtedly lead to our club folding as we are a self-sufficiently run club without a sponsor • This is a criminal attack on grass root sports in the Sefton area, is totally unjustifiable and will lead to much short term disgruntlement and long term health and well being issues. We will do all in our power to oppose the council's proposals because football is out national sport and needs to exist from top to bottom. • The implementing of the increased costs would close our football team down. St Georges none of my players would be able

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>to afford to play as most of them at our university some unemployed and some with part time jobs. So one of the few enjoyments they young players look forward too would be taken away from them. Football keeps young men on the straight and narrow and teaches respect for others. Ridiculous proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would hope that any extra costs for allotment holders would be pro rata for the size of allotment. As a new allotment holder I pay £26.50 for 1/2 allotment. A full holder paid £31 this is a considerable increase I would hope that water charges for 1/2 allotment holders would be only half that of a full holder I also think allotment holders would be asked to reduce the use of water. It is known for some to leave hoses or sprinklers on for hours (especially those with homes backing on the allotments). More revenue could possibly be made by asking some of the full owners to relinquish half. As can be seen several allotments are not fully cultivated a lot left fallow • 1) Water wastage - The use of hoses is necessary as carrying water from the taps is physically too demanding for some members. Most wastage occurs when hoses and sprinklers are left running. Allowing only hand held hosepipe watering would minimise wastage and reduce costs 2) Council should be made more pro-active in insisting on size reduction (i.e. 250 yds - 125 sq yds) where standards of cultivation/maintenance do not meet required standards - This would produce higher revenue due to the rental costs per sq yds of the smaller units 3) Additional rent to cover water and costs should be proportional to the size of the allotment i.e. water usage for 125sq yd plot will be 1/2 of that required for a 250 sq yd unit. • Southport Croquet Club already pays for all their own utilities - water, electric, gas, etc. We also pay for a grounds man of our own. We have a lot of elderly members and as well as providing them with a mild form of exercise in the open air, we act as a support and social network for them. If the fees go up to the proposed rate, many of

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>them will not be able to maintain their membership. I will struggle to do so. The club will fold.</p>
<p>In Bloom Forum Meeting (17 attendees/7 organisations)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for charging sports users and allotment holders. Contributing something would make people appreciate the value of it.
<p>Friends of Parks Forum (30 attendees/ 12 organisations)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for proposals. • Proposed bowling charges (which represent a massive increase on existing charges) seem cheap. • Private lawn tennis Club and Bowling Club in Southport has comparable charges. • General feeling that 'pensioners should be protected' as well as juniors.
<p>Southport and District Amateur Football League</p>		✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are Sefton trying to eliminate all amateur sport in the area? Increase the pitch rents for Football by between 300% and 400% to such an amount that most of the clubs will have to fold. • If no Football was played on the Public parks, as appears to be the intention, not only would up to 1000 young men, many of whom are unemployed or at Higher Education be denied healthy exercise, but the Council would still have to maintain the Parks. The resultant savings would only amount to the marking out of pitches. • The facilities at the majority of the grounds are very basic and the League over the years has spent many thousand pounds to keep them at an acceptable level in addition to paying for pitch drainage and making a substantial contribution to new changing rooms at Portland Street. • If we only had to pay for the pitches we use, rather than those we don't use it would make more sense. • Do not protect junior sports • I confirm that if the proposals were adopted then the Southport and District Football League would fold.
<p>Liverpool County FA</p>		✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are concerned that the removal of all subsidy will discourage participation in football
<p>Botanic Gardens Bowling Club</p>		✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On behalf of my club, I welcome the suggestion under option E4.7 to limit the recharge to 50% the grounds maintenance costs

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
Hatton Hill Bowling Club		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implementation of proposals 1, 2, or 3 could mean the death knell of park bowls The bowlers are aware that they should take their share in the reductions proposed and that even a 100% increase in present costs, whilst not being desirable, would be acceptable in these exceptional circumstances
Mr I H F	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still cheap compared with the costs of most private clubs' membership
Mr L		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charges may be unlawful under the Allotments Acts
Mr B J		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would equate to a 213% increase in utility service!!!! Do you think this is fair or just? I do not use electricity – no requirement for this service I and a majority of other plot holders do not use these utilities The council should be encouraging more greener/efficient ways of recycling
Sefton Access Forum/ABILITY (SAF = 16 attendees, ABILITY = 32 attendees)	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal 3 [charge for utilities and grounds maintenance costs] was the most appropriate. This was only on the basis that the concessions mentioned within the proposal were extended to cover older people. If increased fees are introduced monitoring of possible reductions in uptake and usage are vital to assess any negative impact particularly on vulnerable groups such as older or disabled people who the services are vital in reducing social isolation and aiding physical activity.
Equal Voice (3 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general principle of people paying for what they use was agreed to, although older people with limited income should receive some form of concession for utility and grounds maintenance costs. Greater use should be made of advertising to support income to the services
Parents Forum (28 persons/19 organisations)	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed increases in charges are reasonable (for footballers) If it's something people like to do, maybe they should pay? Increasing charges – pleased that proposed charges do not apply to children. If you want to play, you should support it It is a hobby and a weekly charge is reasonable (£1 to £3)

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed savings is a LOT of money Increasing charges: charging for fitness facilities – would health suffer – because it tackles obesity – keep-fit clubs will suffer Allotment charges impact family food budget Increasing Charges: Sefton already has high levels of obesity – this could be worse Suggested consultation – speak to services users and sports groups Fixed rate for allotment holders on pensions Subsidies for older people with allotments Fundraising within sport (communities and clubs) Increasing Charges: Look at options for ownership of areas such as bowling greens Fundraising and donations – (£35 per year in some areas - £2 per week)
Young Advisers (17 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 78% were against this proposal This was identified as their third highest spending priority, after Parks maintenance and pool lifeguard cover (People Directorate proposal) Could look for sponsors involved in sport or gardening, for example footballers or horticultural society Could look for sporting charity or eco-friendly charity sponsors
Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens (Written response)	?	?	If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not “get out of the house” there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.
Telephone Survey (303 respondents)		x	48% of respondents disagreed with the proposal and 42% agreed. (10% neither agreed or disagreed)
General Summary			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most respondents are against the change proposal The majority of those against the proposals are sports users The following suggestions were received as alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charge juniors as well as adults (either in addition to, or within, the current proposal) Subsidise older people / bowlers Several clubs have expressed interest in maintaining their facilities 			

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An agreed lowering of the agreed maintenance specification to harvest alternative savings ● As a result of the consultation the following mitigation/action needs to be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should juniors be charged, in addition to adults ○ Should any subsidies/concessions apply 			

Impact Assessment

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.6 & 4.7

Details of proposal

The change proposals covered by this equality analysis are:

- E4.6 Recharging formal sports users and allotment users the cost of providing utilities at pavilions, allotment sites etc
- E4.7 Recharging formal sports users the costs of grounds maintenance

This will mean that the costs of utilities and/or grounds maintenance, either in part or in full, will be recovered from formal sports users and allotment holders as appropriate.

The Parks and Green Spaces Service is a part of Landscape Services, and are located within the Street Scene Directorate. This Equality Analysis covers the above separate change proposals.

They provide a range of services to both the public and internally within the council:

Service	Provides
Parks and Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parks & open spaces ▪ Playgrounds ▪ Grounds maintenance/ contract management ▪ Trees and woodland management ▪ Golf course provision ▪ Outdoor sports pitches and bowling greens

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

Sefton Council currently provides: 79 football and rugby pitches, 18 bowling greens, 2 cricket wickets, one croquet lawn. It also has overall responsibility for 14 allotment

sites. It receives a total income of £65,000, whilst the cost of providing these facilities for a small proportion of park users is around £350,000 per year. Currently the Council receives an average income of around £5.50 a year for each footballer, £8.00 for each bowler, and £27.00 for each allotment holder.

The increase to charges for formal sports users would mean:

- All users of formal sports facilities (except juniors) would pay for all electricity, gas, water and drainage, and charges for pavilions and changing rooms where provided. All allotment holders would pay the full utility costs for huts and water supply where provided. Or:
- All users of sports facilities, (except juniors) would pay for all grounds maintenance costs incurred in providing facilities (e.g. grass cutting marking out, renovation etc). Or:
- All users of sports facilities (except juniors) would pay for all grounds maintenance, electricity, gas, water and drainage, and charges for pavilions and changing rooms where provided. All allotment holders would pay the full utility costs for huts and water supply where provided

Mitigation:

This programme has been looked at extremely carefully and there are many good reasons why people participate in the activities – some related to health and wellbeing connected to issues such as age or disability.

It was felt in general that ‘children’ (because they are completely unwaged) may experience a disproportionate negative impact. As such, the current proposal will keep subsidies in place for junior users.

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

Our consultation and research produced the following

Older People

Demographically, most allotment holders are between the ages of 51-64, a rate over 13% higher than the Census 2001 figure, and nearly 30% are over retirement age. The number of males using this service is also over 13% higher than the percentage of males in Sefton. Anecdotally, it is a similar profile for people using bowling greens and croquet lawns. Therefore there may be a disproportionate effect on older males if charges are increased. In the current proposal, children and young people participating in junior leagues will be exempt from the price increase.

Sefton Access Forum and ABILITY CEN identified the following issues:

- If increased fees are introduced monitoring of possible reductions in uptake and usage are vital to assess any negative impact particularly on vulnerable groups such as older or disabled people who the services are vital in reducing social isolation and aiding physical activity.

Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens group identified the following issues:

- If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not “get out of the house” there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.”

However, whilst we agree that ‘activities’ are vital for well being, it was felt that those with a reasonable income would be expected to pay.

We would exempt children from charges and would have a mitigation programme in place if a disabled service user on extremely low income could show how the activity was linked to the treatment of the illness/disability.

Consultation

Consultation took place between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012, and included the following groups:

- “In Bloom” groups
- Allotment users
- Bowlers
- Equal Voice CEN
- Football League Committees – north and south
- Formal sports pitch clubs and users
- Friends of Parks
- General Park users
- Parents Forum – north, central and south
- Public – via drop-in sessions and electronic questionnaires
- Sefton Access Forum CEN
 - Sefton Croquet Club
 - Sefton CVS
 - Sefton Sports Council
 - Southport Flower Show Ltd
 - Young Advisers CEN

With regard to those with protected characteristics their views and concerns are reported above.

A full consultation report has been prepared and is available.

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

Yes: the service will be delivered in line with the equality act and we will have allowances to ensure those most at risk of a negative impact will be able to access service thus ‘advancing equality of opportunity.

It is currently planned that children and young people participating in junior leagues will be exempt from the price increase.

Officers will work with sports groups and allotment holders to help them reduce utility costs, by conserving water, reducing electricity use, and applying to utility companies for special concessionary schemes. They will also look at reducing grounds maintenance costs e.g. by reducing the specification, or assisting groups to maintain some of the facilities themselves.

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

- 1) Notify service users of new charges.
- 2) Establish mitigation process for junior users and disability
- 3) Work to reduce costs of services
- 4) Reschedule work patterns
- 5) Monitor

Part B Annex D

E4.7 Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance to provide outdoor sports facilities

Change Proposal

Service Description: Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance to provide outdoor sports facilities (Parks and Greenspaces Service Review – Option 3)

Categorisation: Critical, Frontline, Regulatory, Other

Consultation has closed on the following option

Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance to provide outdoor sports facilities

Original Rationale for service change proposal – To achieve a highly significant level of savings overall, and try to minimise the effect on the wider Sefton community as much as possible.

Those who have more ‘exclusive’ use of facilities (as opposed to general park users), will therefore pay more towards the costs of running these themselves.

Legislation Considered

Anticipated Impact of Service Change –

Service Users – Current use of facilities is heavily subsidised by the Council and users generally pay only a small proportion of the actual costs associated with their activity. Therefore the proposed increases in income will mean that users are paying significantly more for their sports / hobbies than they are currently.

This may cause a number of people to stop using the services, with associated wider health issues.

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 would need to be drawn up with users / user groups to ensure that the payment of increased charges is formally agreed.

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

See Consultation and Engagement Overview within this Annex.

Equality Analysis

See Equality Analysis Reports within this Annex

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken 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 associated with their use of the facilities.

Costs will be calculated from the costed bill of quantities in the Grounds Maintenance contract.

Bowling greens- as above, however consideration be given to part-subsidise users / user groups to offset the full cost of grounds maintenance associated with their use of the facilities.

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

The table below summarises the anticipated average cost to the users (including existing fees and charges and utilities costs).

	No of facilities	Approx. number of users (2010/11)	Current approx average income to the Council per user (existing)	Likely approx average payment to Council per user (including grounds maintenance) i.e. this proposal	Likely approx average payment to Council per user (including grounds maintenance costs and utility charges)
			See note 1	See note 1	See note 1
Football pitches (adult see Note 3):	49	2,500	£5.41 per year per user £0.14 per week per user (over 38 week season)	£32.00 per year per user £0.85 per week per user (over 38 week season)	£38.20 per year per user £1.01 per week per user (over 38 week season)
Cricket wickets (adult see note 3)	2	75	£2.29 per year per user £0.10 per week per	£78.33 per year £3.26 per week per user	£78.33 per year per user £3.26 per week per user

			user (over 24 week season)	(over 24 week season)	(over 24 week season)
Rugby pitches (adult see note 3)	2	35	£16.53 per year per user £0.44 per week per user (over 38 week season)	£113.57 per year per user £2.99 per week per user (over 38 week season)	£113.57 per year per user £2.99 per week per user (over 38 week season)
Bowling greens*:	18	1,000	£7.88 per year per user £0.30 per week per user (over 34 week season)	£84.90 per year per user £2.50 per week per user	£119.90 per year per user £3.53 per week ((over 34 week season)
Croquet lawns*:	2 (9 courts)	100	£14.04 per year per user £0.54 per week per user (over 34 week season)	£222 per year per user £6.53 per week per user (over 34 week season)	£222 per year per user £6.53 per week per user (over 34 week season)
Allotment sites:	13	1,000	£27.00 per year per user £0.52 per week per user	n/a (no grounds maintenance costs)	£61.00 per year per user £1.17 per week per user

Note 1: In most instances the relationship with individual users is via agreements with sports leagues / allotment associations. The fees/charges levied on individual users by sports leagues /allotment associations may be higher than this to cover their other costs and aspirations.

Note 2: The approximate average future payments indicated above are based on retaining the existing number of users. Significant reductions in users would mean higher costs or closure of facilities.

Note 3: junior sport is not listed above, as it is proposed not to increase charges for juniors

NB * Consideration be given to part-subsidising the GM costs to be recharged for

bowling and croquet for the reasons stated above.

Suggested amendments following Consultation

- Most respondents (approx 89%) are **against** the change proposal
- The majority of those against the proposals are sports users
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Charge juniors as well as adults (either in addition to, or within, the current proposal)
 - Subsidise older people / bowlers
 - Several clubs have expressed interest in maintaining their facilities
 - An agreed lowering of the agreed maintenance specification to harvest alternative savings
- As a result of the consultation the following mitigation/action needs to be considered:
 - Should juniors be charged, in addition to adults
 - Should any subsidies/concessions apply

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

Risk: Increased costs may cause individuals and groups of users to stop using the facilities

Mitigating Action: Members to consider if any subsidies / concessions should apply

Risk: a number of facilities may close down due to lack of use

Mitigating Action: Subject to staff resources, officers to work closely with sports user groups to look at rationalisation of facilities, and reduction in specification / costs.

Extra-over cost of grounds maintenance to provide outdoor sports facilities: £218.5K

Staffing: N/A

Other Resources:

Proposed Cost 2012/13: £157.5K

**Budget Reduction 2012/13: £61K
(Further saving in future years)**

Council Staff at Risk: No

Consultation and Engagement Overview

During the consultation process E4.6 and E4.7 were consulted on simultaneously.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
e-Consult Feedback (Question responses: Option 1 = 402 Option 2 = 378 Option 3 = 356)		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 (charge for utilities): 76.12% are against this proposal • Option 2 (charge for grounds maintenance): 87.03% are against this proposal • Option 3 (charge for both): 89.04% are against this proposal.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of respondents to these questions were formal sports users <p>Examples of comments received from the public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would support the recharge proposals for bowls IF they included a limitation in respect of grounds maintenance of 50% of the costs. • The Botanic bowling club is of vital importance to the health and well being of its 200+ members. This is a very important source of exercise fresh air and socialization, not only for the older members of the community but also the younger members to. This mix of people forms strong bonds across age ranges and abilities which can only be a good building block for the future of our community. Whilst it is accepted that in these difficult times we all have to accept a little pain, I feel very strongly that if to heavy a financial burden is placed on the bowling club many members will not be able to afford to continue. For the older members who have contributed for countless years to the coffers of Sefton council via council tax this would be a bitter blow. Without this exercise, fresh air and socialization it is likely that many people will become more dependent on other social services supplied by Sefton Council costing significantly more in the long run. I would ask the Council to think long and hard before imposing any draconian increase in charges to the Botanic bowling club and think of this more in terms of an investment in the health and well-being of the community. • Proposed increases for all, at this unstable economic time is unfair for all concerned, we appreciate we have to tighten belts but so many peoples health and wellbeing will be sorely affected by such huge increases • The proposed increase in fees from £400 to approx £1,400 per season half pitch would undoubtedly lead to our club folding as we are a self-sufficiently run club without a sponsor • This is a criminal attack on grass root sports in the Sefton area, is totally

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>unjustifiable and will lead to much short term disgruntlement and long term health and well being issues. We will do all in our power to oppose the council's proposals because football is our national sport and needs to exist from top to bottom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementing of the increased costs would close our football team down. St Georges none of my players would be able to afford to play as most of them at our university some unemployed and some with part time jobs. So one of the few enjoyments they young players look forward too would be taken away from them. Football keeps young men on the straight and narrow and teaches respect for others. Ridiculous proposals. • I would hope that any extra costs for allotment holders would be pro rata for the size of allotment. As a new allotment holder I pay £26.50 for 1/2 allotment. A full holder paid £31 this is a considerable increase I would hope that water charges for 1/2 allotment holders would be only half that of a full holder I also think allotment holders would be asked to reduce the use of water. It is known for some to leave hoses or sprinklers on for hours (especially those with homes backing on the allotments). More revenue could possibly be made by asking some of the full owners to relinquish half. As can be seen several allotments are not fully cultivated a lot left fallow • 1) Water wastage - The use of hoses is necessary as carrying water from the taps is physically too demanding for some members. Most wastage occurs when hoses and sprinklers are left running. Allowing only hand held hosepipe watering would minimise wastage and reduce costs 2) Council should be made more pro-active in insisting on size reduction (i.e. 250 yds - 125 sq yds) where standards of cultivation/maintenance do not meet required standards - This would produce higher revenue due to the rental costs per sq yds of the smaller units 3) Additional rent to cover water and costs should be proportional to the size of the allotment i.e. water usage for 125sq yd plot will be 1/2 of

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>that required for a 250 sq yd unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southport Croquet Club already pays for all their own utilities - water, electric, gas, etc. We also pay for a grounds man of our own. We have a lot of elderly members and as well as providing them with a mild form of exercise in the open air, we act as a support and social network for them. If the fees go up to the proposed rate, many of them will not be able to maintain their membership. I will struggle to do so. The club will fold.
<p>In Bloom Forum Meeting</p> <p>(17 attendees/7 organisations)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for charging sports users and allotment holders. Contributing something would make people appreciate the value of it.
<p>Friends of Parks Forum</p> <p>(30 attendees/ 12 organisations)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for proposals. • Proposed bowling charges (which represent a massive increase on existing charges) seem cheap. • Private lawn tennis Club and Bowling Club in Southport has comparable charges. • General feeling that 'pensioners should be protected' as well as juniors.
<p>Southport and District Amateur Football League</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are Sefton trying to eliminate all amateur sport in the area? Increase the pitch rents for Football by between 300% and 400% to such an amount that most of the clubs will have to fold. • If no Football was played on the Public parks, as appears to be the intention, not only would up to 1000 young men, many of whom are unemployed or at Higher Education be denied healthy exercise, but the Council would still have to maintain the Parks. The resultant savings would only amount to the marking out of pitches. • The facilities at the majority of the grounds are very basic and the League over the years has spent many thousand pounds to keep them at an acceptable level in addition to paying for pitch drainage and making a substantial contribution to new changing rooms at Portland Street. • If we only had to pay for the pitches we use, rather than those we don't use it would make more sense. • Do not protect junior sports • I confirm that if the proposals were adopted

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			then the Southport and District Football League would fold.
Liverpool County FA		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are concerned that the removal of all subsidy will discourage participation in football
Botanic Gardens Bowling Club		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On behalf of my club, I welcome the suggestion under option E4.7 to limit the recharge to 50% the grounds maintenance costs
Hatton Hill Bowling Club		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implementation of proposals 1, 2, or 3 could mean the death knell of park bowls The bowlers are aware that they should take their share in the reductions proposed and that even a 100% increase in present costs, whilst not being desirable, would be acceptable in these exceptional circumstances
Mr I H F	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still cheap compared with the costs of most private clubs' membership
Mr L		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charges may be unlawful under the Allotments Acts
Mr A W		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At present the bowlers pay a charge of £8 to the council who maintain the bowling greens in fit condition. Also the council pay for electricity & water charges in relation to the bowling greens. I think that all would agree that such a charge is more than reasonable and probably should have been increased in past years to a more realistic figure. The proposals outlined by Sefton Council would have a disastrous affect on the bowling community. I calculate the percentage increases as follows :- Proposal 1 – 437.5 % increase to a fee of £43. Proposal 2 – 962.5 % increase to a fee of £85 Proposal 3- 1400 % increase to a fee of £120
Mr R G		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst accepting the need for "cuts" it is hoped that the Council will consider those who are the main users of the bowling facilities. They are, of course, those of a low generally fixed income group, namely pensioners.
Mr B J		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would equate to a 213% increase in utility service!!!! Do you think this is fair or just? I do not use electricity – no requirement for

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>this service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I and a majority of other plot holders do not use these utilities • The council should be encouraging more greener/efficient ways of recycling
<p>Sefton Access Forum/ABILITY</p> <p>(SAF = 16 attendees, ABILITY = 32 attendees)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 3 [charge for utilities and grounds maintenance costs] was the most appropriate. This was only on the basis that the concessions mentioned within the proposal were extended to cover older people. • If increased fees are introduced monitoring of possible reductions in uptake and usage are vital to assess any negative impact particularly on vulnerable groups such as older or disabled people who the services are vital in reducing social isolation and aiding physical activity.
<p>Equal Voice</p> <p>(3 attendees)</p>		✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general principle of people paying for what they use was agreed to, although older people with limited income should receive some form of concession for utility and grounds maintenance costs. • Greater use should be made of advertising to support income to the services
<p>Parents Forum</p> <p>(28 persons/19 organisations)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed increases in charges are reasonable (for footballers) • If it's something people like to do, maybe they should pay? • Increasing charges – pleased that proposed charges do not apply to children. • If you want to play, you should support it • It is a hobby and a weekly charge is reasonable (£1 to £3) • Proposed savings is a LOT of money • Increasing charges: charging for fitness facilities – would health suffer – because it tackles obesity – keep-fit clubs will suffer • Allotment charges impact family food budget • Increasing Charges: Sefton already has high levels of obesity – this could be worse • Suggested consultation – speak to services users and sports groups • Fixed rate for allotment holders on pensions • Subsidies for older people with allotments • Fundraising within sport (communities and clubs) • Increasing Charges: Look at options for

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			ownership of areas such as bowling greens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundraising and donations – (£35 per year in some areas - £2 per week)
Young Advisers (17 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 78% were against this proposal This was identified as their third highest spending priority, after Parks maintenance and pool lifeguard cover (People Directorate proposal) Could look for sponsors involved in sport or gardening, for example footballers or horticultural society Could look for sporting charity or eco-friendly charity sponsors
Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens (Written response)	?	?	If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not “get out of the house” there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.
Telephone survey (303 responses)		x	48% of respondents disagreed with the proposal and 42% agreed. (10% neither agreed or disagreed)

General Summary

- Most respondents are **against** the change proposal
- The majority of those against the proposals are sports users
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Charge juniors as well as adults (either in addition to, or within, the current proposal)
 - Subsidise older people / bowlers
 - Several clubs have expressed interest in maintaining their facilities
 - An agreed lowering of the agreed maintenance specification to harvest alternative savings
- As a result of the consultation the following mitigation/action needs to be considered:
 - Should juniors be charged, in addition to adults
 - Should any subsidies/concessions apply

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.6 & 4.7

Details of proposal:

The change proposals covered by this equality analysis are:

- E4.6 Recharging formal sports users and allotment users the cost of providing utilities at pavilions, allotment sites etc
- E4.7 Recharging formal sports users the costs of grounds maintenance

This will mean that the costs of utilities and/or grounds maintenance, either in part or in full, will be recovered from formal sports users and allotment holders as appropriate.

The Parks and Green Spaces Service is a part of Landscape Services, and are located within the Street Scene Directorate. This Equality Analysis covers the above separate change proposals.

The Parks and Green Spaces Service is a part of Landscape Services, and are located within the Street Scene Directorate. This Equality Analysis covers the above separate change proposals.

They provide a range of services to both the public and internally within the council:

Service	Provides
Parks and Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Parks & open spaces▪ Playgrounds▪ Grounds maintenance/ contract management▪ Trees and woodland management▪ Golf course provision▪ Outdoor sports pitches and bowling greens

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

Sefton Council currently provides: 79 football and rugby pitches, 18 bowling greens, 2 cricket wickets, one croquet lawn. It also has overall responsibility for 14 allotment sites. It receives a total income of £65,000, whilst the cost of providing these facilities for a small proportion of park users is around £350,000 per year. Currently the Council receives an average income of around £5.50 a year for each footballer, £8.00 for each bowler, and £27.00 for each allotment holder.

The increase to charges for formal sports users would mean:

- All users of formal sports facilities (except juniors) would pay for all electricity, gas, water and drainage, and charges for pavilions and changing rooms where provided. All allotment holders would pay the full utility costs for huts and water supply where provided. Or:
- All users of sports facilities, (except juniors) would pay for all grounds maintenance costs incurred in providing facilities (e.g. grass cutting marking out, renovation etc). Or:
- All users of sports facilities (except juniors) would pay for all grounds maintenance, electricity, gas, water and drainage, and charges for pavilions and changing rooms where provided. All allotment holders would pay the full utility costs for huts and water supply where provided

Mitigation:

This programme has been looked at extremely carefully and there are many good reasons why people participate in the activities – some related to health and wellbeing connected to issues such as age or disability.

It was felt in general that 'children' (because they are completely unwaged) may experience a disproportionate negative impact. As such, the current proposal will keep subsidies in place for junior users.

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

Our consultation and research produced the following

Older People

Demographically, most allotment holders are between the ages of 51-64, a rate over 13% higher than the Census 2001 figure, and nearly 30% are over retirement age. The number of males using this service is also over 13% higher than the percentage of males in Sefton. Anecdotally, it is a similar profile for people using bowling greens and croquet lawns. Therefore there may be a disproportionate effect on older males if charges are increased. In the current proposal, children and young people participating in junior leagues will be exempt from the price increase.

Sefton Access Forum and ABILITY CEN identified the following issues:

- If increased fees are introduced monitoring of possible reductions in uptake and usage are vital to assess any negative impact particularly on vulnerable groups such as older or disabled people who the services are vital in reducing social isolation and aiding physical activity.

Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens group identified the following issues:

- If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not “get out of the house” there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.”

However, whilst we agree that ‘activities’ are vital for well being, it was felt that those with low income would be expected to pay.

We would exempt children from charges and would have a mitigation programme in place if a disabled service user on extremely low income could show how the activity was linked to the treatment of the illness/disability.

Consultation

Consultation took place between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012, and included the following groups:

- “In Bloom” groups
- Allotment users
- Bowlers
- Equal Voice CEN
- Football League Committees – north and south
- Formal sports pitch clubs and users
- Friends of Parks
- General Park users
- Parents Forum – north, central and south
- Public – via drop-in sessions and electronic questionnaires
- Sefton Access Forum CEN
- Sefton Croquet Club
- Sefton CVS
- Sefton Sports Council
- Southport Flower Show Ltd
- Young Advisers CEN

With regard to those with protected characteristics their views and concerns are reported above.

A full consultation report has been prepared and is available.

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

Yes: the service will be delivered in line with the Equality Act 2010 and we will have allowances to ensure those most at risk of a negative impact will be able to access service thus 'advancing equality of opportunity.

It is currently planned that children and young people participating in junior leagues will be exempt from the price increase.

Officers will work with sports groups and allotment holders to help them reduce utility costs, by conserving water, reducing electricity use, and applying to utility companies for special concessionary schemes. They will also look at reducing grounds maintenance costs e.g. by reducing the specification, or assisting groups to maintain some of the facilities themselves.

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

- 1) Notify service users of new charges.
- 2) Establish mitigation process for junior users and disability
- 3) Work to reduce costs of services
- 4) Reschedule work patterns
- 5) Monitor

Part B Annex E

E4.8 Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park

Change Proposal

Service Description: Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park (Parks and Greenspaces Service Review)

Categorisation: Service split between Frontline (Grounds Maintenance and Trees: £2,321K + £89K), Regulatory (Land Management: £400K), Other (Tier 1: £1,057) and Trading (Golf: -£295K).

Consultation has closed on the following option
Closing and mothballing the facilities listed above

Original Rationale for service change proposal – To achieve a highly significant level of savings overall, and try to minimise the effect on the wider Sefton community as much as possible.

Legislation Considered

Anticipated Impact of Service Change – Service Users –

There will be a significant reduction in the attractions and facilities at two of Sefton's 'destination' parks. The closure of these facilities will add to the reduced maintenance standards described in the separate Savings Proposal (PLR1-01), with a consequential reduction in the number of park users, which may have a knock-on effect in making the parks feel less safe.

Partners –

Council -

There may be significant issues with increased vandalism in the empty facilities and in the parks generally, which would have cost implications.

There would be 3 redundancies.

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

See Consultation and Engagement Overview within this Annex

Equality Analysis – see Equality Analysis Reports within this Annex

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –

At Botanic Gardens, Southport:

- Aviary to be closed.
- Fernery to be 'closed to the public and 'mothballed'.
- Nursery shop to cease operating.

Hesketh Park:

- Conservatory to be closed off to the public and 'mothballed'.

Staff would be placed at risk as a result of this option.

Suggested amendments following Consultation

- Most respondents (approx 87%) are **against** the change proposal
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Look at volunteers / voluntary organisations to manage facilities
- As a result of the consultation the following mitigation/action needs to be considered:
 - Volunteer support / sponsorship for fernery and conservatory
 - Alternative management of aviary

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

Risk: Increase in vandalism, anti-social behaviour, and associated costs.

Mitigating Action: Subject to outcome of change proposals to Ranger Service (E4.10, E4.11), focus Park Rangers Service on reducing anti-social behaviour; seek to retain small budget for diversionary park activities.

Risk: Closure of facilities may affect Southport tourism offer

Mitigating Actions: Look at volunteer support / sponsorship for facilities, investigate alternative management for aviary

Risk: Closure of Conservatory may raise issues with Heritage Lottery Fund, who provided grant to refurbish the building in 2007/08.

Mitigating Action: Investigate volunteer support / sponsorship for conservatory

This needs to be explored further with Heritage Lottery Fund.

Cost of Botanic Gardens / Hesketh Park facilities (as listed) including staff: £50K
Staffing: 3
Other Resources:

Proposed Cost 2012/13: 0

Budget Reduction 2012/13: £50K

Council Staff at Risk: Yes

Consultation and Engagement Overview

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
<p>e-Consult Feedback</p> <p>(Question responses = 519)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 86.90% of respondents are against this proposal. • Could look for sponsors involved in sport or gardening, for example footballers or horticultural society • Could look for sporting charity or eco-friendly charity sponsors <p>Examples of comments received from the public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visiting the aviary is a big reason for going to Botanic Gardens • I enjoy feeding birds @ botanic gardens I used to do @ Hesketh and was most upset when they went. My grandchildren love to feed the rabbits too. • I don't think you could, or would, re-house the birds, a great many would be killed, just to save a few pounds. Less people will visit, affecting others, including cafe I would certainly volunteer to help care for them.
<p>Heritage Lottery Fund (written response)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to the HLF contract for the completed project at Hesketh Park, Sefton Council required to manage and maintain the park to the standards achieved by the grant for a minimum of 10 years and to ensure Green Flag standard for a minimum of 7 years following completion. • These standards and budgets are articulated in more detail in your Management and Maintenance Plan 2010, which the Council has adopted as part of the contract. To assess the impact of the proposals on the funded works it would be useful if you could provide reassurances that the standards outlined in the plan will be maintained under the proposed new structures and reduced budgets, and/or specify where and to what extent these would be reduced. • I have particular concerns relating to the conservatory closing as this was restored and made publicly accessible using the HLF grant. It is possible that we would seek to clawback all or some of this part of the grant if this was to close. • It would also be useful if you could provide

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>reassurances about the safety of the park in light of the reduced ranger service and let us know to what extent activities will be reduced as you will be aware that one of the main aims of HLF funding is to increase the range of audiences and engage people in learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In many instances the Friends group are instrumental in delivering these activities and can provide significant in kind/volunteer support and therefore withdrawal of support from this group as outlined in the proposals for reductions should be considered carefully.
<p>In Bloom Forum Meeting (17 attendees/ 7 organisations)</p>		<p>✘</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing the aviary and fernery is 'absolutely horrific' – would affect tourism. These and the café are focal points in the park. A lot of money has been spent on the fernery and conservatory, so closing them would be a waste of this money. Need to look at sponsorship, be pro-active about finding ways to keep them open.
<p>Friends of Parks Forum (30 attendees/ 12 organisations)</p>		<p>✘</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of money been spent on upgrading Fernery and Conservatory, would be a waste if they were closed. The aviary is very popular. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Should be last choice among the options' 'Should be taken off the board completely' Suggestion that Oakbridge (who currently help to manage the conservatory) be involved to allow the conservatory to remain open Botanic Gardens is THE park in the Borough, a key tourist attraction, too valuable an asset to lose.
<p>Hesketh Park Heritage Group</p>		<p>✘</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We all believe it would be very damaging to the prospect of any Lottery application if it became known to the Lottery Board that this possibility of closure of this funded conservatory was an option being considered. This group is itself working now with Council Officers to make an application for a small Lottery bid to develop an education/visitor centre in the park which will have toilets, a much needed facility.
<p>Mrs S W</p>		<p>✘</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Gardens are an integral part of Churchtown and its local history.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All consideration should be taken to revitalise the area as in it's heyday it was a popular and well used space both for leisure and pleasure for visitors and locals alike. Losing the park would be detrimental to local people and Sefton's tourism. All efforts should be made by Sefton councillors to regenerate open spaces not close them. Local parks are our heritage and should be regarded as vital to tourism and the locality.
<p>Sefton Access Forum/ABILITY</p> <p>(SAF = 16 attendees, ABILITY = 32 attendees)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum felt that although these services were important they were aware that funds had to be saved from somewhere and that the removal of these services were preferable to the closure of others. The group noted caution regarding maintaining structures to prevent them becoming dangerous and to also preserve where possible the old Victorian structures for the future as an important part of Sefton's historical legacy.
<p>Equal Voice</p> <p>(3 attendees)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater use should be made of advertising to support income to the services
<p>Parents Forum</p> <p>(28 persons/19 organisations)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of services and attractions at Botanic Gardens is NOT supported Parks already used for structures activities for children and groups – closing would impact on this. Risks to doves and swans Birds have been in the environment and fernery for ages and moving or disrupting birds in Botanic Gardens could cause distress and problems (would you do that to children?) Botanic Gardens is part of Sefton History Fears of deterioration/vandalism - would this be a waste of new parks and facilities Hesketh Park has come a long way – it would be a pity to lose facilities Are services advertised at the moment? Look at options for opening areas like Botanic Gardens on certain days Get coverage and advertising
<p>Young Advisers</p> <p>(17 attendees)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 82% are in favour of the proposal This was identified as their lowest spending priority Focus a little more on security than closing

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>down some of the best attractions to Southport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about the cost of moving all the birds and ferns and also the cost to regain them and restore the building if they were ever to be used again.
Telephone Survey – Aviary, Nursery, etc. (303 responses)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 68% of respondents disagreed with the proposal to close the Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at the Botanic Gardens and 17% agreed. (15% neither agreed or disagreed) 56% of respondents disagreed with the proposal to close the conservatory at Hesketh Park and 23% agreed. (20% neither agreed or disagreed)

General Summary

- Most respondents are **against** the change proposal
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Look at volunteers / voluntary organisations to manage facilities
- As a result of the consultation the following mitigation/action needs to be considered:
 - Volunteer support / sponsorship for fernery and conservatory
 - Alternative management of aviary

Impact Assessment

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.8 & E4.9

Details of proposal:

The change proposals covered by this equality analysis are:

- E4.8 Closing the Aviary, Fernery and Nursery Shop at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park, Southport
- E4.9 Stop providing Hanging Baskets

This means that hanging baskets will no longer be provided free of charge, and that the aviary, fernery and nursery shop at Hesketh Park, and the conservatory at Botanic Gardens, will be closed.

The Parks and Green Spaces Service is a part of Landscape Services, and are located within the Street Scene Directorate. This Equality Analysis covers the above separate change proposals.

They provide a range of services to both the public and internally within the council:

Service	Provides
Parks and Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Parks & open spaces▪ Playgrounds▪ Grounds maintenance/ contract management▪ Trees and woodland management▪ Golf course provision▪ Outdoor sports pitches and bowling greens

Ramifications of Proposal:

E4.8 Closing the Aviary, Fernery and Nursery Shop at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park, Southport and E4.9 Stop providing Hanging Baskets

There is a proposal is to stop putting up the 556 hanging flower baskets in town centres in Ainsdale, Aintree, Birkdale, Churchtown, Crosby, Formby, Hightown, Litherland, Netherton, and Southport. (We may still provide these if they are sponsored / paid for. This will however depend on demand, location and having the staff resources available).

There is also a proposal to close the aviary, fernery and nursery shop at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park, Southport to public access and to mothball facilities pending a future use being identified. This would mean no public access to the aviary, which has a bird collection of 80 types of birds from across the world (This would result in the bird collection being re-housed), the recently refurbished Victorian fernery that houses a collection of 90 rare ferns and plants from across the world, as well as the nursery and shop. The recently restored Hesketh Park conservatory would also close.

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': No

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

None.

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

No.

Consultation.

Consultation took place between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012, and included the following groups:

- “In Bloom” groups
- Allotment users
- Bowlers
- Equal Voice CEN
- Football League Committees – north and south
- Formal sports pitch clubs and users
- Friends of Parks
- General Park users
- Parents Forum – north, central and south
- Public – via drop-in sessions and electronic questionnaires
- Sefton Access Forum CEN
- Sefton Croquet Club
- Sefton CVS
- Sefton Sports Council
- Southport Flower Show Ltd
- Young Advisers CEN

Those groups representing people with protected characteristics made the following comments:

Equal Voice suggested advertising to increase income

Disability noted that caution regarding maintaining the structure that may become dangerous but preferred the removal of these services rather than the closure of others.

The Young Advisers were in favour of closure (82%)

A full consultation report has been prepared and is available.

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

Closure of these facilities and services will not impact on the public sector equality duty

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

E.4.8

- 1) re-house bird collection
- 2) secure building

E.4.9

- 1) Inform local business/community of opportunity to sponsor hanging baskets.
- 2) Reorganise work schedules.



Part B Annex F

E4.10 Cessation of Park Ranger Functions

Change Proposal

Service Description: Cessation of Park Ranger Functions (Parks and Greenspaces Service Review)
Consultation has closed on the following option Cessation of the Park Ranger functions
Original Rationale for service change proposal – To achieve a highly significant level of savings.
Legislation Considered: Occupiers' Liability legislation and common law duties
Anticipated Impact of Service Change – Service Users – <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Park users will experience a very significant decline in the standards of parks, and there would be no staff to help deal with the anticipated increase in vandalism and anti-social behaviour caused by other cuts.• Parks will feel less safe, with a consequential reduction in the number of park users.• Slower response to vandalism, graffiti, and general repairs• Minimal support for volunteers; loss of potential 'income-in kind'• Increase in dog-fouling and litter in parks Partners – <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Probable disengagement of Friends of Park groups• Increased involvement required from police, Community Safety etc to address increased ASB Council - <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduction in ability to deal with public concerns about antisocial behaviour. This may cause particular problems for the council, as other parts of the 5 tier security model referred to earlier have also been diluted. Unless severe, the police rarely consider perceived ASB in parks to be a priority issue for them. The role of the PCSOs in parks focused work has been reduced as the number of PCSOs has been reduced. The way Sefton security operates has changed. Removal of the Park Rangers will potentially leave the public feeling isolated.• Likely increase in costs due to vandalism.• 8 redundancies and deletion of 1 vacant posts.• Slower responses to problems and issues, less flexibility; more reactive and less pro-active management.
Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary See Consultation and Engagement Overview within this Annex

Equality Analysis

See Equality Analysis Reports within this Annex

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –

The Parks Ranger function will cease, and the following functions will stop:

- No on-site presence to deal with anti-social behaviour
- No pro-active encouragement of responsible park use
- Minimal capacity to work with volunteers and Friends Groups, fewer volunteer hours
- No activities or events in parks
- No staff to help mitigate impact of other significant service cuts.
- No diversionary activities for young people in parks
- No one to enforce dog fouling and litter legislation
- Reduced interaction with police / community safety partnerships
- Reduction in other parts of the safer and stronger parks communities model

Suggested amendments following Consultation

- Most respondents (approx 90%) are **against** the change proposal
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
- None

As a result of the consultation there is no mitigation/action to consider

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

Risk: Likely to be significant increase in vandalism, anti-social behaviour and complaints about few front-line staff

Mitigating Action: None identified

Risk: Unable to let volunteers / voluntary groups carry out work to help maintain / improve parks, as no staff to train / supervise volunteers.

Mitigating Action: None identified

Risk: increased concerns about personal safety in parks, particularly with older, younger and more vulnerable users

Mitigating Action: The section will liaise with other organisations (i.e. Police/PCSO's) in an attempt to respond to incidents (ASB, vandalism etc) however their response will be governed by other service pressures that they may face that are of greater priority to them.

**Cost of Park Ranger Function:
£266,500**

Proposed Cost 2012/13: £88.8K*

<p>(additional funding also provided to Maghull Town Council via double rating)</p> <p>Staffing: 1 Head Ranger, 4 Park Rangers, 4 Assistant Park Rangers</p> <p>Other Resources:</p>	<p>Budget Reduction 2012/13: £177.7K*</p> <p>Council Staff at Risk: Yes</p> <p>*N.B. Interdependency issue: Full savings for E4.5 cannot be realized if E4.10 / E4.11 taken</p>
--	--

Consultation and Engagement Overview

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
<p>e-Consult Feedback</p> <p>(Question responses = 509)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 89.98% of respondents are against this proposal. • The main concerns are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased anti social behaviour ○ Reduced safety for users ○ Increased litter and dog dirt/negative environmental impact <p>Examples of comments received from the public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF the quality of the parks fall with the reduction of the ground floor staff/gardeners the parks that Sefton are famous for will become a thing of the past and will never return the borough impacting further on the towns involved through lack of visitors • I am a keen bowls player and the rangers keep gangs of troublemakers away from the greens • I feel having Park Rangers in the parks acts as a deterrent to unruly youngsters and adults. They are a form of security. I love taking my children to the events too. Plus they are able to answer any questions relating to the parks • Definitely against the loss of the park ranger service, they have done a lot to reduce the ASB in the parks. A lot of investment has been made in the parks utilizing 106 monies this will have been wasted if the ranger service is lost and ASB returns.
<p>In Bloom Forum Meeting</p> <p>(17 attendees/ 7 organisations)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious concerns about vandalism; last time when the temporary ranger scheme finished, there was the worst period of vandalism ever in Seafront Gardens. • Devastating cut would have a major impact on the environment.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rangers provide a major educational resource; teach young people the importance of parks. Valuable, pro-active joint working with other agencies – lowest level of anti social behaviour this year on Mischief Night due to Ranger input.
<p>Friends of Parks Forum</p> <p>(30 attendees/ 12 organisations)</p>		<p>✘</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everything would collapse if Park Rangers left Kids behave themselves when Park Rangers are around, people feel a lot safer Suggestion to combine the wider Parks and Coast Services to make savings rather than just the Rangers Services There has been a big reduction in ASB since the Rangers started
<p>Merseyside Police</p>		<p>✘</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summer/ Mischief diversionary activities without doubt assist with reductions in ASB - activity is meaningful and fun. Support with neighbourhood priorities. B2 have a large number of parks and over the summer months the overriding problem is young people drinking and causing a nuisance / damage. The rangers patrol the areas and provide us with feedback. Indecent exposure operation in June/July 2011. CM and her staff provided details of possible suspects and an arrest was subsequently made. Streetgames initiative - combating ASB in the Parks and green spaces that was very successful and has clearly assisted in our ASB reductions this year The common consensus is that the neighbourhoods have built up excellent working relationships with the Rangers and fear that their cessation would significantly result in an increase in anti social behaviour within their respective neighbourhoods. I can confirm that the activities arranged over the Halloween Period certainly enabled officers to concentrate their patrolling elsewhere knowing that the locations were appropriately staffed, activity was co-ordinated and supportive and that the teams were positively contributing to reductions in ASB in the relevant areas.
<p>Sefton CVS</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over the last 3 years we have forged a strong working relationship with yourselves and the staff within Parks and

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>Greenspaces. This has enabled a number of project developments including volunteer programmes within the parks for people with learning disabilities to build on their NVQ qualifications in horticulture, supporting and development of over 34 Friends of Groups, support and successful funding bids for tree planting and sculpture trails and input into Kings Gardens bid via Volunteer Centre Sefton, Community Development Team and Sefton Young Advisors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has also supported the development of training packages for volunteers with Park Rangers within the parks to ensure that people volunteer in a safe environment and enable added value to the Park Rangers work. • As part of the continued partnership work we are keen to develop the Friends of Groups and community engagement within the parks, however without the provision of Park Rangers the probability of a development programme will be difficult to implement. • We are keen to continue and grow our partnership and will endeavour to work with you and your team to support and develop community engagement within the parks and greenspace and therefore we are aware that the future decisions on the budget savings will be key to this partnership progression.
Friends of Bedford Park		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Park Rangers] bring knowledge and expertise to their work drawing in and educating and inspiring young people to care for the park and the environment generally • They run the young rangers, liaise with groups with learning difficulties to offer them support to carry out tasks on the park. • The fear is that the loss of the ranger service will lead to the park falling into disrepair and be subject to vandalism again. • The Rangers are able to issue fixed penalty notices for dog fouling which brings in revenue for the council.
Friends of Waterloo		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the last meeting of our committee I was asked to write to the Council to express the

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
Seafront Gardens			<p>strongly held view by our group that the service provided by Sefton's Park Rangers and particularly our current Ranger, CM, is excellent and we would be extremely sad if the services CM provides were to be diminished because of the savings the council is having to make.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last year we ran an amazingly successful summer festival with over 2000 people attending. The Rangers involvement was invaluable. This year we are running an autumn festival to coincide again with the Scarecrow competition that the Rangers have run for the last two or three years. CM's organizational skills and her contacts will we believe produce yet another great day. • Without her services I fear that our group would have far less impact
Olsen House School, Great Crosby, L23		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortly after our school opened (Spring 2010), we were approached by Sefton Rangers (CM) and asked if we would like to take part in the local Scarecrow Competition. We were delighted to be invited as it is crucial for our young people to have the opportunity to take part in community based activities. Since then we have been involved in a number of projects, just recently we have been helping with the redevelopment project of Marine Crescent Pond. • This kind of activity is vital for our pupil's social skills development apart from the academic knowledge that they gain from the experience!
Valewood Primary School and Children's Centre		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our Valewood Primary pupils benefit hugely from the educational and environmental service they all provide. We use their expertise to drive our curriculum and to enhance outcomes for our pupils. • The work our Park Rangers do enriches the lives of all the community and helps us all to appreciate and take care of our local environment.
St. Luke's Halsall CE Primary School		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the last few years the children at St. Luke's have benefited greatly from the many Schools projects the Ranger service has put on. • We feel this is valuable work to undertake with the children, to educate them about

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			the local environment and how they can look after it for the future. We do hope that the Park Ranger Service will still continue to exist for the future.
Holy Family Catholic High School		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I just wanted to offer our support to this wonderful service as we have had the opportunity to work with them on several projects over the years. • Our pupils have helped with planting in Victoria Park, Coronation Park and in the Marine Gardens. They have designed artwork for the pavilion in Coronation Park. The pupils have made bird nests and took part in the Scarecrow competition. • This has been really positive for our students as we have been able to offer these events to some of our more vulnerable students. I feel that this would be a real loss not just for the community but for our students as well.
Higham Consultancy		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am an independent research and evaluator, who has been carrying out research work with the local primary schools to this area. A number of these schools have been working with the Park Rangers at Sefton and I feel I must report that it was notable how hugely supportive the schools were of the rangers roles. These schools, in of course, high areas of deprivation, are now as part of that strong partnership role, taking children out of the school arena to learn about their natural local environment on a regular basis. • These schools report a much higher recognition from the children of their local green area, and a greater sense of ownership. This ownership is passed along their families and we believe demonstrates that this can positively affect levels of anti-social behaviour and a real wish to look after their surroundings. • It is very hard to return to old posts and I feel that once this role has been eradicated it will probably never return. What a shame to deprive an area of such a pivotal - and perhaps largely unseen - partnership role.
St Michael's High School		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel that this decision would have a massive negative impact on the development of community relationships within Sefton. Having worked closely with the Rangers on numerous occasions I

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>appreciate how beneficial their input has been in raising awareness of sustainability and local community issues with our young people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students from St Michael's High School have been fortunate enough to participate in a number of initiatives organised by CM and her team including the Art in the Park and Eco Greenhouse Projects, scarecrow making, and bulb planting sessions. These positive experiences have inspired students to initiate similar activities on their own school grounds and equipped them with the confidence to explore further possibilities within their local community. • By encouraging young people to take ownership of their parks and local community we are able to challenge anti-social behaviour together and strengthen community working partnerships.
Mr I H F		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2006 when the Park Rangers lost their external funding and their jobs; the police had to put the Matrix task force into Crosby and Waterloo for five weeks to crack the antisocial behavioural consequences • We accept that they may have to be merged to provide a more flexible service.
<p>Sefton Access Forum/ABILITY</p> <p>(SAF = 16 attendees, ABILITY = 32 attendees)</p>	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group supported the option to save the most money – the cessation of Park Ranger services. • Overall the group felt that the roles of the park and coast rangers were vital in maintaining safety within parks and countryside but that in these times of financial cuts other vital services needed to be prioritized. • The group felt that if any changes were to take place within the park and coast ranger teams it was vital that the maintenance of access around the coast were maintained, in particular pathways, the prom and key access points to ensure that disabled people have equal access to enjoying these spaces as none-disabled people.
<p>Equal Voice</p> <p>(3 attendees)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cessation of Parks Rangers could lead to a rise in anti-social behaviour. • There should be greater analysis of ethnicity and gender around parks and on the coast so that potential impacts of these changes could be understood. • There should be increased monitoring of

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			anti-social behaviour on the coast and in parks to compare the period after any change is implemented with the present situation, to detect any increase in hate crime against minority communities.
Parents Forum (28 persons/19 organisations)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children need to be taught in schools how to look after their environment and protect it for future generations. • Rangers are active across the borough in (local parks) • We feel safer with Rangers about. • Rangers have not been seen at night in local areas – problem areas particularly.
Young Advisers (17 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 71% were against the cessation of the Park Ranger Service • Despite the score, this was identified as their third lowest spending priority
Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens (Written response)	?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not “get out of the house” there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.
Mrs D L		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have been a volunteer gardener at Hesketh Park for some years. I was saddened to hear that due to cut-backs the position of some of the park ranger staff is at risk. • Apart from the security and gardening aspects their positions hold, they also give so much on special occasions, in helping organise creative events for children and adults. Events such as these give such enjoyment to those who may not be able to afford similar events where payment is required and encourage interest in the environment. • To lose them would soon show a decline in security and deterioration in the upkeep of the parks.
Ms. S S		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to the park rangers’ service: Have the public safety aspects been considered and the ultimate costs around vandalism. This will affect residents access to these amenities
Ms. M A		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be a shame, and we at Ainsdale Village Park have always valued their assistance.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the service were to remain, I would like to see them undertake a greater roll in patrolling our parks e.g. fining dog walkers for not picking up dog mess.
Telephone survey (E4.10) (303 responses)		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% disagreed with the proposal and 15% agreed with the proposal. (5% neither agreed or disagreed)
General Summary			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most respondents are against the change proposal The following suggestions were received as alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None As a result of the consultation there is no mitigation/action to consider 			

Impact Assessment

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.10 & 4.11

Details of proposal:

The change proposals covered by this equality analysis are:

- E4.10 The cessation of Park Rangers
- E4.11 The merger of the Ranger functions on the coast and the Park Rangers into a single unit.

The Parks and Green Spaces Service is a part of Landscape Services, and are located within the Street Scene Directorate. This Equality Analysis covers the above change proposals.

They provide a range of services to both the public and internally within the council:

Service	Provides
Parks and Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parks & open spaces Playgrounds Grounds maintenance/ contract management Trees and woodland management Golf course provision Outdoor sports pitches and bowling greens
Service	Provides

Coast and Countryside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management of coast and countryside ▪ Tourist beaches and promenades ▪ All Estate maintenance ▪ Litter management/beach cleansing ▪ Coastal Oil Pollution Coordination ▪ RNLI/partnership management ▪ Woodland and Tree management ▪ Biodiversity and Access Inclusion Project ▪ Management of SSSI's/nature reserves ▪ Litter and sand clearance management ▪ Litter and dog order enforcement ▪ Enforcement of byelaws ▪ Maintains the rural right of way network ▪ Coastal access ▪ Sefton Coast HLF Landscape Partnership
-----------------------	--

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': No

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': Yes

E4.10 The cessation of Park Rangers and E4.11 The merger of the Ranger functions on the coast and the Park Rangers into a single unit.

Park Rangers currently help the Council manage 260 parks and green spaces by making people feel safe and welcome. Ceasing the Park Ranger Service would potentially result in an increase in anti-social behaviour and vandalism in parks and a reduction in the number of Council run activities in parks and educational work with children and young people. Additionally there would be less opportunity to work with the community, volunteers and Friends of Parks groups as well as a reduced on-site presence and less enforcement of by-laws.

Mitigation:

Currently there are rangers in the Coast and Countryside Service and in the Parks and Green Space Service. One of the proposals is to merge the rangers from the two areas of service into a single team to make a saving from the economies of scale that the merger will bring. Although they operate differently and have some different functions, there are some similarities between the two roles. Park Rangers help the Council to manage its parks and green spaces, Coast and Countryside Rangers help the council to manage the coast and Rimrose Valley country park. Rangers in both services help make people feel safe and welcome. They work with the local community, the Police, Community Support Officers, Fire Service and other organisations, deterring anti-social behaviour, vandalism and enforcing by-laws. They also organise activities, work with volunteers and Friends of groups to encourage more, and better use of our parks. Both work with children and young people to educate them about having respect for the environment and biodiversity, in parks, the coast and countryside. There would be a reduction in community and volunteer engagement, anti-social behaviour deterrence, bylaw enforcement, and education of young people.

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

A number of issues were identified during consultation:

Older People

Older people may feel less safe using the parks if there is an increase in anti-social behaviour due to a reduction or cessation of Ranger services.

Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens group identified the following issues:

- If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not “get out of the house” there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.”

People with Limited Mobility

Sefton Access Forum and ABILITY CEN identified the following issues:

- If any changes were to take place within the park and coast ranger teams it was vital that the maintenance of access around the coast were maintained, in particular pathways, the prom and key access points to ensure that disabled people have equal access to enjoying these spaces as non-disabled people.

Minority Communities

Equal Voice CEN identified the following issues:

- There should be a greater analysis of ethnicity and gender around parks and on the coast so that the potential impacts of these changes would be understood
- There should be increased monitoring of anti social behaviour on the coast and in parks to compare period after any change is implemented with the current situation, to detect any increase in hate crime against minority communities

Children and Younger People

Cessation of Park Rangers or the merger of these with Coast and Countryside Rangers would impact on young people due to the cessation or reduction of education and volunteer programmes that they are involved in. Children and younger people may feel less safe in parks if there is an increase in anti-social behaviour due to a reduction or cessation of the Ranger service.

Mitigation: : if a merged service is formed, it will try to take in to account these issues and ensure that access to the facilities will continue to be open and safe to the general public.

Consultation

Consultation took place between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012, and included the following groups:

- “In Bloom” groups
- Allotment users
- Bowlers

- Equal Voice CEN
- Football League Committees – north and south
- Formal sports pitch clubs and users
- Friends of Parks
- General Park users
- Parents Forum – north, central and south
- Public – via drop-in sessions and electronic questionnaires
- Sefton Access Forum CEN
 - Sefton Croquet Club
 - Sefton CVS
- Sefton Sports Council
 - Southport Flower Show Ltd
- Young Advisers CEN

With regard to those with protected characteristics their views and concerns are reported above.

A full consultation report has been prepared and is available.

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

The service provision will continue to be provided in line with the Equality Act.

The consultation has highlighted some possibly of positive action work to help advance equality of opportunity. These will be pursued in developing the new **provision**

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

1. Reorganise work teams
2. Reschedule and prioritise work plans
3. Monitor
4. Work with partners (e.g. police) to help identify and treat potential and actual hate crime within in this service area.

Part B Annex G

E4.11 Merger of Parks and Coastal Ranger Functions

Change Proposal

Service Description: Merger of Parks and Coastal Ranger functions (Parks & Greenspaces / Coast & Countryside reviews – Option 7)

Categorisation:

Service split between

Frontline (Grounds Maintenance and Trees: £2,321K + £89K), (beach lifeguarding and sand clearance (282,500)

Regulatory (Land Management: £500K)

Other (Tier 1: £1,057)

Other (Tier 2: £380,750)

Trading (Golf: -£295K).

Consultation has closed on the following option

The merger of the Parks and Coast and Countryside Ranger Services.

Original Rationale for service change proposal – Budget savings driven. This is further rationalisation of the management of the coast, countryside, parks and other open spaces.

Legislation Considered The Environmental Protection Act, Wildlife and Countryside Act, Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act and Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations Occupiers Liability Act

Anticipated Impact of Service Change –

- A reduced service means will there will have to be an emphasis on identifying other opportunities to support management of parks, open spaces and the coast and how a reduction in the ability to respond to community and environmental needs can be supported by volunteers, employment schemes and possibly inclusion partnerships.
- As there may be an increase in anti-social behaviour in the short-term, an increased involvement of the friends/volunteers as 'eye and ears' should be seen as a priority to assist in lowering problems with anti-social behaviour across Sefton.

Service Users –

- Users will experience a decline in the standards as there would be fewer staff to help deal with the anticipated increase in vandalism and anti-social behaviour caused by other cuts. New opportunities to enhance a reduced merged service through the use of Volunteer Rangers, apprenticeship, employment schemes and inclusion projects will be investigated.
- Slower response to vandalism, graffiti, and general repairs
- Potential increase in dog-fouling and litter in parks, reduced maintenance on

coast and countryside sites

- A merged service could deliver inclusion projects with New Directions, other providers and young people excluded from education, employment and training
- Work experience for young people can continue through a merged but reduced service.
- Liaison with schools and other educational establishments on sites will continue and the ability to re-build this element of both services following 2011/12 reductions will be enhanced through a targeted education programme across a wide spectrum of service users.

Partners –

- Increased involvement required from police, Community Safety etc to address increased ASB
- The merger of the ranger services will allow for some cover where it may be potentially lost due to service reductions in respect of the management of some open spaces and nature reserves.

Council

- There will be less staff to deal with issues that may arise, leading to prioritisation of responses.
- Slower responses to problems and issues, less flexibility; more reactive and less pro-active management.
- A targeted programme of developing opportunities for the community through volunteer rangers, activities and skill development can support a reduced merged service.

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

See Consultation and Engagement Overview within this Annex.

Equality Analysis

See Equality Analysis Report within this Annex.

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –

The following Parks Ranger functions will reduce:

- Less on-site presence to deal with anti-social behaviour
- Less pro-active encouragement of responsible park use
- Less capacity to work with volunteers and Friends Groups, fewer volunteer hours
- Fewer activities or events in parks
- Fewer staff to help mitigate impact of other significant service cuts.
- Fewer diversionary activities for young people in parks
- Less enforcement of dog fouling and litter legislation
- Reduced interaction with police / community safety partnerships

- Reduction in other parts of the safer and stronger parks communities model

On Coast and Countryside sites, exactly which activities are reduced, and when, will depend on the staff resources available and the issues being faced at any particular time. A flexible and responsive, rather than planned and proactive approach will be adopted for the following:

- Revised and reduced management of beach car parking -Southport and Ainsdale
- There will be further reductions in onsite management of car parking
- Reduced level of sand clearance from promenades and access points
- A reduced level of plant/equipment and staffing will result in sand blocking the promenade and adjoining paths and/or being in situ for longer periods.
- Reduced level of litter clearance from the Resort beaches, Crosby Coastal Park and Rimrose Valley Country Park
- In general there will be further reductions in cleansing activity on all the main amenity beach areas and reduced cleansing on other coastal areas, including the hinterland, nature reserves and pinewoods.
- Reduced Habitat management of the protected sites and discharge of Habitat Regulations obligations to seek to meet Favourable Status
- All of the coastal operations within the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's) are 'consented activity' agreed with Natural England.
- Reduced patrolling of the 39km of coastline and Rimrose Valley.

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

- A substantial amount of the work undertaken by these services is already supplemented by; volunteers, training scheme placements (e.g. work experience, Future jobs fund etc) and an inclusion project. This has been the case for many years.
- Although a reduction in the overall number of rangers will affect the ability to manage volunteers and trainees etc there is potential to further develop arrangements with Friends/Volunteer groups to take the lead in management of sites in future.
- The ability to draw down and manage external funding such as lottery and other environmental schemes could be reduced, but opportunities may be available through the development of partnerships with communities and service partners
- Whilst efforts will be made to plug any gaps with volunteers and trainees. It should be noted that a substantial apprentice initiative and an employment scheme were active on the coast in 2011, which lessened the impact of budget reductions. However, it is difficult at this stage to predict whether and how much supplementary support will be available in the future as Government policy in respect of employment schemes has changed and funding contributions towards apprenticeship projects may not be available. In addition, how these can be managed and supported to assist service delivery will need to be carefully considered as the ability to supervise such schemes is greatly reduced following service reductions.

Cost of Ranger services; ~£315k

Staffing:

2 x Coast and Countryside

8 x Parks and Open Spaces + 1 vacant

Notes –

- **1 additional Ranger post is**

Proposed Cost 2012/13: approx £285K

Budget Reduction 2012/13: £30K

Council Staff at Risk: Yes

<p>externally funded within the Coast and Countryside section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 ranger post is affected by the Coast & Countryside Service Review – Option 1 proposal • All Park Ranger posts are potentially affected by Cessation option E4.10 <p>Other Resources:</p>	
--	--

Consultation and Engagement Overview

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
<p>e-Consult Feedback</p> <p>(Parks questionnaire question responses = 504, Coast questionnaire question responses = 295)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60.12% of respondents to the Parks questionnaire were against merging Coast and Countryside Rangers with the Park Ranger Service. • 71.52% of respondents to the Coast and Countryside questionnaire were against merging Coast and Countryside Rangers with the Park Ranger Service <p>Examples of comments received from the public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think merging the services would be a bad idea. The expertise that they have in their particular area (i.e. parks or Coastal conservation) are very different. I have small children and I imagine if the services merge there will be less attention given to parks. We may go there less if the service/cleanliness in the parks deteriorates. • The function of coastal rangers is entirely different to that of urban green space staff. There are different issues to deal with that require different training. A coastal ranger has important first aid / life guard skills etc that are not required of a regular park ranger. • To merge the two is missing the point of having trained coastal staff and then on the other hand trained staff to deal with urban green space issues such as access, cleanliness and horticultural issues. • As a dog walker and recreational walker, I would be very annoyed if you reduced the presence of rangers and their activities. The friends of Waterloo Seafront Gardens are working tirelessly to improve things and

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>we deserve the support of the authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can only speculate that the merge would be unsuitable as the coast and the parks use different skills and knowledge to manage. I can imagine that sharing the resources (if there are enough to share) would be ideal, but the merging of the two services completely would not be beneficial. • Experts would still have to exist separately and a thorough understanding of each site would be crucial in managing sensitive habitats (SSSIs, NNRs etc) compared to manicured parks. I do understand security and basic management (bins and fences) would be compatible between the two services but habitat management and legal requirements for the whole range of sites are complicated and specialist. • Due to my disability I would feel isolated knowing that if I fell over or had an accident there would be nobody there to help me or come to my aid • Fully appreciate the work done by Rangers on Rimrose and aware that should reduction occur the park will undoubtedly end up overgrown and frequented by youths. Wouldn't feel as safe. • Without the presence of coast and countryside staff making a safe, pleasant environment for visitors and users I would be less confident using this coast and feel less safe. Also I think the nature that is so important here would not be as well looked after so perhaps less reason to come here • Amphibian and Reptile Conservation staff and volunteers will try and assist the Rangers more often, though we have limited numbers of local representatives to assist. Our capacity to directly assist will also be hampered due to staff loss and budgetary costs. • Certainly there are no easy options though the further loss of Ranger staff, resources and knowledge will have a huge negative impact on tourism, public use, favourable conservation status of sites and the ability and capacity of the remaining staff to deal with these issues e.g. the Rangers have been very successful at securing European funding to assist with local initiatives, at no

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			or limited local cost, this may not be possible with further staff reduction.
Friends of Parks Forum (30 attendees/ 12 organisations)	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion to combine the wider Parks and Coast Services to make savings rather than just the Ranger Services
In Bloom Forum Meeting (17 attendees/ 7 organisations)	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why do we need 2 sets of management structures for Coast and Parks?
Mr I H F	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We accept that they may have to be merged to provide a more flexible service.
Sefton Access Forum/ABILITY (SAF = 16 attendees, ABILITY = 32 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group did not fully support this option, as a number of options listed under this were felt to have major implications for the lives and experiences of disabled people within the borough and also visiting key coastal attractions. The point around the management of beach car-park was supported if it was not costs effective. The point regarding sand clearance from the promenade and access areas were not, and serious health and safety implications were raised for disabled people with limited mobility and those with visual impairments. Points of concern were also raised regarding litter, habitat maintenance and graffiti as the group were aware of projects within the borough around increasing visitor numbers of Sefton and particularly coastal areas. And that a dirty, vandalised and generally scruffy Sefton would send out the wrong messages to visitors and would seriously put people and families off visiting.
Equal Voice (3 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merger of the Coast and Countryside Rangers with Parks Rangers could lead to a rise in anti-social behaviour. There should be greater analysis of ethnicity and gender around parks and on the coast so that potential impacts of these changes could be understood. There should be increased monitoring of anti-social behaviour on the coast and in parks to compare the period after any change is implemented with the present situation, to detect any increase in hate crime against minority communities. Community Payback Teams should be

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			used on the coast and in parks for sand clearance, habitat management and parks maintenance
Parents Forum (28 persons/19 organisations)		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we don't teach our children about the environment, they will not preserve the coastal areas and the countryside. We need the rangers to do this.
Young Advisers (17 attendees)		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% were against this proposal This was identified as their fourth highest spending priority Ask volunteers to work alongside the coastal and park rangers to help lighten the burden of their work
Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens (Written response)	?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not "get out of the house" there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.
Telephone Survey (E4.11) (303 responses)	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 72% agreed with the proposal and 19% disagreed with the proposal. (10% neither agreed or disagreed)
General Summary			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most respondents are against the change proposal The following suggestions were received as alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None As a result of the consultation there is no mitigation/action to consider 			

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.11 (R)

Details of proposal:

E4.11 The Merger of the Ranger functions on the coast and the Park Rangers into a single unit.

This will involve the merger of the two services in to a single unit, and a reprioritisation of work load potentially leading to the cessation or reduction of some Ranger led activities.

Other Coast and Countryside option identified in E4.12

(The Coast and Countryside Rangers were reduced by three posts (50%) as part of the budget measures for the financial year 2011/12 totalling £305,000).

Other Park Rangers option identified in E4.10

The Coast and Countryside Service and Parks and Green Spaces Service provide a range of services:

Service	Provides
Parks and Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parks & open spaces ▪ Playgrounds ▪ Grounds maintenance/ contract management ▪ Trees and woodland management ▪ Golf course provision ▪ Outdoor sports pitches and bowling greens
Service	Provides
Coast and Countryside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management of coast and countryside ▪ Tourist beaches and promenades ▪ All Estate maintenance ▪ Litter management/beach cleansing ▪ Coastal Oil Pollution Coordination ▪ RNLI/partnership management ▪ Woodland and Tree management ▪ Biodiversity and Access Inclusion Project ▪ Management of SSSI's/nature reserves ▪ Litter and sand clearance management ▪ Litter and dog order enforcement ▪ Enforcement of byelaws ▪ Maintains the rural right of way network ▪ Coastal access ▪ Sefton Coast HLF Landscape Partnership

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': No

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': Yes

E4.11 The merger of the Ranger functions on the coast and the Park Rangers into a single unit.

Park Rangers and Coast and Countryside Rangers currently help the Council manage 260 parks and 6,000 Hectares of green spaces, coast and countryside by making people feel safe and welcome. Reducing Ranger Service's would potentially result in an increase in anti-social behaviour and vandalism across the Borough and a reduction in the number of Council run activities relating to educational work with children and young people. Additionally there would be less opportunity to work with the community, volunteers and Friends of groups as well as a reduced on-site presence and less enforcement of by-laws.

Mitigation:

Currently there are rangers in the Coast and Countryside Service and in the Parks and Green Space Service. One of the proposals is to merge the rangers from the two areas of service into a single team to make a saving from the economies of scale that the merger will bring. Both sets of rangers perform similar duties but in different areas of the borough. Park Rangers help the Council to manage its parks and green spaces, Coast and Countryside Rangers help the council to manage the coast and Rimrose Valley country park. Rangers in both services help make people feel safe and welcome. They work with the local community, the Police, Community Support Officers, Fire Service and other organisations, deterring anti-social behaviour, vandalism and enforcing by-laws. They also organise activities, work with volunteers and Friends of groups to encourage more, and better use of our open spaces. Both work with children and young people to educate them about having respect for the environment and biodiversity, in parks, the coast and countryside. There would be a reduction in community and volunteer engagement, anti-social behaviour deterrence, byelaw enforcement, and education of young people

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

Yes.

- 1) The service reduction may mean delays in clearing access points and maintenance of access features such as paths and disabled boardwalks which may have access issues for disabled / elderly users and families with prams/push chairs and who may use on-beach car parking.
- 2) A lack of Rangers may lead to higher incidents of crime including hate crime.

Mitigation:

- 1) Key access spots have been identified in consultation with disabled community and there will be 'priority' access spots that will continue to be kept clear – so access to

parks, beach/ attraction will always be maintained. Continued dialogue with the disabled community will enable us to identify further task/ improvements and to inform the community of accessible sites.

- 2) Whilst the Park Rangers and Coast and Countryside Service report crimes and request support from the Police, when they are not available the community contacts the police in the normal manner – we will make it clear that the police should be contacted and we work with partners to ensure that Hate crime is reported and acted on.
- 3) Although issues of antisocial behaviour are generally a police matter, enforcement of byelaws is the responsibility of Sefton Council. There will be a reduction in enforcement, but we will continue to provide evidence and support the Council legal Department and the police within our resources.

Consultation.

Older People

Older people may feel less safe if there is an increase in anti-social behaviour due to a reduction of the service. This is more apparent at Crosby, Formby and Ainsdale when increased problems are observed by groups of young people during the summer months.

People with Limited Mobility

Sefton Access Forum and ABILITY CEN identified the following issues:

- If any changes were to take place within the parks and coast and countryside teams it was vital that the maintenance of access around the coast were maintained, in particular pathways, the prom and key access points to ensure that disabled people have equal access to enjoying these spaces as non-disabled people.

Minority Communities

Equal Voice CEN identified the following issues:

- There should be increased monitoring of anti social behaviour on the coast and in parks to compare period after any change is implemented with the current situation, to detect any increase in hate crime against minority communities

Children and Younger People

The merger of these Ranger services may impact on young people due to the cessation or reduction of education and volunteer programmes that they are involved in. Children and younger people may feel less safe if there is an increase in anti-social behaviour due to a reduction of the service. This is more apparent at Crosby, Formby and Ainsdale where considerably increased anti social behaviour takes place by groups of young people during the summer months.

Consultation took place between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012, and included the following groups:

- “In Bloom” groups

- Allotment users
- Bowlers
- Equal Voice CEN
- Football League Committees – north and south
- Formal sports pitch clubs and users
- Friends of Parks
- General Park users
- Public – via drop-in sessions and electronic questionnaires
- Sefton Access Forum CEN
- Sefton Croquet Club
- Sefton CVS
- Sefton Sports Council
- Southport Flower Show Ltd
- Beach Management Forum
- Sefton Coast Nature Conservation Forum
- Sefton Coast Partnership
- Sefton Cycling Forum
- Friends of Parks
- General coast and countryside users
- Parents Forum – north, central and south
- Sefton CVS
- LINK
- Young Advisers CEN
- Formby Civic Society
- Beachsafe
- Church Ward Forum

With regard to those with protected characteristics their views and concerns are reported above.

A full consultation report has been prepared and is available.

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

Yes: we will continue to deliver services in line with the equality act and ensure that the facilities are accessible by the disabled and elderly community members. We will continue

to work with the police in identifying hate crime.

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

- 1) Reorganise work schedules
- 2) Ensure system is in place to identify 'hot spots' for access issues and prioritise them.
- 3) Inform public of any changes to services.
- 4) Monitor service provision.

Part B Annex H

E4.12 Coast and Countryside Reduction in Site and Visitor Management

Change Proposal

Service Description: Reduction to Coast and Countryside Site Management and Visitor Management

Categorisation: Critical, Frontline, Regulatory, Other

£282,500 frontline, (beach lifeguarding, sand clearance)

£100,000 regulatory, (occupiers liability)

£380,750 Other Tier (2) (rest of service)

£763,330 total

N.B: the coast and countryside review recommends that these budgets should be aggregated and the whole service considered as frontline.

- Visitor and land management of the Coast and Rimrose Valley Country Park. This includes areas of international, national, regional and local importance for nature conservation and tourism. The service is responsible for managing visitors and addressing anti-social behaviour. Removing sand from promenades at Crosby and Southport, clearing litter from beaches and for controlling beach car parking at Southport, Ainsdale and Formby. The Coast & Countryside service also deals with the Council's responsibilities to bring nature conservation areas into 'favourable status' to meet government targets.
- The Council is responsible for coastal areas spanning 39 kilometres. The length of coastline in Council ownership is 22.5k, 10.5k of the coastline is classified as amenity/resort beach
- Sefton Council is the largest landowner on the coastal area; including the foreshore, Rimrose Valley Country Park and other areas the total area of responsibility for this service is 5,968 hectares. The Borough of Sefton as a whole is 15,210 hectares.

Consultation has closed on the following option –

Reduction to Coast and Countryside Site Management and Visitor activities

Original rationale for service change proposal –

Budgetary saving. This is further rationalisation of coast and countryside management

Legislation Considered –

The Environmental Protection Act, Wildlife and Countryside Act, Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act and Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, Occupiers Liability Act.

Anticipated Impact of Service Change –

There will be less capacity to proactively manage, protect and respond to community and environmental needs

Service Users

There will be reduced interaction with the public e.g. at Ainsdale, soft sand is a major problem. In 2010, 1700 vehicles were assisted after getting stuck in sand on the beach car park or at the entrance. The capacity of the Coast and Countryside Service to deal

with this issue will be reduced. Visitors/drivers may need to seek assistance from motoring breakdown organisations in such circumstances in future.

Partners

A reduction in staffing will have an impact on the management of SSSI's and other sites designated under European legislation and the ability of partners on the coast to manage their land (as incidents that occur that do not respect boundaries) with reduced support from Sefton

Council

There will be less staff to deal with issues that may arise, leading to prioritisation.

The Council is responsible for dealing with and coordinating other incidents such as cockling activity. The Coast and Countryside Service currently lead on the beach management side of any oil pollution incident on behalf of the Council. In the future, the Council's ability to react will be greatly reduced.

Communications, Consultations & Engagement Summary

See Consultation and Engagement Overview within this Annex

Equality Analysis

See Equality Analysis Reports within this Report.

Risks & Mitigating Actions–

- A substantial amount of the work undertaken by this service, along the entire length of the coast, is already supplemented by; volunteers, training scheme placements (e.g. work experience, Future jobs fund etc) and an inclusion project. This has been the case for many years.
- Whilst efforts will be made to plug any gaps with volunteers and trainees. It should be noted that a substantial apprentice initiative and an employment scheme were established in 2011, which lessened the impact of budget reductions. However, it is difficult at this stage to predict whether and how much supplementary support will be available in the future as Government policy in respect of employment schemes has changed and funding contributions towards apprenticeship projects may not be available. In addition, how these can be managed and supported to assist service delivery will need to be carefully considered as the ability to supervise such schemes is greatly reduced following service reductions.

Having taken consideration of the consultation and engagement activity undertaken the following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce

The following activities have been substantially reduced as a consequence of savings made for 2011/12 and these activities will now be further reduced.

Exactly which activities are reduced and when will depend on the staff resources available and the issues being faced at any particular time. A flexible and responsive, rather than planned and proactive approach will be adopted for the

following;

- **Revised and reduced management of beach car parking -Southport and Ainsdale**

There will be further reductions in onsite management of car parking

- **Reduced level of sand clearance from promenades and access points**

A reduced level of plant/equipment and staffing will result in sand blocking the promenade and adjoining paths and/or being in situ for longer periods.

- **Reduced level of litter clearance from the Resort beaches, Crosby Coastal Park and Rimrose Valley Country Park**

In general there will be further reductions in cleansing activity on all the main amenity beach areas and reduced cleansing on other coastal areas, including the hinterland, nature reserves and pinewoods.

- **Reduced Habitat management of the protected sites and discharge of Habitat Regulations obligations to seek to meet Favourable Status**

All of the coastal operations within the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's) are 'consented activity' agreed with Natural England.

- **Reduced patrolling of the 39km of coastline and Rimrose Valley**

Cost of Service: £763,330

Staffing:

3 Admin

12 Staff (including 3 ranger posts)

5.5 Temp FTE (summer staff)

Other Resources:

Proposed Cost 2012/13: £60,000

Staff at Risk: Yes

Consultation and Engagement Overview

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
e-Consult Feedback (Question responses = 296)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 91.22% of respondents are against the reduction in management of Sefton's coast and countryside areas • The main concerns are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased anti social behaviour ○ Negative environmental impact, especially regarding litter and habitat management ○ Negative impact on tourism ○ Negative impact on access, especially for the infirm and disabled <p>Examples of comments received from the</p>

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you reduce the management of the coast the species and habitats I come to the coast to enjoy will disappear. If they disappear I will no longer visit. • They will be used more by undesirable members of society and will therefore become dangerous for individuals, groups and dog walkers. As the area is also used by schoolchildren going to and from school it would only be a matter of time before something really bad occurred. • As I use the beach location for my hobby (power kiting) and its managed well here which attracts me to fly here and that will no longer be available to me. • I will still use the same, but will not be able to bring my daughter who is a wheelchair user if the sand is not cleared away. • I feel the benefit to the whole community in terms of well being, exercise, fitness etc., of using the facilities available within Sefton coastal and countryside areas make any decision to reduce the management of these areas extremely questionable particularly if the decision is being driven purely by budgetary requirements. • While I appreciate savings have to be made please consider that the Sefton Coast is a very special place not only to the people of Sefton but Countrywide. It is a "lung" for the people on low incomes living in Bootle to have a good day out with little expense. Please do not cut back too much on this excellent and lovely facility. It is needed not only by affluent Formby but by all residents. Maybe an increase in parking charges might help a little. • The stretch of coastline that Sefton is responsible for is well-known beyond Merseyside. Accordingly the Council does need to consider its responsibilities carefully before taking precipitate measures that may require a very long time to put right in the future. • It would be very easy to make cuts to your countryside service, but it would be false economy. The Sefton Coast attracts large numbers of people who come for the wildlife and the freedom, open spaces. If facilities and coverage are further reduced,

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>the whole area will be much less attractive. Anti-social behaviour will increase and the whole atmosphere will suffer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the coastal area is left to degrade it will massively affect tourism. Not only the people of Sefton come to visit the coast but also people from the whole of the North West bringing in trade to the area. It has taken many many years of management to the coast to protect the flora and fauna and if left unmanaged it will take many many years to re-establish the endangered flora and fauna. The coastal dunes also act as a massive sea defence which if left unmanaged could eventually cause coastal flooding. NOT AN OPTION A NECESSITY. • The Coast has always been under-resourced and is undervalued by many people who use it. It is unique, highly dynamic and internationally important for a variety of habitats and species of wildlife. It is often held up as an example of best practice and has been recognised and aspired towards by other agencies and authorities. Further additional cuts to coastal management may even compromise the safety of the visitors who enjoy the beaches, dunes, woodlands and nature reserves. Fewer coastal staff will lead to an even further reduced capability to deal with antisocial behaviour, environmental crimes like fly tipping or pollution incidents. The presentation of the Council's coastal estate and access to it, will suffer and claims against the Council will become more difficult to defend. • I manage the beaches / foreshore for a major resort in the south west. My primary concern when reading the proposals was the detrimental effect this could have on the built and natural environment. When cuts of this type are made the first effect is that the area becomes untidy with an uncared for feeling. This will very quickly spread to minor vandalism, graffiti etc. It will be seen from other areas where environmental care is reduced that this is just the beginning of a steady spiral in to a general degradation of the open spaces which affects the way a population

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			negatively identifies with and treats their surroundings. When attempting to turn around areas of deprivation the first job is always to get it tidied up. Learn from this.
Heritage Lottery Fund (written response)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In regards to the ongoing Sefton Landscape Partnership Scheme, you will be aware that we have awarded £1,174,000 towards conservation and access improvements on the coast. • As part of the HLF contract, the Coast and Countryside Department undertook to provide £31,450 of in kind support to the scheme and a cash contribution of £59,250. • On completion, as with Hesketh Park, the Council is contractually obliged to maintain the benefits of the scheme and in view of this £108k over 10 years was committed for this purpose. • It is clear that the scheme has already been hit hard by the economic downturn with a number of projects having to be reorganised as partners have suffered cuts or even abolished, as such despite the efforts of a very strong project team the scheme is well behind targets at this stage. • I would therefore be grateful if you could confirm whether these commitments are still in place, and if not which elements of the scheme and/or maintenance will be reduced. • If the change is significant and the benefits of the scheme are greatly reduced, we would need to consider whether the project should be taken back to our Board of Trustees.
Merseyside Police		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work in conjunction with 'ALL' Merseyside councils in relation to Wildlife Crime incidents that take place in parks / coast / open spaces across Merseyside. By far, Sefton are more professional in their approach. Over recent months, there has been issues at the cockle beds on the Ribble Estuary which is a Marine Conservation Area. Due to the fact that Sefton planned extremely well, I am sure that incidents of Wildlife Crime would have been significant, but from a human aspect there have been 'no' risks posed to human life. I am certain that if the Coastal Services had not been run in such a tight

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>manner, fatalities would have been reported this year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I can only congratulate Sefton on their approach to the Coast Line and Coastal services and the hugely varied eco system it presents (one of the most significant in Europe). [Name Omitted] has exceptional skills in this area and I feel that any potential loss to this service would be devastating not only to the Wildlife that inhabits the Coast Line, but would put human life at risk.
National Trust		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sefton Coast and Countryside Service has a reputation for excellence in dune and coastal management which extends to international audiences. The management of the beaches and natural dune areas and recreational activities in these areas brings huge benefits to local residents and visitors from a very wide area. Well managed coastal access here brings positive benefits to the visitor economy in local towns and villages like Southport, Formby and Crosby. The services provided by Sefton are similar to those provided by the National Trust here at Formby Point although the area of landscape managed by Sefton is very much larger. We are concerned that the proposed savings of £60,000 will further reduce the capacity of the Coast and Countryside Service which had to make very significant savings with losses of staff in 2011. Whilst the service has continued to deliver significant benefits this year, the cumulative reductions in funding will clearly make these harder to sustain. As an organisation with similar goals to conserve natural landscapes and deliver a range of benefits for people, we are concerned about the proposal to disinvest in one of England's finest natural assets. We are also concerned about the threat to productive partnership working going forward. At Formby, we face particular challenges in working with and adapting to natural changes of dune erosion and sand blow. We need to be able to work with Sefton to consider options which will sustain public benefits of access and enjoyment as well as landscape

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
One Vision Housing		x	<p>conservation going forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sefton's own research has shown that Tourism is worth over £400m to the local economy through 10m tourist days and through supporting 5000 jobs. Cuts proposed to the tourism budget and to the Environmental Conservation and Coast Management Budget will have a <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ direct impact on the ability of Sefton to maintain its appeal to tourists though: ○ Inaccessible beaches and parks if sand is not removed consistently ○ Loss of habitat and wildlife ○ Lack of support to tourists through removal of the tourist offices • Cuts to the Tourism budget will also have significant impact on Sefton's ability to deliver upon the City region priorities laid out in the Liverpool City Region Visitor Economy Strategy to 2020 including the regeneration of Southport and the promotion of Sefton's Coast. • Cuts to this budget will provide a short term saving which will have long term negative economic impacts on the borough as a whole making Sefton a less attractive place to visit and live.
Lancashire Wildlife Trust (Represents over 1000 members)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sefton Coast is arguably the country's most important site for nature conservation and almost all of it enjoys statutory designation as SSSI, SAC, SPA and Ramsar Site, with concomitant obligations for all its landowners/managers. • Our overwhelming concern, though, is that the level of service provided by Coast & Countryside should be maintained at its present level, particularly in respect of land management and public interface. • The presence of a Ranger Service on the Council's landholding on the Sefton Coast forms a critical resource, together with staff from the National Trust, Natural England and ourselves, in implementing the objectives of the Sefton Coast Partnership in respect of habitat management, lifelong learning, tourism, engagement of the public and enhancing the image of the borough. • The ability of the Coast & Countryside Service to deliver these objectives has already been hard hit, suffering an

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>approximate cut of 50% in funding and staffing during 2011/12. This has resulted in their having to cease educational provision and significantly reduce both their ranger and beach staff. The Formby/Ravenmeols area, for example, is now without any dedicated staff during winter, the period when most habitat management work needs to be carried out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's landholding is by far the largest on the coast and Sefton Council has over the years built a national and international reputation for innovative and consistent habitat management, especially of sand dunes, but equally for its leading role in bringing together nature conservation organisations, tourism interests, educationalists, local communities and others under the umbrella of the Sefton Coast Partnership as an exemplar of Integrated Coastal Zone Management. Further cuts would seriously jeopardise this. • The consultation document puts forward the possibility of making good possible staff losses through increased use of training schemes etc. Useful as such schemes have proven to be, they require dedicated staff in order to function - not just in respect of direct supervision of trainees but critically from rangers with their intimate knowledge of the coast and its requirements. Lose those staff and you run the risk of losing permanently many years of accumulated knowledge and experience. • We have similar reservations with the proposal to make good gaps in provision through the use of volunteers. Our organisation is extremely reliant on volunteers to assist in carrying out all aspects of our work – we have 200 or so in Sefton alone. But our experience has shown us that this is by no means a 'free' option. Large expenditure of staff time is required in order to recruit, train, supervise and above all enthuse volunteers, they can rarely be left just to 'get on with things' and do not appreciate being asked to. Further staff cuts are therefore much more likely to result in a decrease rather than an increase in volunteering.

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
Sefton Council Cycling Forum (11 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was put forward proposed by JF and seconded by DH. • Motion: That the Cycle Forum does not support the further reduction in the Coast & Countryside operational budget as it would be detrimental to the level of service provided particularly in the removal of wind blown sand from Crosby & Southport promenades which are key components of the Sefton Cycle Network and coastal path enjoyed by many Sefton residents and visitors. • Agreed This motion was agreed by the Members of the Cycle Forum
Beach Consultation Group (now Sefton Beach Management Forum) (31 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affecting the capability of the Coast and Countryside Service to look after internationally important species and habitats could seriously devalue the coast.
(Dr) Philip H. Smith MBE		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coast & Countryside Service is responsible for the management of land that has international, national, regional and local importance for nature conservation and tourism. Indeed, the one feature for which Sefton Borough is internationally renowned is its coastal sand-dune system which is the largest in England, the fourth largest in Britain and is increasingly recognised as the most biodiverse in northwest Europe. • SMBC is the largest land-owner on the dune coast and has an international responsibility for its duneland holding, most of which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and a European <i>Natura 2000</i> site. There is a statutory requirement for the Council to maintain the areas so designated in "favourable condition". • For over 30 years, through its involvement in the Sefton Coast Management Scheme and Sefton Coast Partnership, the Council has gained an enviable reputation for best practice in coastal dune conservation and management. This is now threatened by proposed cuts in services. • Already, the 2010/11 cuts have adversely impacted the Coast & Countryside

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			Service's ability to manage effectively the Council's sand-dune property. Further proposed cuts are likely to have serious and potentially disastrous long-term implications for the future of this internationally important natural resource
Ms. LH	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If this is the way in which money is being managed then I am quite sure that the £384,000 due to be spent on the Ainsdale and Birkdale dunes could be put to far better use in a Sure Start nursery, or to help retain staff for SEN children, or keep payments to care providers, would it not?
Sefton Access Forum/ABILITY (SAF = 16 attendees, ABILITY = 32 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The groups did not fully support this option, as a number of options listed under this were felt to have major implications for the lives and experiences of disabled people within the borough and also visiting key coastal attractions. The point around the management of beach car-park was supported if it was not costs effective. The point regarding sand clearance from the promenade and access areas were not, and serious health and safety implications were raised for disabled people with limited mobility and those with visual impairments. Points of concern were also raised regarding litter, habitat maintenance and graffiti as the group were aware of projects within the borough around increasing visitor numbers of Sefton and particularly coastal areas. And that a dirty, vandalized and generally scruffy Sefton would send out the wrong messages to visitors and would seriously put people and families off visiting.
Equal Voice (3 attendees)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater use should be made of advertising to support income to the services Community Payback Teams should be used on the coast and in parks for sand clearance, habitat management and parks maintenance <p><i>Note: Community Payback Teams are already in use by this service. Their use is restricted operationally.</i></p>
Parents Forum (28 persons/19 organisations)		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued cuts would increase the build-up of sand on the Promenades particularly in Waterloo. Where there is no or little sand clearance which affects accessibility for bikes, prams and wheelchairs. Do we not

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<p>have a human right to walk freely on the promenades or is it for able-bodied people? The sand was at least 6 feet high!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I live on the Formby Coast and I am proud of how clean and safe it is. To take away this service will be a disadvantage to local people, visitors and wildlife. • Reduction in maintenance already been noticed • The Crosby Coastal Area is cleaner now than it was 40 years ago. • The Squirrel Reserve needs to be kept clean and safe • We need to keep the beach clean and safe for local residents and visitors. • Ocean Plaza – main beach (can we do something about grass growing through?)
<p>Young Advisers (17 attendees)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 62% were against this proposal • This was their fifth highest spending priority • Ask volunteers to help with cleaning of the coast and countryside and could have a coast & countryside award for so many hours service • Volunteers (e.g. university students or people with a keen interest in the coast) to take school groups and youth groups out and explain the coast and wildlife etc. • University students could also contribute to the maintenance of habitats and preservation of our wildlife and rarer species
<p>Sefton Pensioners and Older Citizens (Written response)</p>	?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If older citizens do not participate in physical and social activities, and do not “get out of the house” there is a much greater likelihood that they will suffer from social isolation and, consequently, physical and mental health problems. In the long term this will generate extra costs for both the local authority and the NHS.
<p>Telephone survey (303 responses)</p>		x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% of respondents disagreed with this proposal and 28% agreed. (11% neither agreed or disagreed)

General Summary

- Most respondents are **against** the change proposal
- The statutory management of habitat has been highlighted as being of national and international importance
- The following suggestions were received as alternatives:
 - Ask volunteers to help with cleaning of the coast and countryside
 - Use of Community Payback Teams to help with cleaning of the coast and countryside

Respondent	For the Proposal	Against the Proposal	Comments Received
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a result of the consultation there is no mitigation/action to consider

Impact Assessment

Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

Reference E4.12 (R)

Details of proposal: E4.12 The Reduction to Coast and Countryside Site Management and Visitor activities by £60K (less than 10%) from a total budget of £763.330 (including the RLNI Lifeguarding contract)

The Coast and Countryside Service has already been reduced by £356,000 as part of the budget measures for the financial year 2011/12. Budget reductions for the five year period up to and including the figure for 2011/12 total £434,000 or 57%.

The Coast and Countryside Service provides a range of services:

Service	Provides
Coast and Countryside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of coast and countryside Tourist beaches and promenades All Estate maintenance Litter management/beach cleansing Coastal Oil Pollution Coordination RNLI/partnership management Woodland and Tree management Biodiversity and Access Inclusion Project Management of SSSI's/nature reserves Litter and sand clearance management Litter and dog order enforcement Enforcement of byelaws Maintains the rural right of way network Coastal access Sefton Coast HLF Landscape Partnership

Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': Yes

- Reduced management of beach car parking (Southport / Ainsdale)
- Reduced levels of sand clearance from promenades and access points
- Reduce level of litter clearance from resort beaches/coastal park/Rimrose

valley country park

- Reduce Habitat management from protected sites
- Reduce patrolling of the 39km coastline & Rimrose valley

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

Yes.

- 3) The service reduction may mean delays in clearing sand from access points and maintenance of access features such as disabled boardwalks which may have access issues for disabled / elderly users and families with prams/push chairs and who may use on-beach car parking.
- 4) Lack of Coast and Countryside Rangers will lead to higher incidents of crime including hate crime.

Mitigation:

- 4) Key access spots have been identified in consultation with disabled community and there will be 'priority' access spots that will continue to be maintained subject to prevailing conditions and resources. Continued dialogue with the disabled community will enable us to identify and further inform the community of accessible sites.
- 5) Whilst the Coast and Countryside Service report crimes and request support from the Police, when they are not available the community contacts the police in the normal manner – we will make it clear that the police should be contacted in the instance of serious offences and we work with partners to ensure that Hate crime is reported and acted on.
- 6) Although issues of antisocial behaviour are generally a police matter, most matters are dealt with by rangers without Police involvement, especially relating to the enforcement of byelaws which is the responsibility of Sefton Council. There will be a reduction in enforcement, but we will attempt to continue to provide evidence and support the Council legal Department and the police within our resources.

Consultation.

Visitor demographic research was carried out by the Sefton Coast Partnership for Sefton's Natural Coast in 2008 and prepared by England's Northwest Research Service in the form of a report in 2009. The report identified the following age group profiles:

16-24	6%
25-34	14%
35-44	22%
45-54	23%
55-64	20%
65+	15%

In terms of gender, the split was 50%/50%

Over half respondents were in employment (61%) and a quarter being retired.

85% of respondents were described as “white British/other” and 6% came from other ethnic groups.

In total 9% of all those interviewed as part of the survey indicated that had some form of disability, although this varied considerably by location and was higher on sites managed by the Coast and Countryside Service than other partner sites on the coast;

Disability % of respondents for Sefton Council managed sites is described as:

Ainsdale Beach	10.3%
Discovery Centre	2.1%
Hall Road	12.3%
Birkdale	19.6%
Ainsdale/Birkdale NR	5.1%
Formby LBR	18.8%
Crosby	10.3%

Consultation took place between 20th November 2011 and 16th January 2012, and included the following groups:

- Beach Management Forum
- Sefton Coast Nature Conservation Forum
- Sefton Coast Partnership
- Sefton Cycling Forum
- Equal Voice CEN
- Friends of Parks
- General coast and countryside users
- Parents Forum – north, central and south
- Sefton Access Forum CEN
- Sefton CVS
- LINK
- Young Advisers CEN
- Formby Civic Society
- Beachsafe
- Church Ward Forum

Older People

Older people may feel less safe if there is an increase in anti-social behaviour due to a reduction of the service. This is more apparent at Formby and Ainsdale by groups of young people is experienced during the summer months.

People with Limited Mobility

Sefton Access Forum and ABILITY CEN identified the following issues:

- If any changes were to take place within the coast and countryside teams it was

vital that the maintenance of access around the coast were maintained, in particular pathways, the prom and key access points to ensure that disabled people have equal access to enjoying these spaces as non-disabled people.

Minority Communities

Equal Voice CEN identified the following issues:

- There should be increased monitoring of anti social behaviour on the coast and in parks to compare period after any change is implemented with the current situation, to detect any increase in hate crime against minority communities

Children and Younger People

Cessation of Rangers or the merger of these Ranger services would impact on young people due to the cessation or reduction of education and volunteer programmes that they are involved in. Children and younger people may feel less safe if there is an increase in anti-social behaviour due to a reduction of the service. This is more apparent at Crosby, Formby and Ainsdale where considerably increased anti social behaviour takes place by groups of young people during the summer months.

A full report is available on request.

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

Yes: we will continue to deliver services in line with the equality act and ensure that key facilities are accessible by the disabled and elderly community members. We will continue to work with the police in identifying hate crime.

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

- 1) Reorganise work schedules, but take into account that other operational aspects of the service will not take place
- 2) Ensure system is in place to identify 'hot spots' for access issues and prioritise them.
- 3) Inform public of any changes to services.
- 4) Monitor service provision.

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex L

(As 2nd February 2012 Cabinet Report)

Budget option E2.1 to review all services that are funded by Supporting People by looking at outcomes, contractual arrangements and diversity of services that this may fund.

Purpose/Summary

As Members are aware extensive consultation has been undertaken in order to provide an evidence base of the needs and views of the local communities, together with other data and information relating to the relevant service areas. This part of the report contains an option which relates to Supporting People. The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of the feedback on the consultation and engagement activities associated with the option to:

- E2.1 to review all services that are funded by Supporting People by looking at outcomes, contractual arrangements and diversity of services that this may fund.

This option is identified as potentially having complex and far reaching impacts either across all the community or on the most vulnerable. The option has been amended in the light of the consultation, further analysis and risk assessment are continuing. This part of the report gives Members the opportunity to carefully consider the information available at this stage.

The report contains the following Annex –

Annex A – Responses and Analysis to Sefton Council's consultation on the option to reduce the budget for Supporting People.

Recommendation(s)

Cabinet is recommended to

- a) note and take into account the key messages identified from the results of the consultation
- b) give careful consideration to this information
- c) identify any further information required by Members for consideration at the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 in order to inform their recommendation to 1st March 2012 Council based on an understanding of local need
- d) at the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 give further regard to the information contained in this report and any additional information provided and determine if this proposal will be recommended for approval by Council. Such proposal to include a further period of consultation on commissioning priorities for the remaining resources and the detail of how the budget reduction could best be delivered whilst minimising/mitigating the impacts i.e. a further review. That further review to be completed by May 2012 so that it identifies the services to be ceased/de-commissioned, rationalised and resources targeted to maximise effect on the basis of those commissioning priorities. The ambition is to reduce the

budget in 2012/13 by £2m and by £3m in 2013/14.

- e) Members will be advised in June 2012, following the conclusion of the consultation and review, as to whether and how it will be possible to deliver the full-year budget saving of £3m.

Implications:

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

<p>Legal LD</p> <p>This budget provides a myriad of services. In completing the further review any legislative basis for such support will need to be considered. In addition tailored equality analysis reports will need to be completed, risks and mitigating actions identified in order to allow Members to reach informed decisions.</p>						
<p>Human Resources</p> <p>There are currently no staffing implications associated with this report. A reduction in the Supporting People Admin staffing is contained in Part A of the Transformation report.</p> <p>Regular consultation on proposed changes will continue with the trade unions and employees will be informed of developments by their respective Service Directors. Employees within service areas are aware that their status may change subject to the outcome of these reviews.</p>						
<p>Equality See Section 3</p> <p>The Corporate Commissioning Team holds the responsibility for taking an overview on Equality Impact Assessments and assessing the impact of decisions. These will be published on the Council website.</p> <table><tr><td>1. No Equality Implication</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>2. Equality Implications identified and mitigated</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>3. Equality Implication identified and risk remains</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td></tr></table> <p>In relation to compliance with the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, Members need to make decisions in an open minded balanced way showing due regard to the impact of the recommendations being presented. Members need to have a full understanding of any risks in terms of people with protected characteristics and any mitigation that has been put in place. Equality Impact Assessments, including consultation, provide a clear process to demonstrate that Cabinet and Council have consciously shown due regard and complied with the duty.</p>	1. No Equality Implication	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Equality Implications identified and mitigated	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Equality Implication identified and risk remains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1. No Equality Implication	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. Equality Implications identified and mitigated	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. Equality Implication identified and risk remains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

Impact on Service Delivery:

Should this option progress there will be a reduction in the number of clients that will be able to be supported due to a reduction in units available, together with a change in the level of support available. This may have an impact on the community.

There is a related saving (E2.2), to review staffing support for the Supporting People commissioning functions, which will be progressed alongside E.2.1 and as part of a wider review of departmental commissioning resources. This is likely to result in a reduction in the number of staff directly supporting the Supporting People commissioning functions. Impact will be managed through and a more integrated commissioning approach.

What consultations have taken place on the proposals and when?

Regular and ongoing consultations have taken place with Strategic Directors, Director of Older People, Director of Commissioning, Head of Personnel, Head of Corporate Finance & ICT, Head of Legal Services and Trade Unions.

The methodology used followed Sefton's Public Engagement and Consultation framework and was approved by the Sefton's Engagement and Consultation panel.

A consultation plan was drafted by the Head of Service Commissioning and Partnerships and agreed by the consultation panel on 21st October 2011. It was agreed that the public consultation on the proposal would take place between 21st October 2011 and the 16th January 2012.

In respect of option E2.2, consultation with staff has been undertaken and some feedback received. This consultation will continue, taking into account feedback received, as part of a wider review of departmental commissioning resources.

Are there any other options available for consideration?

None.

Contact Officers:

Robina Critchley, Director of Older People
0151 934 4900

1. Introduction/Background

- 1.1 This part of the report seeks to provide feedback from the consultation exercise for consideration by the Council prior to making decisions on specific change proposals which may impact upon the final 2012/13 budget.
- 1.2 Members are asked to identify any further information required for consideration at the next Cabinet meeting on 16th February 2012 in order to inform their recommendation to 1st March 2012 Council based on an understanding of local need.
- 1.3 Supporting People is a discretionary programme that funds housing-related support services to help vulnerable people live independently in their own accommodation or to move from temporary accommodation into a more permanent place. The programme supports the following client groups:
- People with learning disabilities;
 - Older people with support needs;
 - People with mental health problems;
 - Young People at risk (including Care Leavers and teenage parents);
 - Homeless people with support needs (including single people, families
 - Offenders and people at risk of offending;
 - People with drug/alcohol misuse problems;
 - People with physical or sensory disabilities;
 - People at risk of domestic violence;
 - People with HIV/AIDS; and
 - Home Improvement Agency.
- 1.4 The programme funds a mixture of short-term (from a few weeks up to a maximum of two years) and long-term services, falling mainly into the following categories:
- *Accommodation-based services* – where the support is linked to the person’s accommodation, either temporary (e.g. Homeless units; Women’s refuge etc.) or permanent (e.g. sheltered housing), and aims to provide a stable environment and extra help for vulnerable people.
 - *“Floating support” services* - where the support is provided in the person’s home and aims to support people who need help to remain independent in their home (e.g. help and advice with rent, bills, managing money, keeping to a tenancy agreement etc.); and
 - *Assistive Technology* – this is a “lifeline” community alarm system provided either as part of the accommodation (e.g. sheltered accommodation) or within someone’s own home.
- 1.5 Supporting People funded services in Sefton support in the region of 5300 people at any one time, with the short-term services having a large throughput of clients.

2. Consultation and Engagement Overview

- 2.1 The approach to consultation was agreed by the Consultation panel on 21st October 2011. A full consultation of residents, service users and interest groups was carried out between 21st October 2011 and 16th January 2012 and included e-Consult online questionnaires, paper questionnaires, an “easy-read” version; attending various stakeholder meetings and forums, and visits to services to assist service user participation.
- 2.2 A total of 747 completed questionnaires were returned, although 1 was so incomplete that it was not included within the analysis. The remaining 746 responses were as follows: 436 from Services Users, 203 from employees, managers or volunteers from Service Providers, and 61 from Friends/Family/Carers of Service Users, The 436 service user responses represents approximately 8.2% of the total current Supporting People service users, indicating a margin of error for service user answers of around +/- 5%.
- 2.3 Of the service users who responded to the diversity questions, 262 were female, 152 were male and 204 considered themselves to have a disability.
- 2.4 From the responses received the overwhelming majority (86.8%) do not agree that the Supporting People budget should be reduced. 388 of these responses were from service users and 179 were from providers. 95 respondents did agree that the budget should be reduced, of these 71.6% stated that they thought the reduction should be between 5-10%, 22.1% stated it should be between 15-20% and the remaining responses totalling 6.3% stated a reduction of between 25-40%. Of the respondents who stated yes to a reduction in funding 38 (40.0%) were Service users and 26 (27.4%) employees, managers or volunteers with a service provider.
- 2.5 When asked to prioritise the client groups receiving support, respondents identified the highest priority Client Groups as: older people with support needs; people with physical/sensory disabilities; people with mental health problems; homeless families with support needs; and people at risk of domestic violence all of whom had essential/high priority rates over 82%. Indeed over half of the client groups currently supported by Supporting People funding were identified as essential or high priority by more than 50% of all respondents.
- 2.6 A significant number of respondents agreed that a reduction in funding for services supporting vulnerable adults would impact on the community. 90.1% agreed or completely agreed that there would be increased pressure on social care services whilst 82.0% of respondents agreed that there would be an increase in homelessness. 91.6% of respondents claimed that a reduction in funding for services supporting vulnerable adults would have an impact on them or somebody they know.
- 2.7 Over 70.2% of respondents stated that they did not know how services could be delivered differently to reduce costs. 164 respondents (29.8%) stated that services could be delivered differently to reduce costs. Suggestions for ways

in which services might be delivered differently included suggestions relating to: greater efficiency; improved effectiveness to gain better value for money; different ways of working, including increased use of volunteers; and means-testing for services.

- 2.8 In addition to the responses to the consultation questionnaire representation has been made by a number organisations in letter format, these responses are attached within Annex A to this report.
- 2.9 The full results of the consultation are contained within Annex A.
- 2.10 Cabinet is asked to note the consultation feedback as part of the decision making process.

3. Risk Management Overview

- 3.1 When considering this in principle budget option, to reduce the Supporting People budget by up to £3m, Members should be aware there will be consequences for both the threshold (eligibility criteria) and capacity (numbers of services users) of the programme, with a reduction in the number of clients that will be able to be supported and the level of support available.
- 3.2 There is a potential that a reduction in Supporting People funding will lead to negative impacts for the vulnerable adults supported by the funded services, including those with protected characteristics of age, disability and gender. The table below shows the range of services provided to those with protected characteristics –

Client Group	Protected Characteristic	Amount and percentage of current funding	Support units available and percentage of total*
People with Learning Disabilities	YES – DISABILITY Services specifically designed for people with disabilities	£2,043,471 29.94%	206 3.84%
Older People with Support Needs i.e. Sheltered Housing and Community Alarm Services	YES – AGE Services specifically designed for persons 60+	£1,217,385 17.84%	3025 56.43%
People with Mental Health Problems	YES – DISABILITY Services specifically designed for people with disabilities	£915,917 13.42%	183 3.41%
Young People at Risk	YES – AGE Services specifically designed for 16 – 19 year olds	£678,593 9.94%	74 1.38%
Generic	NO	£660,507 9.68%	1002 18.69%
Single Homeless with Support Needs	NO – however of the 2 of the 5 schemes under this client group are specifically for young people aged 16 – 25 which accounts for 22 of the units	£468,063 6.86%	86 1.60%
Offenders or People	NO	£235,389	60

Client Group	Protected Characteristic	Amount and percentage of current funding	Support units available and percentage of total*
at Risk of Offending		3.45%	1.12%
Home Improvement Agency	NO – A high percentage of clients who use this service are older people	£139,406 2.04%	528 9.84%
Physical/Sensory Disabilities	YES – DISABILITY Services specifically designed for people with disabilities	£136,434 2.00%	49 0.91%
People with Substance Mis-Use Problems	NO	£112,350 1.65%	10 0.19%
Women at Risk of Domestic Violence	YES – SEX Service specifically designed for females	£99,155 1.45%	103 1.92%
Teenage Parents	YES – AGE Services specifically designed for 16 – 19 year olds	£57,952 0.85%	18 0.34%
Homeless Families with Support Needs	NO	£30,650 0.45%	10 0.19%
Young Parents	NO	£19,266 0.28%	6 0.11%
People with HIV/AIDS	YES – DISABILITY Services specifically designed for people with disabilities	£11,204 0.16%	1 0.019%

3.3 The commissioning priorities will be influenced by the initial consultation and the next phase of consultation, but for illustrative purposes only, they might include some or all of the following:

- Targeting remaining funding at the most vulnerable and those at greatest risk;
- A more integrated approach to the commissioning of services across the Council and other partners to ensure the most effective use of the total available resources;
- Reconfiguring services in order to target resources where they can be most effective;
- To minimise the impact on high cost statutory services;
- Ensuring an appropriate spread of services according to need;
- Ensuring that all targeted client groups have access to services ;
- Maximising value for money; and
- Agreeing clear and measurable outcomes for all funded services.

3.4 There are additional risks that a significant reduction in access to preventative services funded through Supporting People could increase the pressure on higher-cost statutory services, including, adult and children's social care services and services provided to meet the Council's statutory homelessness duties. These risks can be reduced by a more integrated approach to commissioning and the provision of early intervention and prevention services to ensure the most effective use of the total available resources. Service users with the highest needs will continue to receive services if they meet the social care eligibility criteria for adults or children's services.

4. The Proposal /Options for Consideration

- 4.1 Consultation on option E2.1, to review all services that are funded by Supporting People by looking at outcomes, contractual arrangements and diversity of services that this may fund, has confirmed a number of significant risks to vulnerable people as well as the potential to increase pressure on higher-cost statutory services.
- 4.2 In light of the consultation to date and recognising that where services are to be discontinued/de-commissioned providers will need to undertake correct legal employment processes, it is proposed to amend the original option to the extent that, should Members approve this in principle budget option, the review of services funded by Supporting People would include a further period of consultation on commissioning priorities for the remaining resources and the detail of how the budget reduction could best be delivered whilst minimising/mitigating the impacts. That review to be completed and services ceased/de-commissioned on the basis of those commissioning priorities by the end of June 2012, to achieve an in principle full-year budget reduction of £3m in 2013/14 and a £2m saving in 2012/13. Members would be advised in June 2012, following the conclusion of the consultation and review, as to whether it will be possible to deliver the full-year budget saving of £3m
- 4.3 The rationale for Budget Option E.2.2, to review staffing support for the Supporting People programme was that if the Supporting People budget is reduced (E.2.1), activity and commissioning will reduce and less staff would be required. It is proposed that if Members approve option E2.1, that E2.2 remains unchanged, that consultation continues with staff, changes/reductions are implemented as part of a wider review of departmental commissioning resources but that the timescale for implementation is extended to June 2012 in accordance with the timescale and workload now proposed in respect of E2.1. This would result in a likely reduction in the 2012/13 saving achieved through E2.2 from £57,000 to £42,750.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 It is clear from the consultation that there is little support from respondents for a significant reduction in Supporting People funding and services. If accepted, this option does have associated risks and impacts for vulnerable people, it is likely however, that these can to some extent be mitigated by the actions identified within this report, including more co-ordinated commissioning and delivery of early intervention and prevention services.

This page is intentionally left blank

Supporting People
Annex A

Responses and Analysis to Sefton Council's consultation on the option to reduce the budget for Supporting People.

(Ref: E 2.1)

Consultation Period:

21st October 2011 – 16th January 2012

Contents

	Page (s)
Background	3
Consultation Methodology	3
	3
Executive Summary	
Consultation Analysis	4
Other Responses	13

Alternative Options Proposed

Monitoring Information

Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Detailed Responses

Appendix 2 – Other Document Representation

Background

Following the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review and settlement the Council forecast a significant budget gap over the three years 2011-2014.

An initial package of potential budget options was approved by Cabinet, 13th October 2011, to commence consultation and engagement. In relation to these, consultation activity took place with service users, the general public, partners, key stakeholders, staff and Trade Unions.

The consultation on the budget options closed on Monday 16th January 2012.

This report summarises the response for the option of reducing the budget for Supporting People.

Consultation Methodology

The methodology used followed Sefton's Public Engagement and Consultation framework and was approved by the Sefton's Engagement and Consultation panel.

A consultation plan was drafted by the Head of Service Commissioning and Partnerships and agreed by the consultation panel on 21st October 2011. It was agreed that consultation on the proposal would take place between 21st October 2011 and the 16th January 2012. The consultation was made available online and in hard copy format which included an easy read version. Forums and face-to-face consultation events with service users also took place and available notes are attached.

An email was sent to all providers and partners of the programme raising awareness of the council's budget options for 2012/13 highlighting the proposal E2.1 Review of Services – Supporting People and encouraging people to complete the questionnaire on line. A copy

of the consultation was attached to the email with a request for providers to distribute and support clients in their service to take part.

Members of the supporting people team visited 32 services to raise awareness and to help clients to complete questionnaires on a one to one basis. Prior to the visit, posters were produced and distributed to scheme managers to display in communal areas to promote the visit. Notes were made of any questions raised at the visits.

Supporting People staff also attended awareness sessions/forums for Equal Voice, Ability, People First, The Parenting Board and The Learning Disabilities Partnership events. The Health and Social care forum was attended by [Name Omitted] and [Name Omitted] on behalf of the Supporting People team.

This option was also included in the telephone survey.

Executive Summary

A total of 747 completed questionnaires both hard copy and e-consult were returned, although 1 was so incomplete that it was not included within the analysis. Of the 746 responses 203 were received from Providers of Supporting People Services 203, Services Users 436, and 61 Friends/Family/Carers of Service Users.

Of the service users who responded 262 were female and 152 were male. 204 service users considered themselves to have a disability.

From the responses received the overwhelming majority (86.8%) do not agree that the Supporting People budget should be reduced. 388 of these responses were from service users and 179 were from providers.

95 respondents did agree that the budget should be reduced, of these 71.6% stated that they thought the reduction should be between 5-10%, 22.1% stated it should be between 15-20% and the remaining responses totalling 6.3% stated a reduction of between 25-40%. Of the respondents who stated yes to a reduction in funding 38 (40.0%) were Service users and 26 (27.4%) employees, managers or volunteers with a service provider.

When asked to prioritise the client groups receiving support, respondents identified the highest priority Client Groups as: older people with support needs; people with physical/sensory disabilities; people with mental health problems; homeless families with support needs; and people at risk of domestic violence all of whom had essential/high priority rates over 82%. Indeed over half of the client groups currently supported by Supporting People funding were identified as essential or high priority by more than 50% of all respondents.

Out of the 746 respondents a total of 539 (72.2%) said that they had either worked in or used a Supporting people service.

A significant number of respondents agreed that a reduction in funding for services supporting vulnerable adults would impact on the community, 90.1% agreed or completely agreed that there would be increased pressure on social care services whilst 82.0% of respondents agreed that there would be an increase in homelessness.

91.6% of respondents claimed that a reduction in funding for services supporting vulnerable adults would have an impact on them or somebody they know, with over 70% of respondents saying that they did not know how services could be delivered differently.

Of the 695 respondents who answered the question about gender 60.9% were submitted by females. Of the 655 responses to the age question 45.7% were submitted by people aged 60+, the data has also shown that 46.4% of 642 respondents have a disability.

The report provides details on each of the questions and also provides detailed comments received from respondents that provide their thoughts around:

- Why the Supporting People budget should or should not be reduced
- The impact(s) that a reduction in funding may have on communities
- Any other concerns about a reduction in funding for the Supporting People budget
- Any other thoughts about reducing costs i.e. delivery services in different ways


In addition to the responses to the consultation questionnaire representation has been made by a number organisations in letter format, these responses' are attached in appendix 2. All responses show concern that reducing the Supporting people budget would have detrimental impacts on both clients and community.

89% of respondents to the Telephone Survey disagreed with the proposal to reduce housing related support services for older people and others who have support needs. 5% agreed, 5% neither agreed or disagreed.

The Consultation Analysis

Question 1: Why are you interested in this option?

There were 746 questionnaires received in total, 724 respondents answered this question.



Provider – 28.04% = 203 respondents

Of the 203 responses 183 entered a gender, from the 183 gender entries 73 were Male and 110 were female. Of the 183 respondents 165 entered an age, this data is shown below:

	Gender	16 - 25	26 - 59	60+
Male	73	2	44	21
Female	110	2	67	29

Of the 203 respondents 35 stated a disability, 1 respondent did not enter a gender.

	Disability	Disability All
Male	20	35
Female	14	

Total Answers 34

Service User – 60.22% - 436 respondents

Of the 436 interested responses 414 entered a gender, from the 414 gender entries 152 were Male and 262 were female. Of the 414 respondents 394 entered an age, this data is shown below:

	Gender	16 - 25	26 - 59	60+
Male	152	18	55	75
Female	262	22	50	174

Of the 436 respondents 210 stated a disability, 6 respondents did not enter a gender.

	Disability	Disability All
Male	86	210
Female	118	
Total Answers	204	

Friend/Family/Carer of Service User – 8.43% - 61 respondents

Of the 61 interested responses 53 entered a gender, from the 53 gender entries 26 were Male and 27 were female. Of the 53 respondents 49 entered an age, this data is shown below:


	Gender	16 - 25	26 - 59	60+
Male	26	2	15	8
Female	27	2	11	11

Of the 61 respondents 23 stated a disability, 2 respondents did not enter a gender.

	Disability	Disability All
Male	11	23
Female	10	
Total Answers	21	

Question 2: Do you agree that the Supporting People budget should be reduced? – All data

There were 746 questionnaires received in total, 630 respondents stated that the funding should not be reduced with 95 stating that a reduction in funding should be made.



Question 2: Do you agree that the Supporting People budget should be reduced? – “No” data

Of the 746 questionnaires submitted 630 people responded to this question, *668 options were identified; the following table outlines the “No” option by gender.

Gender – Number of people who responded “NO”	630	Female	Male	No Data
		369	218	43
Provider of Supporting People Services - Employee/Manager	179	100	62	17
Provider of Supporting People Services - Volunteer	16	6	6	4
Service User	388	237	131	20
Friend/Family/Carer of Service User	48	25	15	8
Not Stated	37	16	16	5
Total Options identified	*668			

*Some of the respondents identified more than one option

Of the 746 questionnaires submitted 630 people responded to this question, *668 options were identified; the following table outlines the “No” option by Age group.

Age - Number of No answers - 630		Age Range		
		16 - 25	26 – 59	60+
Provider of Supporting People Services - Employee/Manager	179	5	96	48
Provider of Supporting People Services - Volunteer	16	0	10	2
Service User	388	39	89	225
Friend/Family/Carer of Service User	48	4	18	16
Not Stated	37	2	10	18
Total Options identified	*668			

*Some of the respondents identified more than one option

Of the 630 respondents, 36.83 % (232) of respondents considered themselves to be disabled.

Question 2: Do you agree that the Supporting People budget should be reduced? – Yes data

Do you agree that the Supporting People budget should be reduced? – % of yes respondents by reduction %

The following table details the 95 respondents who requested a reduction and what reduction they felt would be viable, of the respondents that answered yes to a reduction 71.58% felt that a reduction of between 5% - 10% was most suitable.

Budget to be reduced by:	Number of respondents	Male	Female	Not Stated
5%	48	26	19	3
10%	20	11	7	2
15%	14	4	10	0
20%	7	3	4	0
25%	1	1	0	0
30%	1	0	1	0
35%	2	0	2	0
40%	2	1	1	0
TOTAL	95	46	44	5

26 (27.37%) of the 95 respondents who stated yes to a reduction in funding were Provider of Supporting People Services - Employee/Manager, whilst 38 (40.00%) of the respondents were Service users.

Question 3: Indicate how you would prioritise these services by ticking the relevant boxes

The table below shows the responses for the question – please indicate how **you** would prioritise these services.

A high percentage of respondents, 92.05% indicated that the client group of Older People with Support Needs was either an essential or high priority service, whilst People with Physical/Sensory Disabilities and People with Mental Health Problems 84.80% and 83.95% respectively were also regarded as essential to high priority.

=> Column Option	Essential			High Priority			Medium Priority			Low Priority			Not a Priority			Total	
Answer Option	Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %
		col %	row %		col %	row %		col %	row %		col %	row %		col %	row %		Response %
Older People with Support Needs	553	14.26	75.75	119	5.15	16.30	31	1.50	4.25	14	1.70	1.92	13	2.32	1.78	730	7.57
Homeless Families with Support Needs	364	9.39	51.70	227	9.83	32.24	89	4.30	12.64	10	1.21	1.42	14	2.50	1.99	704	7.30
People with HIV/AIDS	166	4.28	24.70	162	7.02	24.11	214	10.35	31.85	74	8.97	11.01	56	10.00	8.33	672	6.97
People with Mental Health Problems	382	9.85	54.26	209	9.05	29.69	81	3.92	11.51	19	2.30	2.70	13	2.32	1.85	704	7.30
People with Substance/Alcohol Mis-Use Problems	191	4.93	27.36	129	5.59	18.48	184	8.90	26.36	113	13.70	16.19	81	14.46	11.60	698	7.24
Teenage Parents	161	4.15	23.30	138	5.98	19.97	230	11.12	33.29	100	12.12	14.47	62	11.07	8.97	691	7.17
Young Parents	149	3.84	22.07	132	5.72	19.56	240	11.61	35.56	96	11.64	14.22	58	10.36	8.59	675	7.00
Home Improvement Agency	173	4.46	25.52	115	4.98	16.96	195	9.43	28.76	105	12.73	15.49	90	16.07	13.27	678	7.03
Single Homeless with Support Needs	273	7.04	39.06	197	8.53	28.18	173	8.37	24.75	34	4.12	4.86	22	3.93	3.15	699	7.25
Offenders or People at Risk of Offending	181	4.67	26.27	146	6.32	21.19	173	8.37	25.11	113	13.70	16.40	76	13.57	11.03	689	7.15
People with Learning Difficulties	346	8.92	49.29	199	8.62	28.35	112	5.42	15.95	30	3.64	4.27	15	2.68	2.14	702	7.28
People with Physical/Sensory Disabilities	396	10.21	56.25	201	8.71	28.55	75	3.63	10.65	24	2.91	3.41	8	1.43	1.14	704	7.30
Generic	168	4.33	28.33	135	5.85	22.77	184	8.90	31.03	71	8.61	11.97	35	6.25	5.90	593	6.15
People at Risk of Domestic Violence	375	9.67	53.50	200	8.66	28.53	87	4.21	12.41	22	2.67	3.14	17	3.04	2.43	701	7.27
Total	3878	40.23		2309	23.95		2068	21.45		825	8.56		560	5.81		9640	100.00

The results in the table below are data sorted from the table above in descending percentage order of Essential – High priority service provision. The medium to low columns reflect the results of the corresponding service provision.

Client Group	Essential - High	Medium	Low - No Priority
Older People with Support Needs	92.05%	4.25%	3.70%
People with Physical/Sensory Disabilities	84.80%	10.65%	4.55%
People with Mental Health Problems	83.95%	11.51%	4.55%
Homeless Families with Support Needs	83.94%	12.64%	3.41%
People at Risk of Domestic Violence	82.03%	12.41%	5.57%
People with Learning Difficulties	77.64%	15.95%	6.41%
Single Homeless with Support Needs	67.24%	24.75%	8.01%
Generic	51.10%	31.03%	17.87%
People with HIV/AIDS	48.81%	31.85%	19.34%
Offenders or People at Risk of Offending	47.46%	25.11%	27.43%
People with Substance/Alcohol Mis-Use Problems	45.84%	26.36%	27.79%
Teenage Parents	43.27%	33.29%	23.44%
Home Improvement Agency	42.48%	28.76%	28.76%
Young Parents	41.63%	35.56%	22.81%

The client group with the highest essential – high percentage, Older People with Support Needs had 672 responses:

- 402 Females answered (59.82%) of which 222 were from the 60+ age range (33.04%).
- 232 Males answered (34.52) of which 105 were from the 60+ age range (15.63%)
- 245 (36.45) respondents considered themselves to be disabled who prioritised the Older people Services.

The following table outlines responses to essential – high service provision by gender and age group response:

	Female	Male	16 - 25	26 - 59	60+	Age Not Stated
Older People with Support Needs	402	232	42	222	327	43
Homeless Families with Support Needs	350	201	44	222	250	35
People with HIV/AIDS	198	110	32	137	120	19
People with Mental Health Problems	346	211	45	214	263	35
People with Substance/Alcohol Mis-Use Problems	174	125	38	174	74	13
Teenage Parents	165	113	44	141	79	14
Young Parents	151	111	43	135	73	11
Home Improvement Agency	169	109	20	97	142	19
Single Homeless with Support Needs	275	165	46	196	174	24
Offenders or People at Risk of Offending	183	121	32	165	90	17
People with Learning Difficulties	324	186	45	196	236	33
People with Physical/Sensory Disabilities	353	208	45	211	274	31
Generic	188	97	19	100	146	20
People at Risk of Domestic Violence	338	199	47	211	246	33

Question 4: Have you or someone you know worked with/used one of the above support services?

Answer Option	Response #
Yes	539
No	155

Of the 539 respondents who indicated yes:

- 323 of the respondents to this question were female
- 186 of the respondents to this question were Male
- 198 of the respondents considered themselves to be disabled.

If you ticked Yes, please state which support service it is/was:-
See comments Appendix 1

Of the 746 respondents 506 gave comments for this question. A categorised summary of those support services contained within their comments is contained in the table below.

Support Service	Response #
Affordable Warmth	5
Domestic Violence	1
Generic	3
Home Improvement Agency	4
Homelessness/Hostel	21
Mental Health	49
Miscellaneous	65
Multiple Services used	129
Not Recorded	240
Offender Services (Including Offending or risk of offending)	15
Older People with Support Needs	162
People with Learning Difficulties	20
Physical Difficulties	5
Substance/Alcohol Misuse	10
Supported Lodgings/Housing	14
Teenage Parent	1
Young People	2
Total	746

Question 5: Would you agree that a reduction in funding for services supporting vulnerable adults in Sefton would impact on your community in any of the following ways?

A significant number of respondents agreed that a reduction in funding for services supporting vulnerable adults would impact on the community, 90.09% agreed that there would be increased pressure on social care services whilst 81.96% of respondents agreed that there would be an increase in homelessness.

=> Column Option	Completely Agree			Agree			Agree Nor Disagree			Disagree			Completely Disagree			Total	
Answer Option	Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %		Response #	Response %
		col %	row %		col %	row %		col %	row %		col %	row %		col %	row %		Response %
No development of new support services	436	14.09	64.02	126	14.77	18.50	63	15.25	9.25	35	17.33	5.14	21	13.46	3.08	681	14.43
Less choice of support services	435	14.05	64.06	145	17.00	21.35	49	11.86	7.22	25	12.38	3.68	25	16.03	3.68	679	14.39
Lower quality services	469	15.15	69.38	108	12.66	15.98	46	11.14	6.80	28	13.86	4.14	25	16.03	3.70	676	14.33
Increased Crime	420	13.57	62.87	94	11.02	14.07	93	22.52	13.92	42	20.79	6.29	19	12.18	2.84	668	14.16
Less support for victims of domestic violence	408	13.18	61.08	148	17.35	22.16	66	15.98	9.88	25	12.38	3.74	21	13.46	3.14	668	14.16
Increase in homelessness	420	13.57	62.59	130	15.24	19.37	68	16.46	10.13	32	15.84	4.77	21	13.46	3.13	671	14.22
Increase pressure on social care services	507	16.38	75.00	102	11.96	15.09	28	6.78	4.14	15	7.43	2.22	24	15.38	3.55	676	14.33
Total	3095	65.59		853	18.08		413	8.75		202	4.28		156	3.31		4719	100.00

A total of 423 females responded to this question and 299 stated that increased pressure on social care services was their greatest concern (70.69%)

A total of 272 males responded to this question and 181 stated that increased pressure on social care services was their greatest concern (66.54%)

Question 6: Would a reduction in funding for services supporting vulnerable adults in Sefton have any impact on you, your service or somebody you know?

Answer Option	Male	Female	Response #
Yes	202	356	591
No	21	29	54
Blank	49	38	87

There 190 individual comments made by the respondents to this question details of which are in appendix 2

Question 7: Are there any ways you think that services supporting vulnerable adults in Sefton can be delivered differently to reduce costs?

Answer Option	Male	Female	Response #
Yes	57	94	164
No	139	231	387
Blank	76	98	174

If you ticked Yes, please state which support service it is/was:-

There 158 individual comments made by the respondents to this question details of which are in appendix 2

Other Responses (see Appendix 1)

Notes from all visits to Supporting People Services.

[Name Omitted] - Facilitator, Sefton Older Persons Forum

[Name Omitted] - Chief Executive Officer, Light for Life.

[Name Omitted] – Chief Executive Officer, One Vision Housing

[Name Omitted] – Interim Chair, Supporting People Providers Forum, Chief Executive Officer, Forum Housing

Alternative Options Proposals

None

Monitoring Information


Respondents by Post Code

There were 746 questionnaires received in total, the following table indicates the response of clients from the areas were they reside.

Post Code	Number
L9	2
L10	0
L20	166
L21	86
L22	66
L23	48
L29	0
L30	42
L31	37
L37	9
L38	2
PR8	72
PR9	69


Gender

There were 746 questionnaires received in total, 695 respondents answered the gender question, 423 Females and 272 males.




Age

There were 746 questionnaires received in total, 655 respondents answered the age question.



Disability

There were 746 questionnaires received in total, 642 disabilities were identified from the questionnaires.



Ethnicity

There were 746 questionnaires received in total, 680 respondents answered the ethnic origin question, 16 ethnicities were identified within the responses.

Ethnic Origin	Number	Percentage
Black – African	1	0.15%
Black - Caribbean	1	0.15%
Chinese - Chinese	3	0.44%
Chinese - Other Chinese Background	1	0.15%
Mixed Ethnic Background - Asian & White	2	0.29%
Mixed Ethnic Background - Black African & White	1	0.15%
Mixed Ethnic Background - Black Caribbean & White	1	0.15%
Mixed Ethnic Background - Other Mixed Ethnic Background	1	0.15%
White – British	335	49.26%
White – English	303	44.56%
White – Irish	16	2.35%
White - Scottish	7	1.03%
White – Welsh	1	0.15%
White – Polish	2	0.29%
White – Latvian	1	0.15%
White - Other White Background	4	0.59%

Appendix 1 – Detailed Responses

COMMENTS

Question 2 Comments

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

REDUCTION IN THE BUDGET WILL RESULT IN A CUT IN THE SERVICE AT PRESENT FOR ELDER VULNERABLE PEOPLE

PEOPLE NEED THE SUPPORT TO CONTINUE SO THE SERVICE DOESNT SUFFER SERVICES ARE NEEDED

IF ITS CUT IT COULD MEAN THAT MY SERVICE CLOSES AND I WOULD BE HOMELESS. MIGHT END UP IN JAIL.HAVE BEEN CLEAN FOR 7 MONTH DUE TO THIS SERVICE

COULD MEAN US BEING HOMELESS IF OUR SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION IS CLOSED DOWN. OUR CLIENTS WOULD BE HOMELESS & I COULD END UP WITHOUT A JOB.

BECAUSE PEOPLE WOULD END UP WITH NOWHERE TO LIVE

WILL LEAD TO PROBLEMS LATER ON

ELDERLY PEOPLE NEED ALL THE SUPPORT AVAILABLE

ELDERLY PEOPLE NEED ALL THE SUPPORT THEY SE

MY LIFESTYLE WILL NOT BE AS GOOD

IMPACT ON MY LIFESTYLE

IMPACT ON LIFESTYLE

MY LIFESTYLE WILL NOT BE AS GOOD

IT MAY AFFECT MY LIFESTYLE

INPUTTER MESSAGE: THE CLIENT RESPONDED AS HAVING TWO OPTIONS AND IF THERE WAS TO

BE A REDUCTION IT WOULD BE 5% - THE TENANTS IN THIS SCHEME ARE ALL LOW INCOME
I THINK THAT THIS IS THE LAST SERVICE THAT SHOULD BE CUT, IT GIVES SUPPORT TO THE MOST
VULNERABLE PEOPLE IN SOCIETY, AND WILL IN THE LONG TERM COST A LOT MORE IF THESE
SERVICES ARE STOPPED.

NOT ENOUGH SUPPORT AT THE MOMENT

COSTS ARE HIGH ENOUGH, WITH RENT COUNCIL TAX ETC.

IT WILL AFFECT PEOPLES CONFIDENCE FOR THE FUTURE

PEOPLE FROM ALL WALKS OF LIFE WILL BE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED CUTS

NO FURTHER CONFIDENCE IN THE LOCAL AUTHORITY

QUALITY OF LIFE FOR OVER 60s WOULD SUFFER

OVER 60s QUALITY OF LIFE WOULD SUFFER

REDUCTION IN QUALITY OF FUTURE LIFE

PERCEIVED LACK OF FUTURE QUALITY OF LIFE

LACK OF CONFIDENCE RE LOCAL AUTHORITY FOR THE FUTURE

NOT A SERVICE USER YET, BUT IF WE HAVE NO REAL CHOICE, PLEASE LET IT BE SMALLEST

NO WERE TO LIVE

IT IS HIGH ENOUGH

IT SHOULD BE INCREASED

NO REASON TO REDUCE IT

10% IS A VIABLE OPTION AS THIS IS AN EQUATABLE VALUE TO THE CONTROLABLE BUDGET

NO MONEY SHOULD BE REDUCED AS ALL SERVICES ARE ESSENTIAL

BECAUSE IT'S NEEDED

IT IS ESSENTIAL TO HAVE

BECAUSE IT IS AN ESSENTIAL SERVICE VITAL TO PEOPLE AT RISK FROM DANGER

BECAUSE IT HELPS ME TO KEEP MY HOME LIFE IN THE CUSTOM THAT I AM USED. IF IT IS REDUCED

I MAY NOT EVEN BE ABLE TO KEEP UP MY STANDARD OF LIVING.

NOT ENOUGH IS PROVIDED YOU NO

TO MAINTAIN EXISTING LIFE

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

I THINK THAT MONEY FOR VUNERABLE PEOPLE SHOULD BE LEFT ALONE

IT HELPS WITH MY RENT AND SAVES ON SOME OF THE CHARGES

TO MAINTAIN MY STANDARD OF LIVING

SUPPORT IS NEEDED BY ALL

MY LIFESTYLE WOULD NOT BE AS GOOD AS IT NOW.

PENSIONERS IN THE UK ARE AMONG THE LOWEST IN THE EUROPE. YOU CANNOT LIVE ON YOUR

PENSION LIVING STANDARDS AMONG OAPS ARE POOR - YOU EXIST

PEOPLE NEED SUPPORT

EVERYONE NEEDS SUPPORT

BECAUSE THERE ARE SO MANY VULNERABLE ADULTS & CHILDREN DEPENDING ON THE SERVICES
PROVIDED. IF THERE IS A REDUCTION IT IS A QUESTION OF THE DEPENDENTS BEING PUT ASIDE &
BECOMING MORE DEPENDENT.

BECAUSE THESE PROVIDERS ARE IN PLACE FOR A REASON, OTHERWISE THE COMMUNITY GETS
AFFECTED, IF THERE NO HOSTELS.

BECAUSE THEY PROVIDE A MUCH NEEDED SERVICE

BECAUSE THE QUALITY OF THE SERVICES WOULD CHANGE

BECAUSE IT HELPS PEOPLE

THE AMOUNT OF MONEY CURRENTLY BEING GIVEN IS ALREADY FALLING SHORT WITHOUT A 44%
CUT

THEY SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED BECAUSE A LOT OF PEOPLE WOULD SUFFER FOR THIS
SUPPORTING PEOPLE OFFERS PEOPLE A LIFELINE, VALUABLE SUPPORT NEEDED TO LIVE
INDEPENDENTLY, TO BUILD SKILLS AND IT ALSO PROMOTES SOCIAL INCLUSION.

BECAUSE IT IS A NECESSARY AND WORTHWHILE SERVICE

SUPPORTING PEOPLE IN SEFTON MUST BE MAIN PRIORITY, SO SHOULD BE 100% FINANCE
TOWARDS THIS SERVICE

ALTHOUGH WE HAVE HAD QUITE A LOT OF FUNDING INT HE PAST, WE STILL NEED FUNDING FOR
TUTORS. IT IS OF THE UPMOST IMPORTANCE OUR CLIENTS HAVE A GOAL IN LIFE AND WITH
LIMITED OPTIONS THIS QUEST WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE

FUNDING ESSENTIAL TO KEEP SERVICE, BE BACK ON STREETS WITHOUT IT

IT IS ESSENTIAL FUNDING. THERE WILL BE SERIOUS REPERCUSSIONS FOR ALL SERVICES IF

SUPPORT SERVICES ARE CUT.

I HAVE DEMENTIA AND NEED EXTRA HELP. I.E FOR TRANSPORT TO MY DAY CENTRE BECAUSE THERE ARE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL & PHYSICAL DISABILITIES WHO NEED THAT EXTRA HELP

EVERYONE BECOMES OLD & THEREFORE PEOPLE WHO HAVE NEEDS BECAUSE THEY OLDER SHOULD NOY HAVE FUNDING REDUCED THEY HAVE PAID IN ALL THEIR LIVES AND ARE ENTITLED TO HELP GROUPS THAT HAVE NOT PAID INTO THE POT SHOULD NOT HAVE ANYTHING OUT

IT WILL IMPACT ON MY HEALTH

IT WILL IMPACT ON MY HEALTH

IT WILL IMPACT ON MY HEALTH

THE CURRENT BUDGET PROVIDED TO THIS DOES NOT REFLECT THE VALUE OF SUPPORT PROVIDED. A REDUCTION WOULD ONLY HAMPER FURTHER SUPPORT

COMMUNITY BASED HELP IS IMPORTANT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AS IT ENABLES THEM TO MAINTAIN A SECURE LIFESTYLE. SUPPORTED LODGINGS HAS HELPED THE YP I CARE FOR CONTINUE IN STUDIES ETC

SUPPORTING PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY OUR YOUNG PEOPLE SHOULDN'T BE CUT AS THEY ARE OUR FUTURE GENERATION AND AS SUCH NEED A GOOD SECURE GROUNDING BECAUSE IT IS A VERY A INPORTANT SERVICE

AMOUNT PAID FOR HOUSEHOLDER SUPPORT REQUIRED/GIVEN IS NOT REFLECTIVE OF TIME/EFFORT SPENT ALREADY. A REDUCTION WOULD MEAN LESS TIME/EFFORT AND SUPPORT. THIS WOULD BE AT THE DETRIMENT OF SUPPORT REQUIRED. THE VALUE CURRENTLY PAID IS NOT EXCESSIVE AND WOULD ALMOST BE DEEMED TO BE UNDERVALUED.

I WOULD BY PREPARED TO TRY AND MAKE SAVINGS IF POSSIBLE

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

THE YP'S ARE OUT CHILDREN OF THE FUTURE. THEY DESERVE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES TO RECEIVE LOVE, BE GIVEN A STABLE, HAPPY ENVIRONMENT AND AN EDUCATION. WITHOUT STABILITY, THE CHANCES OF THE YP HAVING A BRILLIAN FUTURE ARE DRAMATICALLY REDUCED. PEOPLE WHO USE THESE SERVICES USE THEM FOR A REASON. THEY NEED IT! CUTS TO ADMIN I.E. STATIONERY ETC CAN BE LOOKED AT BUT CUTTING STAFF AND PEOPLE ON THE GROUND WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO ALL USERS AND THE SUPPORT NEEDED BY CARERS ETC.

THE SUPPORT PEOPLE SERVICE IS A MUCH NEEDED SERVICE, IN PARTICULAR THE YOUNG PERSONS SUPPORTED LODGINGS. WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO THEM IF IT WASN'T FOR THIS SERVICE.

BECAUSE YOU KEEP TAKING FROM THE YOUTH THEN THEY WILL END UP IN THE PLACE WE DON'T WANT THEM! THEY NEED SUPPORT, EDUCATION AND GUIDANCE:- I DO UNDERSTAND THAT COSTS ARE BEING MADE EVERYWHERE, BUT IT DOESN'T MAKE IT RIGHT

IT GIVES YOUNG PEOPLE A CHANCE TO GO ON FURTHER EDUCATION AND WITHOUT THEY WOULD HAVE TO TRY FIND JOB

THIS WILL AFFECT NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS AVAILABLE

BECAUSE IT IS A VERY IMPORTANT SERVICE

THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE BUDGET IS CRUCIAL TO PROVIDING SERVICES FOR THOSE MOST UNRELIABLE MEMBERS OF SOCIETY

THIS IS A NECESSARY BUDJET THAT SUPPORT END PROTECTS AND NATURES YOUNG PEOPLE, WHOM ALOT IN MY EXPERENCE OF (16 YRS) WOULD COST THE GOVERNMENT SO MUCH MORE MONEY IN THE FUTURE

THE MONEY IS USEFUL FOR MANY REASONS FOR EXAMPLE HELPS WITH TRAVEL, AND TO STAY IN FULL TIME EDUCATION WHICH WILL BENEFIT IN THE LONG RUN

I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO GO TO COLLEGE. T WOULDN'T HAVE THE SUPPORT I NEED TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN LIFE.

IF THE CUTS HAPPEND YOUNG PEOPLE WOULD REDUCE THEMSELVES TO MORE CRIME, DRUGS AND ALCOHOL AND THERE WILL BE MORE PROBLEMS ON THE STREET

BECAUSE SUPPORTED LODGINGS GIVES A HOME TO THOSE WITHOUT THE THAT CAN NOT LIVE ALONE WITH A BUDGET CUT LESS PEOPLE ARE LIKELY TO BE ACCOMODATED

LIMITS PEOPLE IN NEED OF A SERVICE

BECAUSE VERY MANY PEOPLE RELY ON IT. PERHAPS COUNCILLORS COULD CUT DOWN ON THEIR CIVIC RECEPTIONS AND OTHER PERKS IF THEY ARE SERIOUS ABOUT SAVING MONEY

OLDER PEOPLE NEED HELP AT HOME

SUPPORTING PEOPLE PROVIDE AN INVALUABE SERVICE TO NEEDY PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY

EVERY PENNY IS PUT TO GOOD VALUE

A LARGE PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE WHO RECEIVE SUPPORT, RELY ON THIS SERVICE ESPECIALLY THOSE WHO LIVE IN SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION AND (ARE VULNERABLE). IF WE DID NOT HAVE THIS SUPPORT, ESPECIALLY FROM OUR (SCHEME MANAGER) THEN THE ONLY OTHER ALTERNATIVE FOR LOTS OF US WOULD BE TO MOVE INTO (CARE HOMES) LOSE OUR INDEPENDENCE, AND OF COURSE (COST MUCH MUCH MORE)

I CANNOT ANSWER THIS QUESTION

BECAUSE I WOULD HAVE TO PAY MORE WITH MY RENT AND I CAN'T AFFORD IT OR LOSE THE SERVICE PROVIDED

THERE IS NOT ENOUGH BUDGET FOR THIS SERVICE AT THIS MOMENT IN TIME

IT IS A VERY VALUABLE SERVICE TO VULNERABLE CHILDREN GOING INTO ADULTHOOD AND SOME ADULTS SEE THIS AS THEIR FULL TIME JOB. COMPARE THIS BUDGET TO CHILDRENS HOMES AND INDEPENDENT LIVING!!!

I HAVE WORKED LONG AND HARD FOR MY OLD AGE. I GAVE UP MY HOME AND LIVED IN A HOSTEL IN LONDON BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE I COULD WORK. I BELIEVED THIS WAS A FREE COUNTRY WHERE I COULD CHOOSE TO WHOM I GAVE MY MONEY. IT SEEMS IT IS NOT.

THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE BUDGET IS DIRECTED TOWARD THE MOST VULNERABLE PEOPLE IN OUR COMMUNITY. THE CUTS NEED TO BE BORN BY THOSE WHO CAN MOST AFFORD IT NOT THE LEAST ABLE TO.

TIMES ARE HARD FOR LOTS OF DIFFERENT PEOPLE AT THE MOMENT AND THEY NEED HELP AND SUPPORT

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

BECAUSE YOU WOULD BE CUTTING DOWN ON VITAL SERVICES FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE
BECAUSE YOU WOULD BE CUTTING DOWN ON VITAL SERVICES FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE
SERVICE USER NEEDS SUPPORT. IF SUPPORT IS REDUCED IT WILL IMPACT ON OTHER SERVICES
EG HOSPITALS GP'S

SERVICE USER NEEDS SUPPORT, IF SUPPORT IS REDUCED IT WILL IMPACT ON OTHER SERVICES
E.G. HOSPITALS, GPs ETC

PEOPLE WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO COPE WITHOUT THE HELP OF SUPPORT WORKER

THE SERVICE IS A TREMENDOUS HELP TO ALL WHO ATTEND, ALSO HOME VISITS ARE A BRILLIANT HELP IN TIMES OF NEED

THERE ARE MANY VULNERABLE PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY WHO DO NOT HAVE A VOICE OR WHO'S VOICES ARE NOT EXERCISED DUE TO A MIND FIELD OF BUREAUCRACY AND RED TAPE

BECAUSE IT IS AN IMPORTANT SERVICE AND THE MONEY THEY RECEIVE IS IMPORTANT AND IS USED FOR PEOPLE WHO NEED IT

IT IS A RELATIVELY LOW COST SERVICE WHICH FILLS THE GAP THAT STATUTORY SERVICES DON'T FILL. INDIVIDUAL IMPACT VERY HIGH

SUPPORTING PEOPLE IS ESSENTIAL FOR PEOPLE WHO REALLY NEED HELP, NOT PEOPLE WHO BRING PROBLEMS ON THEMSELVES

SOME PEOPLE NEED SUPPORT

IT IS FALSE ECONOMY TO WITHDRAW SUPPORT FROM THE MOST NEEDY IN SOCIETY.

REDUCTIONS IN THIS SUPPORT WILL INEVITABLY RESULT IN INCREASES IN DEMAND IN OTHER AREAS - E.G. HEALTHCARE, EMERGENCY SERVICES, HOMELESSNESS, ASB ETC.

I BELIEVE THESE TYPES OF SERVICES ARE ALREADY DONE AT THE BARE MINIMUM AND THAT THERE MUST BE OTHER BUDGETS WHICH SHOULD BE LOOKED AT FIRST.

IT WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE USERS AND OVH SERVICES AND LEAD TO LOSS OF JOBS

WE NEED ALL THE MONEY WE CAN GET AS WE GET OLDER WE NEED HELP MORE & MORE VITAL SERVICES

THESE ARE ESSENTIAL SERVICES AND WITHOUT THEM MANY OF THE SERVICE USERS WILL CAUSE OTHER PROBLEMS IN SOCIETY - THEY NEED THE SUPPORT

BECAUSE THEY ARE DOING A LOT OF GOOD, TO EVERYONE THEY HELP

SUPPORTING PEOPLE SUPPORT BUDGET SHOULD REMAIN INTACT FOR THOSE WHO IT APPLIES TO. NO CUTS SHOULD BE MADE TO SERVICES WHICH PEOPLE HAVE LEARNED TO BE USED TO.

SOME AREAS COULD BE CUT BACK BUT MOST ARE VITAL

OLD AND INFIRM PEOPLE NEED ALL THE SUPPORT THEY CAN GET

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

WORKED ALL MY LIFE NOW I NEED A LITTLE BACK TO MAINTAIN MY INDEPENDENCE

MY PARENTS NEED SUPPORT TO LIVE INDEPENDENTLY

OLD PEOPLE NEED THIS SUPPORT THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE TO SUBSIDISE THIS GET THE MONEY FROM SOMEWHERE ELSE IE BANKERS
BUDGET SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED AS NATURAL REDUCTION IS ALLREADY OCCURING. DUE TO REDUCTION IN STAFF AND INCREASE IN COSTS OF MATERIALS
ALTHOUGH IT IS CLEAR THAT THE COUNCIL MUST MAKE SPENDING CUTS, THIS QUESTION CANNOT BE ANSWERED UNLESS IT IS KNOWN HOW SUCH PERCENTAGE CUTS WOULD AFFECT SPECIFIC SERVICES
IT WILL DIRECTLY AFFECT SERVICE USERS
BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT SUPPORTING PEOPLE IN THE HOMES SAVES IN THE LONG RUN. I.E PREVENTING OLDER PEOPLE GOING INTO CARE/HOSPITAL. VULNERABLE PEOPLE SUSTAINING TENANCIES.
NO INFORMED ENOUGH TO FEEL ABLE TO GIVE A DECISION
LOSS OF JOBS
THIS IS A ESSSENTIAL SERVICE. WE NEED THIS SERVICE.
WE NEED THE SUPPORT
IT WILL STOP CARE TO PEOPLE THAT NEED IT
I HAVE A MENTAL PROBLEM AND NEED A LOT OF SUPPORT

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

WE ALL NEED SUPPORT
ZERO. WE NEED THE SERVICE
WE NEED THE SERVICE
WE NEED THE SERVICE
IT WILL AFFECT STANDARDS OF LIFE FOR A LOT OF PEOPLE
VULNERABLE PEOPLE WILL BE AT MORE RISK THAN EVER
DISABLED PEOPLE NEED THE HELP AND THE ELDERLY
THE SERVICES PROVIDED ARE ESSENTIAL AND ANY REDUCTION IN FUNDING WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO SERVICE USERS
I CONSIDER THE SERVICE ESSENTIAL, WE NEED ALL THE HELP WE CAN GET AS AN OLDER PERSON, WITH SUPPORT NEEDS. I FIND THE WEEKLY VISIT OF THE COMMUNITY WARDEN. [Name Omitted], ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL BRIAN IS A LIFELINE FOR ME, AS I LIVE ALONE. HE IS ALWAYS HELPFUL AND PROFESSIONAL AND VITAL FOR ME.
PREVENTS MORE EXPENSIVE OPTIONS DOWN THE LINE
I THINK THEY DO A BRILLIANT JOB TOWARDS TENANTS
THE OLDER PEOPLE IN THE BUNGALLOS NEED THE WARDEN WE HAVE ON A PERMANENT BASIS
PLEASE CONSIDER THIS BEFORE YOU TAKE ACTION
BECAUSE I NEED THE SUPPORT
BECAUSE THEY WORK HARD TO SERVE OTHER PEOPLE
BECAUSE THEY WORK HARD TO SERVE OTHER PEOPLE
CUTS TO THIS BUDGET WILL MEAN A GREAT DEAL OF HARDSHIP AND MISERY FOR MANY OF THE MOST VULNERABLE PEOPLE IN SEFTON. THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY SUPPORTING PEOPLE BUDGETS ALLOW PEOPLE TO LIVE INDEPENDENT AND FULFILLED LIVES. I BELIEVE SHORT TERM CUTS IN THIS AREA WILL LEAD TO GREATER EXPENDITURE ELSEWHERE, PROVING TO BE A FALSE ECONOMY. I ALSO BELIEVE THERE IS NO REALISTIC AND VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR PROVIDING THESE SERVICES AND ONCE CUT WOULD NEVER BE ABLE TO RECOVER SHOULD THE BUDGET SITUATION IMPROVE IN THE FUTURE.
THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT AND ESPECIALLY IN THE CURRENT CLIMATE THIS WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE OVERALL EFFECT ON CARE
THE INDIVIDUALS/GROUPS WITH THE MOST NEEDS ARE BEING PLUNDERED BY THIS AUTHORITY VIA THE GOVT. THE LEAST ABLE MAY NOT BE AWARE OF ACTUAL CUTS AND IMMEDIATE AND LONG TERM SHORTCOMINGS. AND MANY HAVE NEEDS THAT CAN SIMPLY BE CATORGARISED INTO THE USED BOXES
WE ARE PAYING FOR AN ESSENTIAL SERVICE
WE ARE BEING IN TO MORE HARDSHIP
BECAUSE IT COULD CAUSE MORE HARDSHIP
AS A PENSIONER I FEEL THAT SUPPORT IS NEEDED, ESPECIALLY THE ELDERLEY WITH NO FAMILY SUPPORT
SPEAKING FOR MYSELF I THINK WHEN EVERYTHING DONE WHY ALTER IT
SCHEME MANAGERS ESSENTIAL
WITHOUT [Name Omitted] SCHEME WOULDN'T BE THE SAME [Name Omitted]

WE NEED OUR OUR SCHEME MANAGER
BECAUSE WE NEED THEM
WUD HAVE MORE HARDSHIPS
THINGS ARE VERY HARD AS IT IS
NOT A GOOD IDEA. PEOPLE HAVE A HARD TIME ALREADY. IT WOULD CORSE MORE HARDSHIP.
THIS BUDGET IS VITAL IN SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF SEFTON AND PROVIDES A LIFE LINE FOR
MANY PEOPLE
BECAUSE A LOT OF VULNERABLE PEOPLE WILL SUFFER IF THEY DON'T GET HELP
NOT ENOUGH SUPPORT TO DATE
SUPPORTING PEOPLE DELIVERS IMPORTANT AND NECESSARY HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT
SERVICES
I THINK THEY NEED MORE MONEY NOT LESS
CANNOT SURVIVE MORE CUTS

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

SERVICES ARE DIFFICULT ENOUGH TO ENGAGE CURRENTLY. AS AN AGED PERSON I ANTICIPATE
MY NEEDS TO GROW, NOT LESSEN. REDUCED PROVISION WOULD MAKE THE END OF MY LIFE
MORE DIFFICULT AS WELL AS THAT OF THE MANY OTHERS IN MY SITUATION. ALL OF US WHO
HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO SERVICES IN OUR LIFE.

BECAUSE I DO NOT KNOW THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE SCALE OF SUCH CUTS
THEY HAVE DONE THERE BIT NOW DO YOURS

ON A STRICT BUDGET, I'M LUCKY IF I BUY CLOTHES ONCE A YEAR. ANY REDUCTION MEANS LESS
FOOD.

BEFORE YOU EVEN THINK ABOUT REDUCING THE SERVICE SUPPORTING PEOPLE, JUST THINK
ABOUT THE IMPACT THIS WILL HAVE ON THE OLDER PEOPLE WHO DEPEND ON THIS SERVICE
PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION ARE MAINLY ELDERLEY AND THEY FEEL
LESS VUNRABLE KNOWING SOMEONE IS HERE TO HELP IF THEY ARE NEEDED
YOU WOULD FIND MORE VULNERABLE PEOPLE OUT ON THE STREET WITH NO HELP & HAVE HAVE
FOUND AS I HAVE GOT OLDER NEEDING SUPPORT THIS HAS KEPT ME INDEPENDENT (INDEPENDENT)
AT THIS TIME OF LOW ESTEEM PEOPLE SEEM TO HAVE LOST EVERYING BETWEEN SAVINGS,
STOCK MARKET AND AGENCIES? AND FEEL THAT WHAT THEY HAVE LEFT IS NOT A LOT BUT
THERE SANITY AND THEIR HEIALTH, OR DISABILITIES. I DO THINK THAT ANY SUPPORT IS A BIG
HELP WHEN NEEDED, AND SHOULD BE MAINTAINED NOT RESTRICTED TO FAIL AS YOU ASKING.
THE ANSWER IS IN THE QUESTION NO.

DON'T WANT TO LOOSE OUR SCHEME MANAGER

A SCHEME IS VERY MUCH NEEDED

SERVICES ARE ALREADY SUBSTANTIALLY BELOW OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

NO REDUCTION OF SCHEME MANAGER VITAL TO SMOOTH RUNNING OF SCHEME

DON'T WANT TO LOOSE MANAGER

MUM NEED A LOT OF SUPPORT & THESE PEOPLE PROVIDE A LOT OF HELP AND WE ALL MIGHT
NEED THERE HELP SOME TIME IN OUR LIFE TIME

I FEEL THIS HELPS SUPPORT MY MUM AND WE AS A FAMILY AS CARERS & WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO
WORK IF THERE WAS NOT THE SUPPORT

WE NEED HELP

LEVEL OF SUPPORT NEEDS TO BE HIGHER NOT REDUCED

MANY VULNERABLE PEOPLE WILL BE AFFECTED

AM SUPPORTED WITH THE HELP OF MY SISTER & COMMUNITY NURSES OVER WORKED SUPPORT
FROM SCHEME MANAGER

THESE CUTS ARE ILLEGAL, FLY IN THE FACE OF THE GOVERNMENT PROVISIONS FOR
SUPPORTING PEOPLE AND SEFTON COUNCIL WILL BE TAKEN TO COURT IF THEY PURSUE THIS
WHICH WILL COST EVEN MORE MONEY

ONLY GIVE ENOUGH MONEY TO LIVE ON WITHOUT REDUCING IT.

THIS WOULD REDUCE HELP THAT OLDER PEOPLE NEED AND POSSIBLY INCREASE STRESS
PEOPLE ACCEPTED AS SERVICE USERS HAVE PROVED ALREADY THAT THIS SERVICE IS REALLY
NEEDED

THE ELDERLY DON'T RECEIVE AS MUCH HELP AS THEY NEED NOW TO CUT IT IS IMMORAL AND
SHOULD BE TAKEN OF THE AGENDA

HAPPY WITH CURRENT LEVEL OF SERVICE DON'T WANT IT CHANGED LEAVE THINGS AS THEY ARE
BECAUSE THE FACILITIES ARE THERE FOR PEOPLE WHO NEED THE SUPPORT (SIMPLE)

ALREADY POORLY FUNDED

HAPPY WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION
BECAUSE I RECEIVE THIS SERVICE
I RELY ON SUPPORTING PEOPLE
PENSIONERS WHO ONLY HAVE THE STATE PENSION TO LIVE ON NEED ALL THE HELP THEY CAN GET
PEOPLE STILL NEED SUPPORT. THE AMOUNT OF PEOPLE NEEDING SUPPORT HASN'T DECREASED SO WHY SHOULD THE BUDGET?
THE YOUNG PEOPLE INVOLVED ARE AT A VULNERABLE AND CRITICAL TIME IN THEIR LIVES. THIS SERVICE CAN PROVIDE THE STABILITY REQUIRED TO ALLOW THEM TO GO ON TO BECOME SUCCESSFUL ADULTS.

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

CUTTING THE BUDGET WILL RESULT IN YOUNG PEOPLE NOT BEING SUPPORTED AND ACCOMMODATED RESULTING IN INCREASED HOMELESSNESS AS WELL AS ASSOCIATED BEHAVIOUR SUCH AS CRIME. THIS MAY SAVE MONEY ON THIS PARTICULAR BUDGET BUT NOT SAVE SOCIETY ANYTHING. LOOK AT THE BIG PICTURE
THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICES AFFECTS THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE. BUDGET CUTS ARE INEVITABLE IN MOST CASES BUT FRONTLINE ESSENTIAL SERVICES SHOULD HAVE MINIMUM IMPACT AS HARDSHIP FOR SERVICE USERS WOULD BE THE RESULT OF CUTS.
IT IS A VITAL SERVICE TO ALL WHO USE IT IT CAN NOT BE REDUCED PEOPLE NEED IT FAR TOO MUCH

N/A

N/A

SEE ABOVE

SEE ABOVE

REDUCED BUDGET MEANS REDUCED SERVICE

SOMEONE WILL BE LEFT HELPLESS

THE HELP GIVEN BY THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE TEAM IS INVALUABLE TO PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES
KEEPS THE COMMUNITY INFORMED OF WHATS HAPPENING AND ALSO THE NEED OF COMMUNITY OFFICERS WHEN INCIDENTS HAPPEN

IT WOULD REDUCE OUR LIVING STANDARDS

I WOULD LOOSE SUPPORT

PEOPLE NEED SUPPORT

I BELIEVE THAT SOCIETY OWES IT TO DISADVANTAGED GROUPS TO SHOW COMPASSION AND SUPPORT, THIS IS CORE OF WHAT MAKES UP A REGULARLY ORGANISED SOCIETY. REDUCING THESE SERVICES WILL CAUSE HARDSHIP TO PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT IN A POSITION TO HELP THEMSELVES.

I FEEL LOSING THE SUPPORT WOULD LEAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE VUNERABLE

DON'T THINK MONEY SHOULD BE TAKEN FROM FROM RETIRED PEOPLE 80-90YRS

IT WILL REDUCE OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

PEOPLE ON PENSION CREDIT HAVE HAD THEIR MONEY REDUCED, FUEL BILLS ON THE UP PRICES IN SHOPS GOING UP EVERY WEEK THEIR GENERAL STANDARD OF LIVING GOING DOWN PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS SHOULD GET MORE HELP, NOT LESS IF THE BUDGET IS CUT

IT HELPS PEOPLE WHO CAN'T GET HELP ANYWHERE ELSE

THE SP BUDGET IS PROVEN TO REDUCE THE LONG TERM FINANCIAL STRAIN ON THE PUBLIC PURSE. £2.11 FOR EVERY £1 SPENT IS SAVED (CAPGEMINI) REDUCING THE SP BUDGET WILL INCREASE COSTS IN THE LONG TERM AND REDUCE THE ABILITY OF THE SERVICE TO DELIVER TO THE MOST VULNERABLE RESIDENTS AT A TIME WHEN DEMAND IS HIGHER THAN EVER. REDUCING THE SP BUDGET WILL UNDOUBTEDLY PUT LIVES AT RISK

I'M ALMOST 77. IN THE PAST I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN HELPING THOSE SLEEPING ROUGH "N.F.A." (NO FIXED ABODE) BEYOND ANY DOUBT IT'S IMMORAL TO REDUCE SUPPORT TO THE VULNERABLE WETHER A PERSON, GROUP OR COMMUNITY. I HAVE VIVID MEMORIES OF WHAT HITLER DID.

FIRST THE JEWS THEN THE OLD, INFIRM DISABLED ETC ETC

ALREADY TAILORED TO ESSENTIAL NEEDS. THE VALUE OF PREVENTATIVE SERVICES IN £'S TERMS MEANS SUSTAINING IS THE ONLY OPTION TO PREVENT CHAOTIC/COSTLY OUTCOMES
ESSENTIA HELP FOR LOW INCOME PEOPLE

WITH INFLATION AT 5% ANY REDUCTION WOULD ADD TO THIS %

THIS SERVICE IS ESSENTIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED

VERY HAPPY WITH THE SERVICE SUPPLIED

SERVICES WILL BE REDUCED

THE SERVICES ARE GOOD SO WE WANT TO KEEP THEM
THE SERVICE IS GOOD
SERVICE IS GOOD & ESSENTIAL FOR SENIOR CITIZENS
THERE ARE TOO MANY PEOPLE IN THE UK THAT GENUALLY NEED HELP AND SUPPORT AND WILL NOT BE ABLE TO HELP THEMSELVES!
SERVICES PROVIDED ARE ESSENTIAL FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY, ESPECIALLY NOW, WHEN PEOPLE STRUGGLE WITH JOBS, BILLS ETC.

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

BECAUSE VENUS HAVE BEEN FANTASTIC AND HELPED ME LOADS OVER THE PAST IT WOULD BE A SHAME TO ALL THE PEOPLE THEY HELP

I AM IN ILL HEALTH & I DEPEND ON THE SUPPORT OF THE GROUP

I NEED IT I NEED ALL THE HELP I CAN GET TO STAY LIVING IN MY OWN HOME

THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICE IS VITAL TO OUR COMMUNITY

BECAUSE I NEED THE SUPPORT

IF REDUCED MORE PEOPLE WOULD BE AT RISK AND AS WE ALREADY LIVE IN AN AREA OF HIGH HEALTH PROBLEMS, AND HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT, SO REDUCING MONEY FROM SUCH AN AREA WOULD BE SENCELOSS AND INCONSIDERABLE TO INDIVIDUALS LIVES

THE PROVIDER CAN'T MANAGE THE MONEY ITS GOT. TO CUT THAT AMOUNT WOULD CAUSE ARGUMENTS ABOUT WHO SHOULD GET WHAT AMOUNT OF MONEY AND COULD RESULT IN BITTER RIVALRY BETWEEN SERVICES

PEOPLE WHO NEED WHATEVER SUPPORT SHOULD GET THAT SUPPORT

WE KEEP GETTING TOLD THAT THE POPULATION OF ELDERLY IS ON THE RISE IN SEFTON, THIS LEADS TO MORE PEOPLE REQUIRING HELP, AS IT IS THE SYSTEM IS CUT TO THE BONE. I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT THAT INSTEAD OF CUTTING THE BUDGET IT SHOULD BE INCREASED.

BECAUSE WE NEED THEM VERY MUCH

SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICE ALLOWS ME TO MAINTAIN MY INDEPENDENCE, DIGNITY AND QUALITY OF LIVE IT SUPPORTS ME IN MY OWN HOME AND GIVES ME PEACE OF MIND AND A SENSE OF WELLBEING

AS IT WILL CAUSE DISTRESS TO ALL THE CLIENTS AND STAFF LIKEWISE

WE NEED THE HELP THIS SERVICE GIVES AND ITS NICE TO NO YOU ARE NOT ALONE LIKE MANY OLD PEOPLE ARE

BECAUSE THEY COME TO SEE ME TO SEE IF I AM OK SOMETIMES I DON'T SEE PEOPLE FOR A FEW DAYS JUST A LITTLE TALK TO THEM IS GREAT

I FEEL VERY VULNERABLE IF OUR WARDEN DOESN'T CONTACT ME AS I HAVE VARIOUS AILMENTS WHICH WILL GET WORSE. THE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT HAS BEEN USEFUL

TO ENSURE EXISTING SUPPORT SERVICE IS MAINTAINED

I FEEL WE NEED A SCHEME MANAGER ON SITE DAILY

THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICE IS NECESSARY TO HELP OLD AGE PENSIONERS AND OTHER VULNERABLE PEOPLE TO HELP THEM LIVE A DECENT LIFE

REDUCING THE BUDGET WOULD PUT VULNERABLE PEOPLE AT RISK, ALSO MANY OF THE PEOPLE ENJOYING AN INDEPENDENT LIFESTYLE WOULD LOSE THIS INDEPENDENCE IF THE BUDGET WAS CUT.

ALL THE RESIDENTS AROUND HERE LOOK VERY MUCH FORWARD TO [Name Omitted] CALLING, NEVER MIND CUTS [Name Omitted] SHOULD HAVE A RAISE IN SALARY. [Name Omitted] IS A BREATH OF FRESH AIR. HER NAME SHOULD BE SUPERWOMAN. IF YOU CUT WAGES, DO YOU NOT THINK THEY MIGHT HAVE TO LEAVE BECAUSE OF WAGES, THEY ALL HAVE OUTGOINGS IN LIFE. AS FOR ME, I WOULD PUT SOMETHING TOWARDS SUE'S PAY, THAT'S HOW MUCH SHE MEANS TO US ALL.

AT THE MOMENT I CAN AFFORD TO PAY FOR THIS SERVICE.

AS AN OLD (83) TENANT, I NATURALLY THINK THAT SUPPORTING PEOPLE - YOUNG AND OLD - IS IMPORTANT. YOU ARE DOING A GREAT JOB AS THINGS ARE. MANY THANKS

PENSIONERS, ESPECIALLY THE VERY OLD ARE VULNERABLE. MANY LIVE ALONE AND HAVE NO FAMILY AND NEED A GREAT DEAL OF SUPPORT.

THIS SERVICE IS VERY MUCH NEEDED

I WORK WITH MENTAL HEALTH. WORKING ON THE EXISTING BUDGET IS DIFFICULT AS IT IS DIFFICULT ENOUGH TO PROVIDE ENCOURAGEMENT AND SUPPORT TO THOSE WHO NEED IT.

AS A WORKER IN MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDER SERVICES - IT IS DIFFICULT TO PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THOSE WHO NEED IT ON EXISTING BUDGETS, I FEEL THAT A CUT IN BUDGETS WILL IMPACT ON SERVICE USER NEEDS AND IMPACT ON DETERIORATION OF MENTAL HEALTH IN OUR UNIT.

REDUCING SERVICES ADDS TO THE LONELY EXISTING LIFE LOTS OF SERVICE USERS EXPERIENCE NOW. COST OF HEATING ETC, LONELY, SOLITUDE IS WELL KNOWN TO BE THE HIGHEST REASON FOR DEATH. MORE INPUT SHOULD BE IN PLACE NOT TAKEN AWAY.

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

I WORK IN MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDER SERVICE - IT IS DIFFICULT ENOUGH TO PROVIDE ENCOURAGEMENT AND SUPPORT TO THOSE WHO NEED IT ON THE EXISTING BUDGET - I CANNOT SEE HOW A BUDGET CUT WILL NOT IMPACT ON THE AMOUNT OF TIME EACH SERVICE USER NEEDS IN OUR UNIT

PEOPLE NEED SUPPORT AND SOMEWHERE THEY CAN LIVE

I DONT THINK IT SHOULD BE REDUCED AS A LOT OF US BENEFIT FROM ONE TO ONE WITH MEMBER OF STAFF

I DON'T WANT HOME CARE TO BE SCRAPPED

QUALITY OF LIFE WILL BE AFFECTED LOSS OF SERVICES

FEAR OF REDUCED SERVICES

PEOPLE WITH PROBLEMS NEED THE SUPPORT AS MUCH AS THEY CAN

IT IS A FALSE ECONOMY TO WITHDRAW SUPPORT FROM THE MOST NEEDY IN SOCIETY.

REDUCTIONS IN THIS SUPPORT WILL INEVITABLY RESULT IN INCREASES IN DEMAND IN OTHER AREAS - E.G. HEALTHCARE, EMERGENCY SERVICES, HOMELESSNESS, ASB ETC.

BECAUSE PEOPLE NEED THE SUPPORT

MY LIFE AS I KNOW IT WILL CHANGE, AND MY QUALITY OF LIFE AS I KNOW IT WILL NOT STAY THE SAME

PROVIDERS NEED THIS MONEY TO PROVIDE ENOUGH SUPPORT FOR EACH SERVICE PROVIDED

THEY ARE VUNERABLE PEOPLE IN NEED OF HELP

BECAUSE PEOPLE WHO ARE HOMELESS WILL SUFFER

BECAUSE SUPPORTING PEOPLE IS A GOOD CAUSE AND WE NEED TO INCREASE AND NOT DECREASE FUNDING IN THIS AREA

THEY ARE VALUABLE TO PEOPLE WHO OTHERWISE WOULD HAVE NO HELP

SP IS TOO IMPORTANT TO CUT

REDUCING THE BUDGET WOULD HAVE A CATASTROPHIC AFFECT ON THE SEFTON AREA

IF WE LOOSE OR HAVE A % PERCENTAGE TAKEN AWAY IT CAN ONLY EFFECT OUR CONFIDENCE OF WE WER OR WANTED POSATIVATY THAT WE GAIN FROM THE SERVICE USER GROUPS ETC. ACTIVITIES TOO.

BECAUSE SUPPORT SHOULD NOT BE CUT 1% NEVER MIND 44%

It will have a negative impact.

The most vulnerable members of our community should not be penalised when there are other areas which can be cut

lots of vulnerable people will be left to fend for them selves

It provides funding for essential services. If the funding was reduced considerably then many people would suffer severe hardship. The services that Supporting People provide enable shelter for people who would otherwise be homeless. Surely when considering any budget cuts this service must be protected so that the vital work we do can continue.

The value for money delivered by supporting people services was demonstrated through government research in 2009. Reductions in funding will result in short term financial gains for local authorities but will ultimately cost more. There is also the danger of creating situations where the people who need support most are unable to access it or afford it.

A reduction in any funding will have a major impact on the level of services/quality and support that can be offered to those in need - vulnerable people

Me and my fellow service users, dont feel capable of undertaking day to day tasks such as appointments, shopping, cooking etc without the support of our support workers. As I cant cope with lots of people around me, and get panic attacks sometimes, I feel the support helps me deal with this and makes me feel less fearful in these situations. And I feel I could do with more support rather than less, so I can go on physical activities such as swimming etc. And going outside in the community.

I believe that the support packages in place are sometimes unsubstantial at present, without further cuts.

These services are too important to lose

Supporting people, particularly floating support for older people has been proven to save over £6 for every £1 invested (Research into the financial benefits of the Supporting People programme, 2009 by Dept of Communities and Local Government). Therefore, cutting this budget would be counter productive financially in a very short time period.

Low cost preventative service.

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

They provide a vital service. Allow people to remain living in their own homes as long as possible. Ultimately saving costs of long term care - nursing homes ect

Supporting People was established to meet the needs of the most marginalised, vulnerable and hardest to reach people within our society - quite often the services provided under the SP umbrella are essential front line services - but are not legislatively required - so are often the easiest to cut. It may well be the case that to cut in order to save money might produce a short term remedy - it is almost inevitable that the longer term consequence is disastrous for social cohesion, fairness and equitability.

This is a vital service not only for current service users but for future users. If this service is cut it there will be a significant impact on jointly funded provision. In addition to this it is highly likely that emergency and urgent hospitals admissions will increase, thereby increasing hospital waiting lists and increasing the overall costs of providing care.

Sefton Affordable Warmth Partnership Group comprises of Sefton Councillors, officers from Sefton energy team, private sector housing, adult social services and children's services. Along with other support agencies such as Age Concern, Department of Work and Pensions, NHS Sefton, Sefton Pensioners Advocacy Centre, Housing associations, Merseyside Fire and Rescue service and the energy saving trust (to name just a few). The group has been meeting for the past four years, with the joint aim to reduce fuel poverty and excess winter deaths in Sefton. We are concerned that proposed cuts to the Supporting People budget could put the Fuel Poverty service in Sefton at risk, as Sefton's Affordable Warmth Workers (AWW) are funded through a supporting people project. The Affordable Warmth Workers are front line staff and visit vulnerable residents in their homes, this means they have access to vulnerable residents that would otherwise slip through the net. They see issues first hand and can refer to issues to social services promptly before the problem becomes out of hand. Their intervention prevents residents ultimately being admitted to hospital or having to move into long term care. Due to the current economic climate and rising gas and electric prices, affordable warmth issues are increasingly important and the demand for support is rising. All of our organisations refer to the AWW on a regular basis, they provide a focal point we everyone can refer and know that residents will be assisted with heating & insulation measures, fuel debt issues and energy saving advice, along with further referrals to other support agencies. Without the service, our staff would either have to inform residents they can't be helped or waste a lot of time searching for information (as they don't have the specialist knowledge). This would result in increase numbers of excess winter deaths in vulnerable adults and children and more residents in fuel debt. The loss of the AWW would mean that vulnerable Sefton residents would be without access to affordable warmth as there is no other service in like it in Sefton, this is due to the fact that the Affordable Warmth Coordinator post was lost in August 2010 and not renewed, along with the Home Repair Assistance (HRA) loans previously offered through private sector housing, no longer being available. Loss of AWW would directly impact and add cost to other departments within the council (e.g. social work teams).

I think this could put some of the Borough's most vulnerable residents at risk.

Reductions in funding would cause hardship and increase long term costs eventually as more people would need to be rehoused in residential, become homeless, revert back to criminal activities, have children moved into care etc etc as there would be no one available to provide the support they need to remain in their home.

Housing Related Support services are preventative and allow customers to live independently without heavy reliance on other services. If SP funding is reduced or withdrawn and customers cannot afford to access these services levels of dependency may increase and costs in social care services and the NHS may increase. The savings made would be counteracted by increased costs

in these areas and could lead to financial hardship for individual customers

There is no obvious service that can stand in for these services that may be lost as a result of these budget cuts. The pressure of these services will then be placed onto social services due to areas of Sefton being the most deprived area in the UK - max reduction of 5%

These services are essential to enable vulnerable people to continue to and to improve their skills to live independently in the community. If these services are not available many would not receive the support that they need to keep themselves safe and in secure appropriate accommodation. Many more tenancies and placements would fail and people could become homeless, hospitalised or institutionalised. The long term costs of any budget reduction now could be multiplied many times later and could have long term effects on many individuals and families health and wellbeing.

Support currently is stretched and is insufficient to meet all the needs now

Most vulnerable, people with physical and/or mental ill health find it too difficult to deal with processes to get and maintain suitable affordable housing and deal with finances/know about entitlements, without support

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

10 Vulnerable adults with addiction and crime problems are likely to be rendered homeless.

The budget provides preventative measures for the client groups that wouldn't receive any help by statutory funding. This in turn, reduces the cost to the tax payers in the long term by preventing crisis and reducing hospital admissions and custodial sentences.

The services supporting people fund are critical services, which have recently taken a reduction in funding through making savings in other areas, to reduce funding even further, would be reducing services and delivery of the services to vulnerable people, which in future would be an increase in emergency services being used more frequently. As vulnerable people would not have their needs met through services currently being provided by supporting people

Supporting people have already passed on a 5% reduction in the funding it provides to its projects.

At present Supporting People provides £55,000pa to Sefton Councils Energy Team to fund two Affordable Warmth Workers salaries and expenses. We believe this is already great value for money in terms of the increasing demand for the service, the number of residents we assist and revenue generated from benefit entitlement checks and monies raised towards heating, insulation, fuel debt from grants, funding streams and benevolent funds. Due to already operating efficiently on a modest budget any further reduction in funding would dramatically reduce the service we can offer, thus resulting in an increased cost to other council departments that don't have the specialist knowledge to assist the 800-1000 vulnerable households assisted each year.

The fuel poverty service - I understand is funded from supporting people budget and it has literally saved many lives of the most vulnerable and isolated people in Sefton.

will take funding away from the most vulnerable members of society

Clearly the SP budget needs to make a contribution to the overall financial savings required by the Local Authority. However, it is unwise to cut the SP services as the vast majority actually save money by providing a timely intervention which prevents the client from requiring more expensive interventions, e.g. care package uplifts, supported accommodation, imprisonment costs, etc. The SP services are highly regulated and monitored and the National Outcomes Framework clearly evidences the impacts achieved by the SP services in maintaining independent living but also in a wide range of other areas, eg. economic wellbeing, health, education, training, social inclusion, substance misuse, supervision of statutory orders, etc. Cuts in the region of 10% may allow the provider to re-jig services and seek efficiency savings through streamlining functions. Cuts of higher than 10% will leave the provider with nowhere to move other than to either reduce the capacity of the service or reduce salaries to staff which will detrimentally affect the service quality. It may also lead to providers leaving the arena altogether. The clients that SP services provide will not disappear but will present in other arenas either as homeless presentations, increased offending, increased substance misuse, etc. The reality is that the overall costs are not likely to be saved. The benefits of the Supporting People programme were specifically recognised in the 2010 budget with the grant reduction of 12% over four years and the recognition that £1 million spent on SP services will save £5 or £6 million.

I feel the budget should not be cut due to the amount of vulnerable people within Sefton who would be placed in a more vulnerable position if services were cut

because it is an essential service

this is an essential service which ultimately prevents people from becoming homeless and/or hospitalised

Supporting People funding is allocated to the most vulnerable members of Sefton's community and any reduction in the current levels of funding would have a serious detrimental effect not only on the most vulnerable individuals in Sefton & their families but also on the whole community. I anticipate that if funding was cut, local crime levels would rise, for example, reports of and repeat incidences of domestic violence, crime committed by individuals with mental health issues etc. Also, the vulnerability of certain client groups, like older people, people with learning difficulties and/or physical disabilities etc would increase and therefore the burden on health services and care services would increase, causing a greater drain on the local resources. Similarly, the burden upon statutory homelessness services would increase because vulnerable individuals would not be able to access levels of preventative support currently available.

It is a vital support for vulnerable families that we work with.

If reduced this will effect a lot of other agencies who provide supporting services.

I feel that services within Sefton for excluded groups are limited already. Many Sefton service users have to access Liverpool services as we do not have the capacity within this borough to cope with demanding need, hence putting more pressures on other neighbouring boroughs. Our services are preventative services and they provide a much needed resource for statutory services and prisons.

Question 2 Comments

If NO, please give reasons

The budget has already suffered a 5% cut and offers good value for money. Many services provide services that others will not or cannot provide.

This question cannot be answered unless the effects of the percentage cuts are known. It is understood that some cuts must be made. Before any amount of cut can be suggested, specific detail of how they would impact must be stated

Proposed cutbacks can be gleaned in other ways.

Majority of the services payed for by supporting people do not get money from anywhere else so they need all they can get to make sure people remain supported in the community.

because there are a lot of people out there who need help and who aren't getting it. I have used the mental health crisis house several times and have found it has helped me live a normal life. Without it, I wouldn't have been able to.

I do not think vulnerable people especially in my area of work get enough funding

The AP Scheme and AP carers have already accepted a 5% reduction last year. There havent been any uplifts to pass on to our carers since the funding was set up in 2003. Meanwhile both the AP Scheme and our AP Carers have had to meet inflationary cost of living increases across all day to day expenditure.

Supporting People was originally implemented to help identify and deliver services to the most vulnerable people in our country. To reduce the budget for any service would be detrimental to the people receiving the support and losing any preventative service will have a knock-on effect on demand for more critical services. Any reduction in the budget could also result in job losses and contribute to unemployment in the Borough.

The SP programme demonstrates good value for money, intervention such as this at an earlier stage can reduce increased need for intervention at a later date. If support for the groups mentioned in the above box are not provided with support, or their support package is reduced, their support needs will be displaced, they will not dissappear. These vulnerable groups should be given the support services they need to function in society, otherwise they face further polarisation. This disconnect from services now, will in the longer term will drain the public purse.

Services to vulnerable groups identified by SP meet needs far and above the money that is currently allocated. If funds are cut further these groups will add considerable tensions to the sectors that support them. The goodwill of the voluntary, community and faith sector far outweighs any contributions made by statutory input and if funding is continually removed from these groups and providers are forced to remove contact with vulnerable individuals, then the Local Authority will have greater problems to overcome. More people forced onto the streets, mental health increasing, < A

and E departments taking on more, children and families moving further into poverty. Cuts can result in a reduction of choice and quality of life for vulnerable groups how can i just say by what percentage. this is just a finger in the air Young people find it very difficult to access accommodation if family breakdown, sofa surfing no answer Support for vulnerable people to maintain tenancies is vital. Supporting People provides the support necessary to allow service users to live independently. This in turn reduces the risk that alternative higher-cost services will be needed. The reduction could be a false economy if applied to all Supporting Client groups and services equally without a proper assessment of the risks and implications of change. Too many implications for service users and the general community. Cuts in this budget are highly likely to lead to increased costs in other budgets. Implications to service users and general public are not restricted to finance but also health and wellbeing and even public safety SP Budget provides essential services to the most vulnerable in society and without this funding many would suffer, particularly within the offender services which has demonstrated that services provided reduce re-offending, there is the danger that if some services were cut there would be an increase in homelessness and therefore an increase in re-offending rates.

Question 4 Comments

<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS, PEOPLE WITH ALCOHOL MIS USE PROBLEMS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE SUPPORT.
WAS A CLIENT
OFFENDER SERVICE ST CATH'S. CRI TREATMENT SERVICE. ARMSTEAD - WORKING ON THE STREET
ST CATHERINE'S (HOSTEL) BOOTLE, L20 7AL
WORK AT ST CATHS
HOSTEL
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
MARYFIELD - ANCHOR
MARYFIELD - ANCHOR
MARYFIELD ANCHOR SHELTERED HOUSING
ANCHOR - MARYFIELD
ANCHOR SHELTERED HOUSING
JHC - ARENA
JAMES HORRIGAN COURT
ANCHOR - DELPH
ANCHOR. DELPH COURT
ANCHOR HOUSING
ANCHOR DELPH
DELPH COURT
DELPH COURT
DELPH COURT
JAMES HORRIGAN COURT
JHC ARENA
JAMES HORRIGAN COURT
JHC - ARENA
SHETLAND ACCOMMODATION

SUPPORTING PEOPLE. GENERIC
HELP WITH MENTAL & DISABILITY NEEDS
A CLOSE RELATIVE WITH DEMENTIA
QUEEN ELIZABETH COURT
QUEEN ELIZABETH COURT
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE SERVICES
OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE SERVICES
OLDER PERSONS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT SERVICES QEC
QEC
QEC
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
ELDERLY RELATIVES - NOW DECEASED
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
ANCHOR MAPLE COURT
ANCHOR MAPLE COURT
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
ANCHOR MAPLE COURT
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS OR PEOPLE AT RISK OF OFFENDING
ST CATHS L11 20 7AL
OLDER PEOPLE
HANDRAIL, BATH STOOL
O.U.T
AGE CONCERN LIVERPOOL/SEFTON O/T FAZAKERLEY HOSPITAL
HOMELESS
I DO
SATINS
SUPPORTING PEOPLE AND ELDERCARE
HOME IMPROVEMENT
I AM A SERVICE USER
AM LIVING IN THE SEAD PROJECT
AM IN THE SEAD PROJECT
I'M A SERVICE USER
SEAD PROJECT
I AM A SERVICE PROVIDER
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE SERVICE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE SERVICES. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES- WORKED ELDERLY CARE SERVICES SUPPORT SERVICES TO OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT HOURS PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES
MY WIFE WORKED WITH PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PHYSICAL DISABILITIES
YOUNG OFFENDER MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES ALCOHOL/DRUG DEPENDENCY HOMELESS YOUNG PEOPLE
HOMELESS SERVICE
I WORK WITH THE LADS IN THE HOSTEL & IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE LADS & THE COMMUNITIES WERE THERE, HOMELESS & CRIMES.
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
HOUSING AND SUPPORT
MENTAL HEALTH
MYSELF
ALL OF THE ABOVE EXCEPT THE DOMESTIC ABUSE SERVICE
MENTAL HEALTH C.R.I
I HAVE WORKED AS A PROJECT WORKER FOR THE LAST FOUR YEARS AT BOSCO SOCIETY, PROVIDING SUPPORT TO SINGLE HOMELESS MEN
I OFTEN USE AS MANY SERVICES AS POSSIBLE
YES, SUPPORT WORKER IN SEFTON WITH HOMELESS MALES, MENTAL HEALTH, DRUG ALCOHOL ABUSE
AS STATED I HAVE BEEN A VOLUNTEER FOR 8 YEARS UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF SUPPORTING PEOPLE FOR THE PAST 4 YEARS AND REALISE THE IMPORTANCE OF SUCH ORGANISATIONS
BOSCO HOUSE FORUM SEAD
PEOPLE WHO NEED HELP INSTEAD OF CUTS TO OUR PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE LEARNING DISABILITY MENTAL HEALTH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
I HAVE TRANSPORT TO MY DAY CENTRE WHICH I THOROUGHLY ENJOY
I LIVE IN SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION
SHELTERED ACCOM
OLDER PERSONS SERVICE
SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION
OP
OP
O.P.
SUPPORTED LODGINGS : I HAVE CARED FOR 2 YP SO FAR AND I AM ABOUT TO TAKE IN A THIRD PERSON. THEY NEED ALL THE SUPPORT THEY CAN GET

YOUNG HOMELESS ALCOHOL ABUSE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DOMESTIC ABUSE
MAPS CARER
SUPPORTED LODGINGS
SOCIAL SERVICES SOUTHPORT CHILD AND FAMILY THERAPY SERVICE RESULT FINAL DIAGNOSIS OF ASPERGERS SYNDROME GIVEN BY [Name Omitted] CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST
SEFTON SUPPORTED LODGINGS
PHYSICAL DISABILITY SINGLE HOMELESS
SEFTON SUPPORTED LODGINGS
SUPPORTED LODGINGS
SUPPORTED LODGINGS (HOUSEHOLDERS)
SINGLE HOMELESS AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE YOUNG PEOPLE AT RISK
I WAS HELPED A LOT WITH A SUPPORT GROUP
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
MAPS SERVICE USER
TEENAGE PARENTS SINGLE HOMELESS WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
ALL OF THE ABOVE!
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS MENTAL HEALTH ALCHOL MISUSE DISABILITES
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
YOUNG PEOPLE
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
I AM CURRENTLY IN SUPPORTED LODGINGS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS, PEOPLE WITH SUBSTANCE/ ALCOHOL MISUSE
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DIFFICULTIES
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
OLDER PEOPLE
PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES
I LIVE IN SHELTERED HOUSING
RENT
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
IN SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING FULL TIME WARDEN
MOST OF ALL THE SCHEME MANAGER, WHO HAS BEEN MOST HELPFUL IN MANY PROBLEMS WHICH I MYSELF HAVE HAD HERE AT POULTON COURT SOUTHPORT, ALSO THE CALL CENTRE
MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS

ALL
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
LIGHT FOR LIFE SUPPORTS BOTH SINGLE PEOPLE AND FAMILIES WHO ARE HOMELESS OR AT RISK OF BEING SO. LIGHT FOR LIFE ALSO SUPPORTS YOUNG PEOPLE WHO ARE AT RISK.
PROBLEMS MENTAL HEALTH
AINSDALE CARE IN THE COMMUNITY
AINSDALE CARE IN THE COMMUNITY
MENTAL HEALTH
OLDER PEOPLE AND ALSO MENTAL DIFFICULTIES
HOME IMPROVEMENTS PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
CARE AGENCY. SCHEME MANAGER
CARE AGENCY, SCHEME MANAGER
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
HABINTEG
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
OLDER PEOPLE HOMELESS PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH HIV/AIDS PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
OLDER PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT HOME IMPROVEMENTS PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IN PRISON PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
I HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THE POST NATAL SUPPORT GROUP AND I AM AWAITING A CRB TO VOLUNTEER PART TIME TO SUPPORT WOMEN
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS
SUPPORTED LODGING FOR YOUNG PEOPLE
SUPPORTED LODGINGS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE
CARE ALLOWANCE
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
I AM A SUPPORT WORKER TO SERVICE USER WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
SUPPORTING SERVICE USER WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
ONE VISION HOUSING

OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL/ SENSORY DISABILITIES
HOUSING OPTIONS TEAM, VVAT, SUPPOTED ACCOMMODATION
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS & PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR MY DAUGHTER AND MENTAL HEALTH FAMILY CARERS SUPPORT TEAM
OLDER PEOPLE - PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE, WITH SUPPORT NEEDS.
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
SUPPORTING PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE SUPPORT SERVICES DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICE
YOUNG PARENTS HOMELESS
AFTER 2 HIP OPERATIONS ON BOTH OCATIONS I USED THE CARE SERVICES FOR A LIMITED TIME, ALSO THE MANAGER HEAR ARRANGED FOR AIDS AND ADAPTATIONS TO BRING EQUIPMENT TO MAKE IT EASIER TO COPE IN MY OWN FLAT
SUPPORT
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING WITH SCHEME MANAGER AND PULL CORD EMERGENCY
SCHEME MANAGER IN SHELTERED HOUSING
HAVE WORKED WITH AND NOW AM A USER
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS HOME IMPROVEMENT AGENCY
PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOMLESS FAMILY WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOMELESS HOSTEL
VISUAL IMPAIRMENT MENTAL HEALTH CARELINE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
HOMELESS
SUPPORTED HOUSING

SUPPORT PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE
MENTAL HEALTH
SUPPORTING PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE
SUPPORTING PEOPLE
MENTAL HEALTH OLDER PERSONS
SUPPORTED PEOPLE
MOSTLY OLDER PERSON MENTAL HEALTH
MOSTLY OLDER PERSON MENTAL HEALTH
SUPPORTING PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE - MENTAL HEALTH - ALCOHOL
SUPPORTED PEOPLE
SUPPORTED HOUSING
WARDEN CONTROLLED
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
THE COMMUNITY WARDEN [Name Omitted] IS A POSITIVE RE ASSURANCE, THAT I AM NOT LEFT ISOLATED IN THE COMMUNITY. HIS HELPFULNESS AND CARING ATTITUDE HELPS ME FEEL ABLE TO LIVE ALONE.
OLDER PEOPLE - TEENAGE PARENTS - MENTAL HEALTH - OFFENDERS - SUBSTANCE/ALCOHOL - LEARNING DIFFICULTIES - D.V.
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS AND DISABILITY
WEEKLY WARDEN VISIT I THINK IS ESSENTIAL TO OLDER PEOPLE LIVING IN THE BUNGALOO'S
MYSELF
I HAVE WORKED WITH A GREAT NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT PROVIDE THE SERVICES OVERLEAF AND I HAVE WITNESSED FIRST HAND THE DRAMATIC EFFECT THEY CAN HAVE ON TURNING PEOPLES LIVES AROUND AND ALLOWING THEM TO TAKE AN ACTIVE PART IN OUR LOCAL COMMUNITIES.
ALL OF THE ABOVE SERVICES
A FRIEND
MY GRANDAUGHTER WORKS IN A CARE HOME FOR EMI - LONG HOURS LOW PAY
A FRIEND
A FRIEND
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH SUBSTANCE/ALCOHOL PROBLEMS
ONE VISION
ONE VISION
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLD PERSON
MENTAL HEALTH
CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS/LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
INCOME SUPPORT OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
SUPPORTED HOUSING
SCEAM MANAGER

MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
MILL SPRING COURT
HOMELESS, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE/MENTAL HEALTH
WOULD RATHER NOT COMMENT
FUEL POVERTY SERVICE DELIVERED BY SEFTON ENERGY TEAM
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS ORRELL LODGE
RESIDENT
RESIDENT
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
SHELVED ACCOMMODATION SUPPORT NEEDS FOR OLDER PEOPLE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS ORRELL LODGE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS/DISABILITY
ORRELL LODGE
ORRELL LODGE
ORRELL LODGE
SOCIAL SERVICES
BENEFIT NEEDS AND DISABILITY PROBLEMS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
SUPPORTED HOUSING
COMMUNITY PHYSIO, COMMUNITY D.N. (DISTRICT NURSE?) , SOCIAL WORKERS, WARDEN SCHEME
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
MOST
OLDER SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE SERVICES SENSORY SERVICES
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
ONE VISION
ONE VISION
PHYSICAL DISABILITY OLDER PEOPLE & ONE VISION
O.V. OLDER PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES MERSEY-CARE MENTAL HEALTH
ONE VISION
MUM HAS A WARDEN SERVICE WHICH KEEP HER INDEPENDENT WITH HAVING A STROKE
HOMELESS
HOMELESS
OFFENDER
GRAB RAILS BATH SEATS
RESIDENT - KENYONS LODGE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
SCHEME MANAGER AT SHELTERED SCHEME
MENTAL HEALTH OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
SHELTERED HOUSING KENYONS LODGE L31

PHYSICAL AND MENTAL
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
SCHEME MANAGER IN SHELTERED HOUSING
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS SUBSTANCE MISUSE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH DIFFICULTIES
I LIVE IN SHELTERED HOUSING (MARYFIELD)
MARYFIELD
ONE VISION HOUSING, SEFTON SOCIAL CARE
YOUNG PEOPLE AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS SINGLE HOMELESS PEOPLE
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
SINGLE HOMELESS WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
WORKING WITH PEOPLE WHO HAVE MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH SUPPORT NEEDS WORKING WITH YOUNG PEOPLE WITH HOMELESSNESS ISSUES
THE OLDER PEOPLE SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
SHELTERED HOUSING SUPPORT
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERD HOUSING SUPPORT
SHELTERED/SUPPORTED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
SHELTERED HOUSING
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
older people with support needs
MEALS ON WHEELS - MOTHER
APART FROM BEING A SUPPORT WORKER MYSELF WORKING WITH THE OVER 55'S, MY NIECE IS BLIND AND IS IN THE PROCESS OF GETTING SUPPORT TO HELP HER, WITH HER NEEDS.
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS, I LIVE IN ONE THESE COMMUNITIES
SUPPORTED HOUSING
SUPPORT FOR OLDER PEOPLE
SUPPORT NEEDS

IN MY CURRENT ROLE OF EMPLOYMENT ADVISOR WITH A HOUSING ASSOCIATION I HAVE SOME CONTACT WITH VARIOUS SERVICE USERS
SHELTERED HOUSING CARELINE
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
USED SERVICE FOR HOMELESS
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
ALL OF THE ABOVE
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
HOMELESS PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH HIV/AIDS PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IN PRISON PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
HOMELESS PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IN PRISON
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS
HOMELESS PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH HIV/AIDS PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IN PRISON
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT HOME IMPROVEMENTS PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT HOME IMPROVEMENTS
YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT HOME IMPROVEMENTS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
HOMELESS PEOPLE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT HOME IMPROVEMENTS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IN PRISON
PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
HOMELESS PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS HOME IMPROVEMENTS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS HOME IMPROVEMENTS

PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS HOME IMPROVEMENTS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS
HOMELESS PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
HOMELESS PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH DRUG OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS
OLDER PEOPLE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DIFFICULTIES
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
SUPPORT PEOPLE
AS QUESTION 1
ELDERCARE
SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION SERVICES
A FRIEND WHO'S MOTHER WAS IN A WHEELCHAIR AND HAD MS. SHE NEEDED TO BE ABLE TO GET INFORMATION ON THE BEST SUPPORT AVAILABLE TO HER. HER MOTHER HAS SINCE PASSED AWAY.
VENUS CENTRE, BOOTLE
LOTS OF FAMILY AND FRIENDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL AND SENSORY DISABILITIES OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
PROVIDER OF SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICE
OLDER PEOPLE SUPPORT NEEDS
PHYSIOTHERAPY - CARE SERVICE
O.P.S.N. (OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS)
SUPPORTED HOUSING
HOME ALARM SERVICE SUPPORT HOUSING TEAM
MENTAL HEALTH
MENTAL HEALTH
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
OLDER PEOPLES SUPPORTING NEEDS

MENTAL HEALTH
SUSTANCE/ALCOHOL MISUSE MENTAL HEALTH
MENTAL HEALTH/OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS PEOPLE MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SUBSTANCE MISUSE/SLCOHOL - DRUGS PEOPLE LEARNING DIFFICULTY
MENTAL HEALTH
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS LEARNING DIFFICULTIES PEOPLE WITH HIV
MENTAL HEALTH
WOODLANDS SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION
MENTAL HEALTH
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS PEOPLE AT RISK OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION ALL CARE
SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
SUPPORTED HOUSING FOR PEOPLE RECOVERING MENTAL HEALTH
CANNOT REMEMBER
ONE VISION HOUSING
CMHT (COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH TEAM)
SUPPORTED ACCOMADATION FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
I WORK WITHIN SUPPORTED HOUSING FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS. ALSO BROTHER HAS INVOLVEMENT FOR HIS AUTISM
SUBSTANCE MISUSE SINGLE HOMELESS WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
PEOPLE WITH SUBSTANCE MISUSE PROBLEMS
CRI STANLEY ROAD
BOSCO
SINGLE HOMELESS WITH SUPPORT NEEDS
DRUGS
NWPCLtd
older people with support needs.
Floating Support for offenders (DISC)
Bosco Forum HA (SEAD) DISC Sefton Homeless Team
Domestic Abuse, mental health homeless people including young parents & singles , Learning disabilities/ sphysical disabilities , substance misuse
DISC- floating support
Single homeless. Offenders. people with Mental Health problems. People with substance/alcohol problems.
Offender services

Homeless
older people with support needs
Various
single homeless with support needs older people with needs people with mental health problems People with Substance/Alcohol Mis-Use Problems Offenders or People at Risk of Offending People with Learning Difficulties People with Physical/Sensory Disabilities
I use Rethink Mental Illness,
All of the above
Home help
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
Mental health and Learning disability
Floating support for older people in Liverpool
Older people
My nan is 87 has various health needs and is now house bound. She is however, very proud and wishes to remain living in her own home were she is comfortable. She had various people knocking on her door offering to insulate her loft for a variety of different prices. this concerned our family as she is vulnerable. Therefore i contacted Sefton council, they put me through to an the energy efficiency department and i spoke to an Affordable warmth Worker. They visited my nan in her home and informed her the loft could be insulated for free due to her age. This was arranged very quickly and installed in a professional manner. The Affordable Warmth Worker also informed my nan she should be entitled to high rate attendance allowance due to her health needs (she was currently on Low rate Attendance allowance). The Affordable warmth worker asked the benefit agency to arrange to visit my nan and assess her, this was done and she now receives about an extra £30 per week. My nan also mentioned that she was struggling to pay her gas bills as they were high as she needed the heating on constantly due to her poor health and medication. The Affordable Warmth worker called her gas supplier when they where in her home and informed them of my nans circumstances and benefits, they then put my nan on a cheaper tariff that will save her about 15% on the amount she pays. We are very grateful for everything that has been done for nan. She no longer has to worry about being able to keep warm as her property is more energy efficient and she has more money to spend on heating
single homeless with support needs homeless families with support needs offenders or people at risk of offending people with substance/alcohol mis-use problems people at risk of domestic violence
People with substance/misuse problems
women and children experiencing domestic violence people with mental health needs people with learning disabilities older people with support needs
All of our organisations refer to the Affordable Warmth Workers (AWW) on a regular basis when they are concerned a resident is in fuel poverty or does not have access to affordable warmth. An example of a typical referral (of which hundreds have been made over the past 4 years) is a resident that was referred by Welfare rights. [Name Omitted] was an 83 year old woman and was being assessed for Attendance Allowance when she mentioned to the advisor that her boiler had broken. The advisor made the referral to an AWW to conduct a home visit to assess what help may be available. During the visit the AWW confirmed the boiler was broken and she had no access to heating or hot water and she did not qualify for the main nation Warm Front grant. As a result of the AWW visit this vulnerable resident benefited from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New boiler - a quote was arranged and two local funding streams were approached to help towards the cost of getting the boiler replaced. • Loft insulation as it is free due to the fact she is over 70 • Registered onto priority service register with gas & electric

supplier • Reduction in fuel costs - energy supplier was contacted to replace meter as she had two meters set on the wrong tariff. • Handrails and bath lift - as a result of a referral to an occupational therapist due to the fact she had recently had several falls • Careline • Electricians made safe through contribution from local funding stream - as Home Repair Assistance loans are no longer available • Freezer - she was referred to local solutions that assisted her to apply for a charitable grant for a freezer so she had access to quick meals as she couldn't stand for long to prepare meals (this was important as she is diabetic). • Merseyside fire brigade for smoke alarms to be fitted. If the Fuel poverty service was not available then [Name Omitted] would have no heating or hot water as she did not qualify for WF and HRA loans are no longer available. She would have to live with dangerous electricians (as HRA loans discontinued), she would have more than likely suffered more falls as handrails wouldn't have been fitted and she may have been undiscovered after a fall for quite some time, as she would not have a life line available. She would not have been on the priority service register with utilities, which ensures vulnerable customers are not disconnected, have regular metre readings and are prioritised if supply issues occur. She wouldn't have access to quick and easy meals if she didn't have the freezer. Plus she would have been at risk of hospital admissions through cold related illness, dangerous electricians, and risk of fire, frequent falls or diabetic hypos. It is also probable that she would lose her independence and have to be in long term care. Resulting in increased pressure on adult social services, NHS and council care services.

Supported housing vulnerable tenants

Older People with Support Needs

Older People with Support Needs People with Mental Health Problems Young Parents Home Improvement Agency People with Learning Difficulties People with Physical/Sensory Disabilities Generic

Substance Misuse

Sefton's Menat Health crisis House, which was an invaluable service and prevented me from going into hospital

Venus

People with mental health problems

Support needed because of mental/physical ill health and to find suitable affordable housing because of ill health

LEO Project

Mental health services, offending at risk, single homeless, drugs and alcohol.

mental health services, learning disabilities, substance misuse, alcohol misuse, domestic violence, offenders

As stated Supporting People provide funding for Sefton Councils Energy Team to employ two Affordable Warmth Worker's (AWW). This funding has been provided since 2008. Initially one worker was funded, however, due to the high demand for the service (as there is not another service like it in Sefton) and the positive impacts made to residents lives, an additional worker was funded in 2009. Every year the AWW's assist approximately 800 households in Sefton with fuel poverty issues. The majority of referrals are made to the AWW's by other front line staff (eg, supporting people projects, social workers, health visitors, DWP, fire brigade) that are concerned vulnerable residents are living in cold homes. To date over 500 frontline staff have been alerted to the issues of cold homes and we get 17% of clients come from other Sefton Council services and 14% from external agencies (the rest are enquiries directly to the council and as a result of outreach work). The AWW's provide a home visiting service to ensure the most vulnerable groups are engaged with. The primary focus is to ensure that residents have access to affordable warmth. This is achieved through assisting residents to apply to grants, loans, charities and schemes to make

<p>their homes warmer and more energy efficient through the installation of measures such as heating and insulation. They also liaise with utilities to ensure the resident is on the cheapest tariff and receiving the services and offers they are entitled to, along with applying to have fuel debt wiped in extreme cases or negotiating more manageable repayments. The AWW's approach each case in a holistic style and work in partnership with a wide range of other support agencies and we have liaised with other supporting people services to get more help to residents. For example to date £276,000 of extra annual income has been granted to Sefton residents that where previously under claiming the benefits they were entitled to, 64 residents have been referred to Health and Social Care for occupational Therapist assessments and 166 referrals for smoke alarms. They are to name just a few of the organisations.</p>
Teenage Parent
Generic
alcohol
offender
offender
mental health
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
Fuel poverty support, assisting family friend with making their home able to be warm and also helped with benefits check - which brought much needed income to them also.
mental health, Domestic abuse,young people, Older people, Learning disabilities ,substance abuse , homeless families, including very young parents,
Offenders and substance misuse services
Offender services
myself,it was Stonham Tenancy Support
venus
Venus Resource Centre
people with learning difficulties young offenders. single homeless with support needs mental health problems, substance abuse
People with substance/alcohol mis-use problems/single homeless with support needs and offenders or people at risk of offending.
I have worked within services that provide accommodation for single homeless, and offenders at risk.
I know many people who have benefited the advice and specialist support of the Fuel poverty team. They have provided links and ensured many people access alternative support services to prevent them needing higher intensity support. Providing homes that are warm and assisting people to increase their incomes to remain independant of care facilities.
Elderly people with support needs People with mental health issues Home Improvement Agency
First Initiatives Crisis House
work within an sp funded department
HomeImprovement Agency
Kensington Supported Housing ltd - Supported Housing for people with Mental Health issues.
LDs. Phys dis, MH,
single homeless with support needs mental health substance/ alcohol offenders/people at risk of offending domestic violence

Forum Housing Association
Adults with Learning Difficulties
Sefton Mental Health Crisis House Learning Disabilities
Offender
Yong, pregnant and homeless support
TO FIND ACCOMMODATION AND BUDGET
Homeless
older people with support needs
Imagine Independence Mental Health services.
Mental Health Support
Offender services within the borough
Physical disabilities
Deaf
Homeless
<u>If Yes, please state which support service it is/was</u>
Generic
alcohol
offender
alcohol
domestic violence

Question 7 Comments

<u>If YES, please give details.</u>
POSSIBLY CUT BACK ON WASTE WE ALL KNOW THAT SHOCKING WASTE GOES ON IN ALL DEPARTMENTS
STREAMLINE THE SERVICE & MAKE IT MORE EFFICIENT WITH NO DOUBLEING UP ON PROBLEMS
SPEAK TO THE WORKERS WHO MAY HAVE IDEAS ABOUT THE BUSINESS PLAN AT THE TIME THAT COULD BE IMPROVED
CLIENT WITH MENTAL ILLNESS IN SCHEME, POSSIBLY 24 HOUR CARE NEEDED BECAUSE SHE IS MORE VULNERABLE AT NIGHT WHEN NO STAFF THERE
MORE EFFICIENT SERVICES, UTILISING UNITS AND CENTRALISED ADMIN
NONE BRITISH PEOPLE SHOULD BE MADE
JUST HELP THEM OUT!
GAMES ROOM, MORE STAFF. [Name Omitted]
THIS IS HIGHER MANAGEMENT QUESTION
THATS UP TO THE PEOPLE IN THE KNOW TO WORK OUT NOT THE VUNERABLE.
HIGHER EARNERS SHOULD BE EXPECTED TO CONTRIBUTE MORE TO AFFORD CUTS
IDENTIFYING OVERLAPS AND REPRODUCTION OF SERVICES
ASK PEOPLE IF THEY ARE WILLING TO VOLINTEER TO HELP WHEN PEOPLE ARE OFF SICK OR ON MATERNITY LEAVE
MULTITASKING
PROVIDERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO PROVE WHERE THE MONEY IS BEING SPENT AND SHOULD OFFER VALUE FOR MONEY, THERE IS GREAT DISPARITY IN HOW MUCH DIFFERENT SERVICES CHARGE.
RECRUIT MORE VOLUNTEERS E.G. RETIRED SPECIALISTS TO EDUCATE HOUSEHOLDERS RE DRUG ABUSE
NOT ABLE TO COMMENT DUE TO LIMITED KNOWLEDGE
REDUCE ADMIN COSTS ETC
LESS PAPERWORK - TELEPHONE CONSULTATIONS INSTEAD OF PERSONAL VISITS FOR THE LESS VULNERABLE. THIS WILL FREE UP TIME AND CUT DOWN ON COSTS

FOR FUEL AND TIME SPENT OUT OF THE OFFICE
I CAN'T I WOULD HAVE TO REALLY LOOK INTO IT AND I SUPPOSE SOMEBODY IN THAT POSITION HAS ALREADY LOOKED INTO IT
ALL SUPPORT I GET IS ESSENTIAL
MOBILE HANDYMAN/HAIRDRESSER ETC TO VISIT HOUSING SCHEMES IN ROTATION
WHERE POSSIBLE MEANS TESTING FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF SERVICE USERS
MEANS TESTED CONTRIBUTIONS
HOW CAN I SAY IF I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THE PRESENT WAY OF DEALING I WOULD IF I COULD
I AM A VOLUNTARY WORKER FOR TWO CHARITIES AND I SUPPORT A NUMBER OF CHARITIES. A GOOD DAYS WORK WOULD NOT HURT ANYONE. HANDOUTS FROM THE HARD-PRESSED TAX PAYER IS DISGUSTING. THIS IS WHAT YOU ARE ASKING FOR.
CARE AGENCYS TO WORK IN ALLOCATED AREAS ONLY SAVING THEIR TIME . HOUSING ASS HAVING OWN CARE BASED CARERS TO WORK WITHIN THEIR ORGANISATIONS.
CARE AGENCYS TO WORK IN ALLOCATED AREAS ONLY SAVING TRAVEL TIME. HOUSING ASS HAVING OWN CARE BASED CARERS TO WORK WITHIN THEIR ORGANISATIONS
OPEN ACCESS TO SERVICES, MORE DROP IN
If YES, please give details.
THE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO ACCESS SUPPORTED LODGINGS ARE GIVEN A VERY PRACTICAL
CENTRAL HUB OF SUPPORT WITH HOUSING, SOCIAL SERVICES, NHS AND OTHER COMMUNITY AGENCIES
1 DECREASE THE WAGE OF SENIOR STAFF IN SEFTON COUNCIL 2 REDUCE FUNDING TO SOUTHPORT
I WOULD IMAGINE SAVINGS COULD BE MADE BUT I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THE SERVICES TO SAY HOW CHANGES COULD BE MADE
PROBABLY, THERE ARE ALWAYS WAYS TO MAKE SAVINGS, BUT I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH OF WHAT SUPPORT IS AVAILABLE TO SAY HOW CHANGES CAN BE MADE.
GET RID OF SERVICES THAT ARE NOT PERFORMING
POORLY ATTENDED MEETINGS WITH SUPPORT STAFF SHOULD BE CHANGED TO APPOINTMENTS ON REQUEST - ARE HOUSE VISITS REALLY NECESSARY FOR MOST CARERS? COULD SHAKESPEARE STREET OFFICS BE MOVED INTO PART OF THE HOSPITAL (IT IS DIFFICULT TO GET TO WITHOUT A CAR)
AN INCREASE IN VOLLETEERS WOULD HELP ALOT
YOUNG PARENTS AND TEENAGE PARENTS - VOLUNTEERS COULD WORK WITH THEM NOT PAID STAFF WE HAVE EXPERIENCE OF BRINGING UP FAMILIES AND BUDGETING. LET VOLUNTEERS DO THE MENTORING. JUST TRAIN THE VOLUNTEERS
HOUSING TO PROVIDE OWN SUPPORT FOR TENANTS IN HOUSE CUT OUT MIDDLE AGENCYS
RIVERSIDE ECHG TO HAVE OWN SUPPORT CARERS AT SCHEMES
THE HEALTHY ARE OVER LOOKED BY THE SYSTEM, IN PREFERENCE FOR CARE OF THE DISABLE PHYSICAL/MENTAL DRUG ABUSERS AND IMIGRANTS
REDUCE ADMIN AND PERSONNEL COSTS
START WITH GOVERNMENT CUTTING BACK, IF EVERYONE IS CUTTING BACK SLIGHTLY THERE WOULD BE NO PROBLEMS
MORE SHARING OF SERVICES - GRADUAL LESSENING OF SUPPORT TO INDIVIDUAL TO INCREASE INDEPENDENCE LET THE CLIENT ASK FOR HELPREQUIRED. REQUIRED RATHER THAN ALLOCATED.
LESS HIGHER MANAGEMENT
GET RID OF HIRE MANAGERS

REDUCE MANAGEMENT COST
REDUCE MANAGEMENT COSTS
REDUCE MANAGEMENT COSTS - REDUCE SURVEYS - MUST COST A LOT
I CONSIDER SERVICES SHOULD NOT BE CUT AT ALL FOR VULNERABLE ADULTS
EMPLOY MORE PEOPLE LIKE [Name Omitted], THE WARDEN. HE EARNS HIS SALARY BY ENSURING HIS TENANTS CONCERNS ARE LISTENED TO.
PARTNERSHIPS - POOLING RESOURCES
YES TRY STARTING IN THTAG OFFICE THEY EARN MORE MONEY
DON'T KNOW
EARLY INTERVENTION IN ALL 'PEOPLE IN (OR OUT) OF BOXES, AND AWARENESS OF REGIONAL, NATIONAL, AND WOLD DEMOCRATIC CHANGES IN ORDER TO PLAN RESOURCES FOR MORE EFFECTIVE USE
WASHING MACHINE CLOTHES GET MIXED
REDUCE MANAGEMENT COSTS
REDUCE MANAGEMENT COSTS TOO TOP HEAVY
If YES, please give details.
DETAILED EXAMINATION ON THE NUMBER OF SENIOR MANAGERS. IN OTHER WORDS, LESS CHIEFS MORE INDIANS.
AS ABOVE
CHECK ON THE NUMBER OF STAFF
TO MANY BOSSES
STOP PAYING FOR BIG CARS FOR CARE PEOPLE
CUT OUT RED TAPE AND SPEND LESS ON EXPENSE'S AND COMMUNICATE MORE DEPARTMENTAL WISE
SEFTON IS ADEQUATELY FUNDED TO PROVIDE THESE SERVICES WITHIN THEIR EXISTING BUDGETS!
LOCAL COUNCILLORS & M.P.'S SHOULD TAKE REDUCED EXPENSISES AND PLOUGH MONEY BACK INTO SUPPORTING PEOPLE
REDUCE EXPENSES FOR COUNCILLORS AND LOCAL MP & PUT MONEY INTO S.P. POT
TOO MANY HIGHER MANAGEMENT STAFF TOO MANY PERKS FOR SOME STAFF
IF NOT ALREADY ACTIONED A CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF WHAT STEPS HAVE ALREADY BEEN TAKEN TO PROVIDE MORE EFFECTIVE SERVICES BY THE ORGANISATIONS SEEKING FUNDING. I.E. WHAT HAS BEEN DONE INTERNALLY BY THESE ORGANISATIONS TO GIVE BETTER VALUE
DON'T KNOW
DON'T KNOW
DON'T KNOW
DON'T KNOW
LESS FOOLISHNESS FROM THE COUNCIL
LESS BEUROCRACY
DON'T KNOW
DON'T KNOW
DON'T KNOW
?
BY BUDGETING MORE EFFICIENT WAY, LOOKING AT FINANCIAL WASTE AND SERVICES THAT ARE NOT FULLY EFFECTIVE
YOU SHOULD LOOK AT THE COST OF CARE FOR THOSE HOUSES WITH DISABLED

PEOPLE IN. THE WORKERS ARE THERE WHEN THE PEOPLE AREN'T
THE COST SAVINGS THAT SP PROVIDES - REDUCED HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS, REDUCED CRIME & RATES OF RE-OFFENDING ARE SAVINGS FELT BY OTHER AGENCIES THAN THE COUNCIL. THESE AGENCIES SHOULD TAKE A LOCAL APPROACH TO POOLING BUDGETS SO THE OVERALL SP BUDGET IS MAINTAINED & THOSE FEELING THE SAVINGS CONTRIBUTE AND THE COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION CAN DECREASE IN A MANAGED WAY OVER TIME
USE SMALLER VEHICLES FOR REPAIRS ETC AND REPAIRS RATHER THAN REPLACEMENT
SHARED OVERHEADS/CONSORTIA/JOINT TRAINING ETC
I HAVE HAD 2 MIN TO FILL THIS FORM HARDLY TIME TO DO ANYTHING YOU HAVE HAD 12 MONTHS
BRING JESUS BACK INTO SCHOOLS AND CHILDRENS HEARTS. TRAIN UP VOLUNTEERS, BUT THEN AGAIN THAT COSTS MOEY, ALSO GET THE LOCAL CHURCHES INVOLVED, BRING THIS COUNTRY BACK TO IT'S ORIGINAL ROOTS OF CHRISTIANITY AND YOU WOULDN'T HAVE SO MANY VUNERABLE ADULTS TO BEGIN WITH.
KEEP IT LIKE IT IS OR NOT REDUCE IT
CANT ANSER THIS ONE - DONT UNDERSTAND HOW WE CAN ANSER THIS
DONT UNDERSTAND QUESTION
WHY CHANGE SOMETHING THAT IS WORKING WELL. "IF IT AINT BROKE DONT FIX IT"
If YES, please give details.
EVERYTHING IS RUNNING EXTREMELY EFFICIENTLY AS IT IS PLEASE LEAVE OUR SERVICES ALONE!!
DONT CUT COSTS AT ALL THE PEOPLE NEED THEIR SUPPORT
MORE CONTACT BETWEEN AGENCIES I.E. SHARING INFORMATION
BY HAVING MORE COMMUNICATION DIRECTLY AND PEOPLE MAKING MORE OR DIFFICULT CHOICES WHERE NECESSARY
I AM NOT IN A POSITION TO KNOW THE DETAILS OF FUNDING, THEREFORE I CANNOT COMMENT ON HOW CHANGES CAN BE MADE
YOU ARE DOING A MARVELLOUS JOB ALREADY. MANY THANKS!
NO REDUCE FUNDING
HAPPY WITH SUPPORT, DO NOT CUT FUNDING
CUT HIGHER MANAGEMENT STOP PRIVATISATION STOPP WASTING MONEY ON CONSULTANSY FIRMS AND CORRUPTION
CUT HIGHER MANAGEMENT STOP PRIVATISATION STOPP WASTING MONEY
REDUCTION IN HIGHER MANAGEMENT. ENSURE VALUABLE RESOURCES ARE DIRECTED AT SERVICES AND NOT ADVERTISEMENTS/MISS-MANAGEMENT
REDUCE HIGH MANAGEMENT PAY
THERE IS POOR MANAGEMENT OF SERVICES, REDUCE HIGHER MANAGEMENT, HAVE MORE HANDS ON STAFF, MIS MANAGEMENT OF FUNDS
LESS PAPERWORK LESS CHANGES IN POLICIES PROCEDURES WHICH INCUR MANY HOURS WORK AND LOTS OF PAPER, PRINTING PHOTOCOPYING ETC
POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM SERVICE USERS, ALTHOUGH THIS WOULD BE COSTLY TO ADMINISTER. REVIEW HOW SERVICES ARE DELIVERED, FOR EXAMPLE, REDUCTIONS IN HOME VISITS WHERE POSSIBLE. PARTNERING WITH THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR.
ALL DAY DROP IN
NOT SURE
FANTASTIC THE WAY IT IS VERY POSITIVE OUTCOMES MAKING COMMUNITY MUCH MORE IMPROVED
REDUCE SIZE OF POSTS IN SP TEAM
MORE VOLUNTEERS
Joint working

greater involvement of CFV sector(s)
The Council should give greater direction as to whom it considers to be priority groups and allocate funding directly; this allocation may need to be on a "spend to save" basis.
review what services you have more carefully and get rid of the poor quality ones , increase the ones that are working , become more creative with service delivery and less red tape (paperwork). use local resources.
Better partnership working
Most services could reduce costs if pushed , each would have to submit a plan.
More targeted resources and working with providers and service users to look at best models
Encourage voluntary opportunities Annual assessments of benefits/financial circumstances for service users
Use more floating support which is generally better value than accommodation based support services and reaches more vulnerable people
There are ways in which all services can be delivered differently to reduce costs attributed to SP if there's no choice. However, the costs saved will be offset against future increased costs against other budgets.
If YES, please give details.
by looking towards partnership working - promoting and encouraging existing providers to look at ways of effectively working in partnership to achieve back office savings - by setting council tax rates which reflect the real costs of service provision - this may not be popular with the electorate, however given the full facts and reality of cost at least they can make fully informed decisions.
A greater input into the Generic service may mean people at risk could be dealt with at an initial stage reducing the need for further action and the amalgamation of some services.
na
Better planned partnership working between agencies and residents of the borough.
Reduce the high management costs, and unnecessary admin.
Ensure that funding of services comes via the correct stream. To draw down funding from partner agencies such as probation and health if the service contributes towards their aims and objectives.
Some services may be able to reduce costs by working together and some may be able to change the way services are delivered. However this will not be possible for all services and will depend on the size of the organisation and on the way the organisation is set up. Feedback from our customers tells us that they do not want a different delivery model.
In a more collaborative manner - starting from a strategic point of view in particular drug and alcohol services working together or from one service.
Reduce the amount given to MerseyCare and use this money to fund community projects like the Mental Health Crisis House, which is a better option than hospital services, and aids recovery
Out reach and home support
Services need to look at overhead costs for a start and keep costs low. Services should be streamlined as so duplicate work is not being undertaken by several services. Services should also show evidence of work undertaken with the clients to demonstrate the effectiveness of their service.
using volunteers for some labour, using apprentices and students to work within the services developing their own skills but still providing an effective service, looking at current contracts with providers and seeing if there are ways reductions can be made

without impacting on the service delivery and quality.
We have tried to outsource the service to other providers in the past but found the current arrangement offers the best value for money. Last year we out sourced a project however it had to be reclaimed as it didn't operate as efficiently, or cost effectively, as it did when we previously controlled it.
Tameside MBC redeveloped unused council premises at Bayley Hall, Hyde Park to launch the Park Café, which employs, prepares and trains people with learning disabilities for employment in the hotel and catering industry. A place at the café is a third cheaper than traditional day services, and helps participants move out of day services into voluntary work, further education and paid employment. People involved in the scheme have been extremely positive about their experiences, The scheme has 80 placements a week. Currently, 46 people are involved; 66 have participated in overall. The cost of supporting an individual in the scheme is more than a third cheaper than the equivalent cost of a place in day services. Participants in the scheme increase their independence, develop skills and gain valuable experience of a work environment. More than half of the 20 people who have moved on from the scheme have moved into positions where they do not require further day services, generating long-term savings for the authority. Feedback from staff at the café, and from customers, has been extremely positive. Staff say they are very happy to work at the café, and comment on the good atmosphere, while customers have praised the warm and friendly service at the café. Reduce 24hour care settings - replace with assistive technology - no more waking nights required even for those people with acute epilepsy. Invest in prevention, reducing high cost / crisis services.
Re look at financial benefit packages that come with salaries I.e does the mayor need a brand new car buying for him
do a full cost investigation on all care services
reshape services to get more for money, get rid of high cost ones by looking at whats needed not just whats always been there,
If YES, please give details.
re-evaluate what you have and get rid of poor or under acheiving services , stop going towards generic services (one size fits all approach). commission services that make a difference , take your guidance from those who are use the service
Commissioning clearly based on a robust review of the performance of existing services based on: utilisation, quality, outcomes, commitment to delivering local priorities and positive engagement with commissioning bodies. Poor performing services to be decommissioned and put out to competitive tender or novated to high-performing services.
. Reduce office workers Simplify the paperwork
All services should be a value for money service and organisations should keep overhead costs down. I get very frustrated walking into fancy offices and buildings when the same companies complain about costs.
There are always a few things that could be trimmed in £6million programme but no single services could support a 50% cut on top of that already experienced. It maybe worth looking at some of the services and seeing what economies are there. However I know from the service I have worked with, Fuel Poverty, we have tried paying others and outsourcing where possible and it still requires the 2 staff we have to run things inhouse. We could advice to others on how to cut costs and work smarter, as we have used an extnsive network of partners, other people's funding and good efficient practices to keep costs minimal.

Council admin and operation costs are top heavy. A reduction in these costs would alleviate cuts in services delivered.
Rationalise providers Reduce the bureaucratic monitoring machine to monitor what really matters
It is hard to be specific, but ways of delivering services cheaper could be by introducing and 'on site' approach to support, where say at least one member of staff is available in a large property at all times to a number of service users to deliver agreed support to all when appropriate, rather than having to travel individually between properties to deliver set amount of contract hours agreed, this can add hours onto care packages and increase costs. The logistics of asking people to give up their independence and enter into what could effectively be viewed as a step backwards or taking it further an 'institution' of sorts kicks up its own problems and arguments, but if the right types of properties were found and you could encourage people who live alone that they would still have their independence and this would be encouraged then maybe contracts could be reduced slightly by creating a model like this.
Streamline SP monitoring across A A s to reduce duplication/triplication of QAFs, annual reviews etc. Also consider acceptance of CQC inspections as evidence of good practice and meeting standards as opposed to having separate SP and CQC inspections. Where services are measured as excellent or good reduce frequency of inspections and reviews.
Delivering services through joint partnerships to ensure organisations can continue to deliver a vital service to residents in Sefton Borough. Looking at being more creative in delivering services and developing a service which meets the needs of the whole community and not just residents who are in social housing.
intelligent commissioning with redesign of services within an equal partnership relationship , instead of bean counting input giving no regard to impact measures .
I would like to see learning programmes linked to SP support services for different groups. There is potentiality to divert some of teh funding which is paid to learning providers for the delivery of qualifications by the SFA which could be used to co finance the delivery of SP services. Obviously this would require the deilvery of a suite of relevant qualifications.
Reduce systems that allow workers to work with vulnerable people. This is never listened too. It is time the LA was radical in this area. Examine what Support is as a model of service delivery and encourage providers to develop Coaching models, that are more focused and produce results much faster. Get providers to share good practice and lets move away from agenciees holding onto their own. This includes the LA who are experts at it!
Use of third sector grant money to be channelled into supporting vulnerable adults Larger contracts to be given to providers re ecomony of scale (more for less)
If YES, please give details.
Look at the costs of the services of these organisations, and make sure they are not charging people more than once for the same thing, and make sure that the council are not lining the pockets of care providers. Everyone needs to take part in this even those people who are seen as not being able to look after themselves at all, there are loads of equipment these days that would lower the cost of some care services.
Costs need to be looked at for services, true levels of services apportioned to those who need it, not just by an age criteria for a service, there should be mulitple cost levels within services based on need not just the same cost for all clients, peoples needs are different and some clients utilise more of the support service than others and the charging regeme should mirror this. There should be a look at how the local authority pays for all services, and ensure that care services are not being over funded when other lower cost services are available that could save the council a lot of money.
Larger contracts for providers could be considered - or even combined contracts across

Council boundaries in a way that reflects the proposal to merge Social Work teams across Merseyside.
Possibly re-configuring some support services, in order that there is not a reduction in the numbers of vulnerable people that can be supported.
Check services are not being paid too much, make sure all adult services gave a financial check, reduce ridiculous costs and pay for things being given to people not more for nothing because you haven't got the time to check them all
Look at high cost care services
invest in good companies who can help lots of people not ones that cost loads and do nothing

Question 8 Comments

Do you have any other comments about this option?
NO
IF TIS SERVICE WAS NOT HERE I WOULD BE BACK ON THE STREET. I WOULD HAVE NO MONEY AND WOULD HAVE TO FIND WAYS OF GETTING SOME. THIS IS MY HOME, I DON'T LIKE HOSTELS BUT THIS IS NOT LIKE A HOSTEL IF THE FIRST ONE I'VE STAYED AT.
IF BUDGET CUT MEANS LOSING ST CATH'S, I AM CONCERNED DEEPLY FOR HEALTH ISSUES, AND HIGH RISK OF GOING BACK TO USING DRUGS & GOING BACK TO PRISON.
NO
I THINK THIS IS A DISGRACE & THE CUTBACK WOULD EFFECT MY LIFESTYLE
NO
I AM DISGUSTED AT THE PROPOSED CUTS TO THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE BUDGET
I THINK THIS IS A DISGRACE & THE CUTBACKS WOULD AFFECT MY LIFESTYLE
THIS WOULD AFFECT MYSELF & OTHERS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY
SPEAKING ONLY FOR MY TENANTS THESE PEOPLE ARE VERY VULNERABLE AND CAN'T ALWAYS MAKE THEIR OWN DECISIONS OR FILL FORMS IN. ALL ESSENTIAL SERVICES SHOULD BE MAINTAINED AT ALL COSTS. LESS ESSENTIAL SHOULD BE REDUCED. A 5% CUT PEOPLE WOULD ALL BE DOING THERE BIT BUT ANYTHING MORE FOR IMPACT ON THEIR FUNDS.
THIS SERVICE COVERS THE MOST VULNERABLE PEOPLE IN OUR SOCIETY AND IS A EASY OPTION. IT MUST NOT BE CUT TO SAVE MONEY THAT WILL IN THE LONG TERM PUT PREASURE ON THE OTHER SERVICES,IE POLICE,NHS, SOCIAL SERVICES ETC, THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT SERVICE WHICH A LOT OF PEOPLE WOULD SUFFER WITHOUT, IT MUST BE SAVED.
I'M NOT SUPPORTIVE OF THE SP POTENTIAL BUDGET CUTS
I AM NOT SUPPORTIVE OF THESE POTENTIAL CUTS
NOT SUPPORTED OF THESE CUTS
IT WOULD BE CONCERNED AT LOSING MY CHOICE AND CONTROL, MY INDEPENDENCE AND THE EFFECTS THE CUTBACKS COULD MAKE ON MY LIFESTYLE
INSTEAD OF US MAKING CUTS, TELL THE GOVERNMENT TO DO SO, BRING BACK PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT. WE PAY £750 PER PRISONER PER WEEK. WOULDN'T WE BE RICH IF MURDERERS WERE PUT TO DEATH. CRIME WOULD BE REDUCED PEOPLE COULD LIVE IN PEACE & NO MORE WARS!!
A 44% REDUCTION IN OVERALL SPEND IS CRIMINAL, WITH £20 MILLION POUNDS WORTH OF SAVING TO BE FOUND OUT OF A £260 MILLION POUND CONTROLABLE BUDGET 7.69%, HOW CAN 44% BE REASONED OR JUSTIFIED!
NONE
I AM CONCERNED ABOUT MY EFFECTS ON MY GENERAL WELLBEING.
AS A SCHEME CO ORDINATOR I FEEL UNCOMMUNICATED WITH AND STILL FEEL THAT RESIDENTS MAIN CONCERN IS THEIR LIABILITY TO PAY MORE RENT FOR SERVICES THAT HAVE BEEN R ARREARS.
I DO NOT THINK THERE SHOULD BE SUCH A HEFTY CUT IN THE ESSENTIAL SERVICES. INCLUDING OLDER PEOPLE WITH SUPPORT NEEDS

I FEEL THAT THE SERVICE IS LACKING A RESPONSE SERVICE TO OUTSIDE AGENCIES E.G. CRISIS TEAM , POLICE LIASION SOCIAL WORKER ETC TO PROVIDE A OUT OF HOURS SERVICES TO VUNERABLE PEOPLE IS A MUST
I WOULD BE VERY CONCERNED THAT MY LIFESTYLE 7 SOCIAL ACTIVITIES WOULD BE AFFECTED
WE ARE TOLD BY THE GOVERNMENT "WE ARE ALL IN THIS TOGETHER- I JUST WONT HAVE TO CONTRIBUTE TO MEALS.
Do you have any other comments about this option?
IF THE MONEY IS REDUCED I FEEL IT WOULD HAVE A MASSIVE EFFECT ON THE COMUNITY AS AN INCREASE IN CRIME AND HOMELESSNESS WOULD INCREASE DRAMATICLY
I KNOW THAT THE PEOPLE (INPUTTER MESSAGE: FURTHER TEXT BUT CANNOT READ)
YES IT IS A GOOD THING THAT THE PEOPLE WHO NEED SERVICES GET DELIVERED
BETTER COMMUNICATION AND MULTI AGENCY WORKING FROM SERVICES ESPECIALLY BETTER COMMUNICATION FROM THE COUNCIL TO SERVICES
AT PRESENT THERE ARE NOT MANY OPTIONS FOR SINGLE HOMELESS MEN IN SEFTON IN TERMS OF CHOICE. TO REDUCE FUNDING FOR BOSCO WOULD POTENTIALLY DECREASE THE QUALITY OF SUPPORT GIVEN, WE OFFER SUPPORT TO PEOPLE WITH SUBSTANCE MISUSE ISSUES, MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS, LEARNING DISABILITIES. WE PROVIDE GENERIC SUPPORT AND THIS IS A VITAL LIFELINE FOR MANY SINGLE HOMELESS MEN IN SEFTON, IT PROVIDES STABILITY AND TO PLATFORM FOR THEM TO ACHIEVE POSITIVE CHANGE.
IF PEOPLE WANT TO KEEP THERE JOBS THEN I THINK THEY SHOULD BE WILLING TO TAKE A PAY DECREASE OR EARLY RETIREMENT TO LET SCHOOL LEAVERS HAVE A CHANCE TO GET ON THE JOB LADDER AND I THINK EVERYBODY WHO NEEDS HELP SHOULD BE PREPARED TO VOLINTEER FIRST
ASK ABOUT WHO YOU ARE HURTING WHEN THESE ARE ENGLISH, AND YOU ARE SUPPORTING EMIGRANTS BEFORE ARE PENSIONERS AND HURTING PEOPLE [Name Omitted] PMS
THERE ARE MANY OTHER SERVICES WHICH COULD BE REDUCED OR CHARGED FOR WHICH ARE NO WHERE NEAR AS ESSENTIAL
I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE WARDENS TIME
DON'T CHANGE ANYTHING
DON'T CHANGE ANYTHIKE
BEING A HOUSEHOLDER, I FEEL THE SERVICE WE CURRENTLY PROVIDE IS ALREADY UNDERVALUED, IN RELATION TO THE SUPPORT & BENEFITS WE PROVIDE TO A YOUNG PERSON. MY AIM IS TO PROVIDE LODGER, SUPPORT, GUIDANCE AND LIFE SKILLS TO YOUNG PERSONS WHOE NEED THE SUPPORT OF THE SERVICES BY SSL, THIS THEN SETS THE FOUNDATIONS FOR A YOUNG PERSON TO BECOME SUCCESSFUL, INDEPENDENT INDIVIDUALS. A REDUCTION IN FUNDING WILL IMPACT ON AVAILABILITY ON HOUSEHOLDERS AND THE ABILITY TO PROVIDE THIS KEY SERVICE FOR YOUNG PERSONS. I DON'T SEE HOW A REDUCTION CAN BE OF BENEFIT IN THIS MUCH NEEDED AREA OF SUPPORT.
I FEEL AS A CARER THIS IS SO WRONG I HAVE TAKEN IN MANY YOUNG PEOPLE THAT HAVE NO PARENTS OR CARERS AND THEY ARE VERY SCARED AND BRIEFLY MAPS GIVES THEM THE SUPPORT AD CARE THEY NEED AND WITH 1 MILLION YOUNG PEOPLE UNEMPLOYED YOU WILL ONLY MAKE THIS WORSE
BEING A HOUSEHOLDER THE EFFORT WHAT IS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT A YOUNG PERSON IS NOT REPRESENTED IN THE CURRENT PAYMENT. THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT AND STABILITY COULD NOT BE REPLICATED VIA OTHER SERVICES AND TO BRING SOMEONE (UNKNOWN) INTO YOUR HOME AND PROVIDE SUPPORT ON A DAILY BASIS SHOULD NOT BE UNDERVALUED. BY HAVING STABLE/SUPPORTIVE ENVIRIONMENTS THE YOUNG PEOPLD HAVE A CHANCE OF MAKING SOMETHING WITH THEIR LIVES AND/OR THE ABILITY TO LIVE INDEPENDENTLY.
CONCERNS RE REDUCTION IN SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION WHICH WILL IMPACT UPON YP I WORK WITH. IT WILL REDUCE CHOICE AND HAVE A MAJOR IMPACT UPON OUTCOMES FOR THOSE YP.

I THINK THAT PEOPLE WHO NEED SUPPORT SHOULD NOT BE TARGETED, THERE ARE PEOPLE OUT THERE NOW WHO NEED SUPPORT AND DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE SERVICES THEY CAN OBTAIN. SO IF THERE ARE CUTS, THE PEOPLE WHO ARE RECEIVING THE SERVICES ARE GOING TO BE ISOLATED AND LEFT TO LOOK AFTER THEMSELVES WHICH WILL PUT PRESSURE ON OTHER SERVICES LIKE HOSPITALS, POLICE AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Do you have any other comments about this option?

AT THE MOMENT IT AFFECTS YOUNGSTERS AND THEY ARE THE FUTURE IT SEEMS TO BE THE YOUNGSTERS ALL THE TIME LATERLY

IF THIS SERVICE WAS NOT HERE I WOULD FEEL LOST. AT THE MOMENT IM IN EDUCATION AND IF THIS SERVICE WAS CUT I WOULD NOT BE IN EDUCATION AND HOMELESS.

YES! REDUCTION IN OUR COMMUNITIES FUNDING FOR ALL OR ANY OF THE SUPPORT SERVICES MENTIONED WOULD BE NON-BENEFICIAL FINENAEALLY IN THE LONG RUN AS SO MUCH MORE MONEY WOULD NEED TO BE SPENT CORRECTING THIS MISTAKE OF REDUCING SUPPORT. IN MY OPINION THIS WOULD OUTRAGE MOST OF THE COMMUNITY AS ONCE THE FUNING FOR SUPPORT SERVICES.

YES , NON BENIFICAL IN THE LONG RUN, MORE MONEY WILL GET PAID OUT CORRECTING ALL THE WRONGS DONE, PEOPLE WILL END UP TURNING TO CRIME. END UP WITH MORE PEOPLE NEEDING SUPPORT IN THE FIRST PLACE

IF IT WAS NOT FOR THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE I WOULD STILL BE LIVING IN DIFFERENT FRIENDS HOUSES NOT KNOWING WHAT TO DO IN LIFE. I WOULD MOST PROBERLEY WOULD OF TURNED TO CRIME AND ALCHOL I WOULD NOT BE IN COLLEGE AND I WOULDNT HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH MY FAMILY BUT BECAUSE I GOT THE SUPPORT ALL OF THIS WAS AVERTED

I THINK IT'S A BAD DESION AS IT IS IMPORTANT FOR MY LIFE,MAXINE IS VERY GOOD SUPPORT FOR ME. I THINK THAT IF YOU CUT THE MONEY I WILL NOT BE TO MANAGE ANYMORE

IF I DIDN'T HAVE THE SUPPORT THEN I WOULD HAVE PROBABLY KEPT GOING DOWN THE BAD ROAD AND ENDED UP HOMELESS, IN JAIL OR DEAD. THIS SERVICE HAS CHANGED MY LIFE SO MUCH, ON TRACK WITH MY EDUCATION, CAREER PATH AND INDEPENDENCE. I AM GRATEFUL FOR THIS SERVICE, IT HAS A MAJOR IMPACT IN MY LIFE

WITHOUT THESE SERVICES I WOULD STILL BE HOMLESS I WOULD OF TURNED TO CRIME AND ALCHOL, I WOULD NOT BE IN EDUCATION AND WOULD HAVE NO CONTACT WITH MY FAMILY BUT THANKS TO THESE SERVICES THIS HAS BEEN AVERTED

I WOULD LIKE SUPPORTING PEOPLE TO BE ABLE TO CARRY ON SUPPORTING US YOUNG PEOPLE AS THEY HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL IN THE TIME THEY HAVE BEEN LOOKING AFTER MY WELFARE WHICH HAS BEEN FOR 20 MONTHS NOW

LEAVE EVERYTHING ALONE

NO

WHILST I APPRECIATE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC BEING INVITED TO GIVE THEIR OPINIONS, THEY ARE WORTHLESS IF NOT BASED ON ACTUAL FACTS. ANYONE WITH A BIAS TOWARDS A CERTAIN PEOPLE GROUP WILL AUTOMATICALLY SAY TO CUT THEIR FUNDING. SURELY IT COMES DOWN TO THE ASSESSMENT TEAMS WHO KNOW THE POLICIES AND ARE DEALING WITH INDIVIDUAL CASES AT GROUND LEVEL. I'M SORRY BUT OUR OPINIONS CANNOT BE A TRUE REFLECTION TO BASE CUTS ON.

I WUOLD BE GLAD TO BE RID OF THIS CHARGE. A WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY. SINCE I WAS ONLY TAKEN ON FULL-TIME AT WESTMINSTER CITY COUNCIL AFTER SOME YEARS , MY PENSION IS MEAGRE. I PAY A HEFTY RENT TO ANCHOR HOUSING WHO ARE EXPERTS IN WASTING MONEY. [Name omitted] MY PARENTS ASKED FOR NOTHING FROM THE STATE AND RECEIVED NOTHING. THEYWOKED AS LONG AS THEY COULD AND MY MOTHER DIED ON HER FEET. I KNOW OF PEOPLE IN HERE WHO ARE ON BENEFIT WHO ARE FARBETTER OFF THEN I. THEY WOULD NOT DREAM OF CONTRIBUTING TO ANYTHING. THEY TAKE AND TAKE AND CONSTANTLY LOOK INWARDS. THE PEOPLE IN REAL NEED WOULD NOT DREAM OF ASKING FOR IT. MY PARENTS WOULD NOT HAVE KNOWN ANYTHING ABOUT THE BENEFIT OFFICE AND MY MOTHER WOULD NOT EVEN CLAIM HER PENSION. IN AN ERA WHERE IT IS ALMOST FASHIONABLE TO HAVE NO SELF-RESPECT I KNOW THA I AM AN OD D MAN OUT.

I DO NOT BELIEVE I SHOULD LIVE OFF THE TAX-PAYER. THE YOUNG OFFENDERS WHICH I AM HELPING TO KEEP, WOULD NOT BE YOUNG OFFENDERS IF THEIR PARENTS HAD SET THEM A GOOD EXAMPLE BY WORKING AND HAVING SOME SELF RESPECT. THE SUPPORT CHARGE IS NOT FOR ME. I WOULD BE MOST PLEASED TO BE RID OF IT. TO ASK A PENSIONER TO GIVVE YOU £20 PER MONT OF HR MEAGRE PENSION FOR A SERVICE SHE DOES NOT RECCEIVE IS NOTING SHORT OF INIQUITOUS.

Do you have any other comments about this option?

MYSELF AND MY MATE USED TO LIVE IN PARKHAVEN TRUST, MAGHULL IN A CARE HOME LIVING WITH A FEW HUNDRED PEOPLE WITH THE ILLNESS EPILEPSY. WITHIN THE LAST DECADE BOTH OF US WERE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN HOW TO LIVE INDEPENDENTLY, AND LEARN HOW TO DO THE CHORES AND HOW TO HANDLE PAYING THE BILLS WHEN THE TIME CAME ALONG. THEOUTCOME AFTER WE BOTH HAD LEARNT WAS TO GO OUT IN THE WIDER COMMUNITY AND GET OUR OWN HOUSE, FLAT OR BUNGALOW. TWO AND A HALF YEARS AGO WE BOTH MOVED OUT OF PARKHAVEN TRUST AND MOVED TO BOOTLE IN STRAND HOUSE, OUR OWN FLAT AND WE COULDN'T HAVE BEEN ANY HAPPIER. WE BOTH SETTLED IN QUITE QUICKLY AND WE BOTH MADE OURSELVES KNOWN, AND WE BOTH MADE NEW FRIENDS IN AND AROUND WHERE WE LIVE AND ON OUR FLOOR OUR NEIGHBOURS ARE SO FRIENDLY. WE DO GET SUPPORT, WE HAVE A SUPPORT WORKER CALLED [Name Omitted] AND HE'S SO FANTASTIC HE'S NOT JUST OUR SUPPORT WORKER HE'S OUR BEST FRIEND. WE ARE UNDER ONE VISION SO IF THINGS A FEW TIMES A MONTH TO SEE IF EVERYTHING IS ALL RIGHT, AS WELL AS DOING PAPER WORK. WE ARE ON INCOME SUPPORT EVERY WEEK AND DLA EVERY MONTH. AFTER EVERYTHING THAT HAS HAPPENED OVER THE PAST 2 AND A HALF YEARS, ALTHOUGH WE ARE NOT RELATED OUR FRIENDSHIP HAS GROWN, WE SUPPORT EACH OTHER IF NEEDED, WE KNOW EACH OTHER MORE, MY MATE CALLS IT IT'S LIKE WE'RE BROTHERS ALTHOUGH WE'RE NOT. WHAT WE CAN SAY IS WE ARE BOTH UNDER GOOD COMPANY, WE'RE AROUND THE BEST PEOPLE AND FRIENDS AND IN A BETTER AREA THAN WHERE WE WERE AND WE HAVE JOINED THE BEST THING OF ALL JOINING AND BEING AMEMBER OF PEOPLE FIRST.

THE SUPPORT THAT I GET HELPS ME FEEL ABLE TO HELP MY NEIGHBOURS AND OTHER PEOPLE TOO. SOMETIMES I NEED MORE HELP AND SOMETIMES I'M OK SO I WANT TO GET HELP WHEN I WANT TO, NOT WHEN SOMEONE ELSE TELLS ME. WHEN WE GO ON RESIDENTIALS AND DAY TRIPS WE ALL LOOK OUT FOR EACH OTHER. THIS IS GOOD BECAUSE SOME PEOPLE CAN'T GET OUT MUCH AND SO IF WE SUPPORT EACH OTHER WE FEEL BETTER. PEOPLE CAN'T AFFORD TO DO MUCH WITHOUT SERVICES TO HELP THEM KNOW WHAT IS AVAILABLE FOR THEM AND HOW THEY CAN GET HELP WHEN THEY NEED OR WANT IT. I WANT TO CHOOSE WHERE I GET HELP AND SUPPORT FROM. THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT

VENUS ARE NOT ONLY A SUPPORT GROUP, BUT ALSO HAVE BECOME SOMEONE THAT I CAN TRUST IN. IF THIS SERVICE IS DROPPED I KNOW I WOULD PROBABLY END UP HAVING HOSPITAL TREATMENT FOR MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES. IN THE LONG RUN IT WOULD COST MORE TO TAKE CARE OF MYSELF IN HOSPITAL THAN TO FIND A SERVICE THAT THEY PROVIDE, WHICH IS ALSO BETTER FOR ME.

ON A PERSONAL VIEW, I REALLY COULDN'T HAVE GOT THROUGH WITHOUT SUPPORT FROM VENUS. THEY SUPPORT ME THROUGH PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS. I FEEL LIKE THEY ARE SUCH A VERY STRONG SUPPORT GROUP. I RING THEM UP CONSTANTLY WHEN I'M DOWN AND EVEN IF I CAN'T GET THROUGH TO MY SUPPORT WORKER (WHICH IS NOT OFTEN) SHE ALWAYS PHONES ME BACK TO CHECK I'M OK. ALSO VENUS SUPPORTS ME WITH FINANCIAL SUPPORT AS IN HELPING ME DEAL WITH BILLS AND HELPING ME WORK WITH A VIABLE SOLUTION WHICH LEFT ALONE THEY WOULD GROW.

THE SUPPORT HELP I GOT WAS SO MUCH TO ME. IT HELP ME STOP DRINKING. ALSO HELP ME STAY OUT OF HOSPITAL. HELP ME TO MEET OTHER PEOPLE. ALSO HELP WITH MY EX HUSBAND CAME BACK : HELP ME GO TO COURT WHICH I HAD NO ONE TO GO WITH WHICH THEY HELP SO MUCH; ALSO WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE. THE HELP VENUS AS GIVEN ME SO MUCH.

Do you have any other comments about this option?

VENUS IS AN ESSENTIAL SERVICE THAT KEEPS PEOPLE FROM ENDING UP IN HOSTELS AND HOSPITALS. WE DO THIS BY ENSURING OUR SERVICE USERS REMAIN IN SAFE

AND SECURE TENANCIES. THIS HAS A KNOCK ON EFFECT FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN MAKING LOCAL COMMUNITIES MORE STABLE

WITHOUT THE HELP OF THE VENUS CENTRE RESOURCE GROUP I WOULD NOT BE WHERE I AM TODAY. THEY ARE A WONDERFULL TEAM NOT JUST WITH MYSELF BUT WITH MANY OTHER PEOPLE WHOM ARE A LOT WORSE OFF THAN MYSELF ... MY FAMILY HAVE ALSO GOT CONTACT WITH THE VENUS CENTRE SO THEY KNOW THEY CAN RELY ON THE CENTRE BECAUSE OF MYSELF. I HAVE MOVED OUT OF MY DISTRICT TO A COMPLETELY NEW AREA AND HAD TO START AFRESH BUT THE VENUS HAVE ME SO MUCH. THANK YOU

THE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO ACCESS SUPPORTED LODGINGS ARE GIVEN A VERY PRACTICAL AND INFLUENTIAL LEVEL OF SUPPORT, AT A RELATIVELY LOW COST, WHICH HAS A VERY POSITIVE IMPACT ON THEIR LIVES

MENTAL - DISTRESS RE-HOUSING TRANSITIONAL - OVERSIGHT TWO YEARS ON FOR EL E.S.A. PERSONAL - BENEFITS - DRIVEN UN HOMELESSNESS BENEFIT RECEIVING CONFLICT OVER PAYMENT - DISCREPANCY WITH SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION WARDEN/POSSIBLE CLASH OF INTEREST WITH HOUSING ASSOCIATION - ADACTUS, RESETTLEMENT ISSUES OF MINE WERE DIRECTED TO SAVINGS - LIMIT BUSTING WINDFALL AMOUNT IN FUTURE I'LL BE PAYING MY OWN RATES AND RENT C.A.B. CHASED YOU UP FOR HELP AND EVIDENCE FOR ME ABOUT ONE YEAR AGO AS THEY DEALT WITH MY THEN PRESSING PROBLEMS NO ASSURANCES COMING FROM YOU; IT MIGHT STREAMLINE AND REDUCE COSTS IF YOU RESPONDED PROMPTLY AND SYMPATHETICALLY FIRST TIME OF ASKING [Name Omitted]

WOULD NOT LIKE THINGS TO CHANGE - LIKE FEELING SAFE AND SECURE

IF CUTS ARE MADE THEN THE QUALITY OF SERVICE WOULD BE GREATLY EFFECTED

I FEEL THAT THIS IS A SHORT TERM SOLUTION TO A PROBLEM THAT WILL IN THE LONG RUN WILL BECOME A BIGGER PROBLEM! ALWAYS VULNERABLE PEOPLE ARE AFFECTED FIRST BY CHANGE. AREN'T WE SUPPOSED TO TAKE CARE OF THESE PEOPLE REGARDLESS.

SUPPORTING PEOPLE PROVIDES A VITAL LEVEL OF HELP FOR NUMEROUS PEOPLE. TO REDUCE THESE SERVICES WOULD HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT OF THE LIVES OF PEOPLE IN NEED OF SUPPORT, THEIR FRIENDS AND FAMILIES AND THE COMMUNITY AROUND THEM. DISTINGUISHING WHICH SERVICES ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS WILL NOT HELP. IN THE LONG RUN, THE SITUATION OF THOSE SERVICE USERS DEEMED LESS NECESSARY WILL BECOME INCREASINGLY PRESSING AND EVENTUALLY FIND THEIR WAY ON TO THE PRIORITY LIST, AT WHICH POINT ANOTHER TYPE OF SERVICE USER WILL BE SERVICE AND SAVE MONEY ON DUPLICATED ACTIVITIES.

THE GOVERNMENT ARE MAKING CUTS IN AREAS THAT WILL AFFECT THE WELLBEING OF VULNERABLE PEOPLE INSTEAD OF CUTTING IN OTHER AREAS E.G THOSE ON HIGH INCOMES ETC. IT IS DISCRACEFUL TO TARGET THOSE WHO GENUINELY NEED HELP.

IS THERE A NEED FOR SO MUCH STAFF.

I FEEL THE SERVICE IS ESSENTIAL TO ELDERLY PEOPLE ON THEIR OWN, AS I LIVE IN SHELTERED HOUSING. I HAVE SEEN THE SUPPORT THAT THE SYSTEM GIVES I.E. EACH FLAT HAS PULL CORDS PUTTING THEM IN TOUCH WITH CENTRAL CONTROL AND COULD GET HELP TO THAT PERSON IF NEEDED

WHEN I GO TO THE GYM AND SWIMMING I NEED MY SUPPORT TO MAKE ME FEEL SAFE

I AM STILL WAITING FOR A SUPPORT WORKER

Do you have any other comments about this option?

COULD FAMILIES HELP MORE

WE HAVE A BIG PUSH ON A VOLUNTEERING SCHEME. VOLUNTEERS COULD THEN HELP WITH:- ELDERLY (CHECKING ON THEM AND SHOPPING) YOUNG TEACHING THEM LIFE SKILLS MENTORS FOR DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE. PERHAPS EVEN DOING SOME SMALL JOBS AROUND THE HOUSE.

IN MAKING THESE CUTS THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT THOUGHT ABOUT THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES. IT IS MY VIEW A SOCIETY IS JUDGED ON THE WAY IT CARES FOR ITS VULNERABLE MEMBERS. WE WILL FAIL IF WE DON'T DO THAT - THAT IS WHY WE MUST RETAIN THESE VITAL SERVICES. I HAVE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE IN A NUMBER OF CHARITIES IN SEFTON INCLUDING VENUS, PARENTING 2000 AND OTHERS. THEY ARE EXCELLENT ORGANISATIONS WHICH ARE SHOWING UP THEIR SERVICES AND SEEKING TO COLLABORATE ON SERVICES. THIS WILL ALSO MAKE FOR MORE COST EFFECTIVE SERVICES. I FEEL THAT THE COUNCIL SHOULD CONTINUE TO ASSIST THIS COLLABORATIVE PROCESS TO ENSURE THAT SERVICES ARE MAXIMISED THIS WAY.

AS I SAID ABOVE CARE IN THE COMMUNITY IS FALLING APART IF WHEN THE ELDERLY BECOME VERY VONERABLE THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO GO INTO RESIDENTIAL CARE

THERE MUST BE OTHER WAYS THE COUNCIL CAN SAVE MONEY WITHOUT HURTING OLDER PEOPLE WHO HAVE WORKED ALL THEIR LIFE AND ARE STRUGGLING IN THEIR RETIREMENT WITH HEALTH AND LIVING ON A MEAGRE SUM

I AM NOT WELL ENOUGH INFORMED IN THIS WHOLE FIELD. IF YOU DEPRIVE SHELTERED HOUSING OF ITS SCHEME MANAGERS GREAT DAMAGE WILL BE DONE AND PEOPLE MADE MUCH MORE VULNERABLE

HAVE NOTED THESE PAST 5-6 YEARS PREFERENCE FOR HOUSING HAS BEEN GIVEN TO IMMIGRENTS TO THE DETRIMENT OF BRITISH PEOPLE WHO HAVE LIVED IN OUR COUNTRY SINCE THEY WERE BORN, SEFTON AREA IN PARTICULAR

ELDERLY PEOPLE WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE COUNTRY THROUGH THEIR WORKING LIVES DESERVE TO BE SAFE, COMFORTABLE AND IN GOOD HEALTH IN THEIR LATER OR FINAL YEARS. FUNDING CUTS IN RECENT YEARS HAS RESULTED IN FEWER RESIDENTIAL CARE PLACES FUNDED BY SOCIAL SERVICES WHICH MEANS THAT RESIDENTS REMAIN IN SHELTERED ACCOM LONGER BUT WITHOUT PROPER CARE. SERVICES AND SUPPORT TO SHELTERED SCHEMES IS THEREFORE ALREADY BELOW REQUIRIEMENT. ANY REDUCTION WHATSOEVER WILL OBVIOUSLY IMPACT GREATLY AND WITH SOME ONLY JUST EXISTING, THE EFFECT COULD BE DIRE

ALL GOVERNMENT HAVE HAD A GREAT TIME ON TAX PAYER MONEY THEY SHOULD STOP THE WASTE NOW LESS M.P. PEOPLE IN NEED AS IN SUPPORTING PEOPLE WILL SUFFER

I KNOW THAT THE PERSON WHO SUPPORTING PEOPLE THEY DO A FANTASTIC JOB PLEASE DONT CUT THIS DOWN THEY ARE GOOD THANKS TO THEM

IF FUNDING IS CUT IT WILL HAVE A MASSIVE IMPACT ON THE YOUNG PEOPLE AS THIS WILL INCREASE HOMELESSNESS. IF YOUNG PEOPLE ARE HOMELESS THEY WILL BE UNABLE TO CONTINUE TO WORK OR EDUCATION. AS THEY WILL BE FOCUSED ON BECOMING ACCOMMODATED AND UNABLE TO CONSIDER SUSTAINING THEIR EDUCATION PLACEMENTS.

IT SHOULD BE TAILORED BY THE CLIENT AND NOT BY THE ESTABLISHMENT - THE COMMUNITY CARE.

ANY REDUCTION IN FUNDING IN ANY AREA REGARDING SUPPORTING PEOPLE WILL IN MY OPINION RUIN LIVES, IT WILL AFFECT SERVICE USERS AND PROVIDERS. VULNERABLE PEOPLE WILL FALL THROUGH THE CRACKS AND BE COMPLETELY EXPOSED TO FEND FOR THEMSELVES - MANY OF THESE PEOPLE WILL NOT SURVIVE THIS. ADDITIONALLY, A LOSS OF FUNDING WILL RESULT IN A LOSS OF JOBS - IN THE CURRENT CLIMATE THIS COULD BE DISASTROUS

Do you have any other comments about this option?

EMPLOYING WARDENS LIKE [Name Omitted] MAKES RESIDENTS FEEL MORE SECURE IN THEIR OWN HOMES, WHICH IN THE LONG RUN IS ECONOMIC SENSE, AS IT IS FAR CHEAPER FOR THE LOCAL COUNCILS. PEOPLE WANT TO STAY IN THEIR OWN HOMES, AND NOT BECOME A FINANCIAL BURDEN ON THE COUNCIL, BY GOING INTO PRIVATE OR STATE NURSING HOMES. IF AFTER READING THIS FORM, YOU WISH TO CONTACT ME

PLEASE PHONE ME

NONE

NO APART FROM LEAVE THINGS AS THEY ARE.

YES MY OWN PERSONAL CONCERN IS THAT THIS SCHEME IS TRYING TO DO AWAY WITH SOME PEOPLES JOBS NAMELY WARDENS. AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED WRONG CHOICE

AS THIS CONSULTATION EXERCISE IS ASKING FOR OPINIONS ON SUPPORTED PEOPLE SERVICES ONLY I THINK IT WOULD BE UNFAIR TO INDICATE ALTERNATIVE AREAS WHERE I THINK CUTS COULD BE ACHIEVED WITHOUT THE SAME CONSEQUENCES ON PEOPLES LIVES. THAT SAID, I AM AMAZED THAT THIS AREA IS NOT CONSIDERED "ESSENTIAL" AND THEREFORE IMMUNE FROM BUDGET SAVINGS. IT IS THE MOST VULNERABLE IN OUR COMMUNITIES THAT WILL BE AFFECTED BY CUTS IN THESE SERVICE AREAS AND IT WOULD SEND A TERRIBLE MESSAGE TO THEM THAT THE LOCAL AUTHORITY SEES THEM AS UNIMPORTANT, EXPENDIBLE EVEN. THERE IS A REAL DANGER THAT CUTS TO SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICES WILL LEAD TO REAL HARDSHIP AND SUFFERING OR WORSE IN EXTREME CASES - NOT SOMETHING I WOULD WANT ON MY CONSCIENCE IF I WERE AN ELECTED MEMBER IN SEFTON.

I WOULD LIKE TO EMPHASISE THE FACT THAT SEFTON COUNCIL HAVE DONE THEIR VERY BEST IN HELPING ELDERLY PEOPLE. I MUST ENDORSE THE FACT THAT [Name Omitted] CHISLETT'S TRUE GENIUS LIES IN HER GREAT ABILITY IN CREATING A VERY PLEASANT HELPFUL ATMOSPHERE WHEN INTERVIEWING ELDERLY PEOPLE. SHE HELPED ME SO MUCH AND SHE IS AN ASSET TO SEFTON COUNCIL. I CANNOT PRAISE HER ENOUGH. [Name Omitted].

I HOPE THESE CUTS DO NOT TAKE PLACE AS I ENJOY MY CURRENT LIFESTYLE

I WOULD HOPE THESE PROPOSALS DO NOT TAKE PLACE

I DO NOT WANT THE PROPOSALS TO TAKE PLACE

I UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEMS AS IT'S PEOPLES JOBS, PROBLEMS BUT IT NEEDS TO BE FAIR AND SERVICES ARE NEEDED

IF YOU ARE LOOKING AT WAYS TO REDUCE COSTS IN SEFTON YOU SHOULD NOT BE LOOKING AT SERVICES SUPPORTING OLDER PEOPLE, I'M SURE YOU DON'T NEED ANY HELP IN FINDING WAYS TO REDUCE COSTS IN SEFTON, BUT DON'T REDUCT COSTS TO SERVICES TO PEOPLE LIVING IN SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION, THERE ARE A LOT OF VULNERABLE PEOPLE IN THESE ACCOMMODATIONS AND THE LAST THEY THEY NEED IS ANY KIND OF REDUCED SERVICE. FINAL EVEN DON'T THINK ABOUT REDUCING THE SERVICES THAT OLDER PEOPLE DEPEND ON.

WHY WHEN THERE IS A CUT IN FUNDING IS IT ALWAYS THE MOST VULNERABLE IN SOCIETY WHO ARE MOST AFFECTED?

REDUCE COUNCILLORS' WAGES AND CUT THEIR HUGE EXPENSES.

GOVERNMENT & SEPHTON COUNCIL TO CUT OFFICE EXPENSES

- 1) YES, DITCH THIS UNWISE AND ILL THOUGHT OUT OPTION
- 2) REMIND SEFTON COUNCILLORS THAT THEY WILL NEED VOTES TO REMAIN IN OFFICE!
- 3) TRY CUTTING COUNCILLORS ALLOWANCES & MEETINGS!

GET RID OF 50% COUNCILLORS ALL THE WASTE OF MONEY CUTTING GRASS ON THE ROADS, INSTALLING CONES, WHEN ALL YOU NEED IS A TRUCK FOLLOWING THE CUTTING MACHINE SEE HOW MUCH MONEY IS WASTED BY SAN ENGS AT LUNCH HOUR BACK OF MAGHULL SQUARE TURN OVER ADMINISTRATION OF SUPPORTING HOUSING TO OVH

AS LONG AS SCHEME MANAGER SERVICE CONTINUES IN SAME FORMAT I WILL BE HAPPY

Do you have any other comments about this option?

LESS MANAGEMENT NO WORKING LUNCHES SENSIBLE EXPENSES

IN CONSIDERING OPTIONS TO FUND MAY I SUGGEST (1) DUE CONSIDERATION IS GIVEN TO WHETHER THE SERVICE CAN BE FUNDED FROM OTHER STREAMS (2) WHETHER THE SERVICE IS COMPLIMENTARY TO ANOTHER SERVICE (POSSIBLE A STATUTORY SERVICE) AND THE EFFECT ON THE ORGANISATION OF LOSING THIS FUNDING ON THE VIABILITY OF THE COMPLIMENTARY SERVICES.

SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICES HAVE ENSURED PROVIDERS HAVE DELIVERED APPROPRIATE SUPPORT TO THE MOST VULNERABLE IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES. A HUGE CUT IN SP WILL ONLY HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE MOST VULNERABLE COUNCILS CAN EXPECT AN INCREASE IN HOMELESSNESS, INCREASE IN CRIME, OVERCROWDED HOUSING, POVERTY.

WE NEED TO LOOK AT INCOME AND EXPENDITURE. THE ALTERNATIVE CLAIMS MADE BY YP (YOUNG PEOPLE) FROM DWP. HOUSEHOLDERS HAVE SEEN RISES FOR FOOD AND UTILITIES AND HAVE ABSORBED THESE COSTS. HOW CAN YOUNG PEOPLE AFFORD HIGH COSTS WITHOUT OUR SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENT LIVING SKILLS. CAN MEETINGS WITH YOUNG PEOPLE BE DONE CENTRALLY WITH YOUNG PEOPLE DOING THE TRAVEL. THIS COULD REDUCE TRAVEL TIME AND EXPENSES OF THE SUPPORT WORKERS. EMAILS FOR ADVICE TO HOUSEHOLDERS RE PAYMENTS IS GOOD. PERHAPS WE ONLY NEED THEM WHEN THE PAYMENT ALTERS. CAN WE LOOK AT GENERATING INCOME OURSELVES, EVENTS AND CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP.

KEEP CONTROL OF COSTS

NO

GET LABOUR BACK IN

NO

NO

NO

NO

NO

AS I AM AND HAVE ALWAYS BEEN A FIRM BELIEVER IN THE SOCIAL MODEL OF DISABILITY I FEEL THAT THE POWERS THAT BE ARE LETTING US DOWN. IT WASN'T LONG AGO THAT CENTRAL GOVERNMENT WERE THROWING MONEY AT GETTING DISABLED PPEOPLE TO WORK AND ENSURING THAT SERVICES WERE READILY AVAILABLE FOR THE VULNERABLE WITHIN OUR SOCIETY. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT HAS CHANGED AND WHY ARE VULNERABLE PEOPLE BEING TARGETED IN THE FIERCE FINANCIAL CUTS? I SEE NO EVIDENCE OF OUR LEADERS TAKING CUTS SO WHY REDUCE VITAL SERVICES THAT KEEP OUR COMMUNITIES SAFE AND SECURE??

IT WOULD A GREAT LOSS IF THIS SERVICE WAS CUT TO THE USERS IN THE SEFTON AREA

ITHINK THAT IS WOULD BE DEVASTED IF THE SERVICE IS REDUCED I THINK IT WOULD LOWER STANDARDS OF SUPPORT BRIAN IS VERY HELPFUL, AND IS THERE FOR YOU. TAKING THHAT AWAY WOULD LEAVE PEOPLE THAT NED SUPPORT VUNERABLE

TOP BRASS AT SEFTON COUNCIL TAKE PAY CUT THE MILLIONS SEFTON COUNCIL HAS IN THE BANK USE SOME OF THAT ALL SEFTON COUNCIL BUILDINGS TURN THE THERMOSTAT DOWN 1 OR 2 DEGREES THE ONE STOP SHOP IN BOOTLE. THE CEILING IS VERY HIGH COSTING A FORTUNE TO HEAT DROP THE CEILING BY 10 FOOT AND SAVE MONEY SCHOOL PLAYING FIELDS IN ENDBUTT LANE FAR TO BIG, SEFTON COUNCIL COULD SELL HALF OF IT OFF GIVE MORE POWER TO TRAFFIC WARDENS SO THEY CAN BOOK MOTORISTS WHO PARK ON THE PAVEMENT, CAUSING DAMAGE TO FLAG STONES, TARMAC, AND KERB STONES = MORE MONEY COMING INTO SEFTON COUNCIL TO HELP REPAIR DAMAGE CROSBY VILLAGE AREA CONSTANTLY USED BY CARS, VANS & LORRIES DESPITE BEING VEHICLE FREE SEFTON COUNCIL COULD START A LOTTERY, SIMIAR TO NATIONAL LOTTERY WHICH WOULD BRING IN MORE FUNDS WARMER WINTER = LOW BILLS = SAVINGS LOOK AFTER THE PENNIES AND THE POUNDS TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES

Do you have any other comments about this option?

I THINK THAT THE SSP FUNDING IS ESSENTIAL TO MANY IMPORTANT PROJECTS IN THE AREA AND WITHOUT THESE SERVICES, LOTS OF PEOPLE WILL STRUGGLE AND PROBABLY RESULT IN CRISIS EFFECTING THEIR LIVES, MORE SO.

I FEEL IT IS ESSENTIAL TO FUND PROVIDERS WHO SUPPORT CLIENTS IN THE NUMEROUS VULNERABLE GROUPS
I HAVE BEEN ACCESING A SUPPORTING LIVING PROGRAMME THROUGH THE 408 PROJECT AND I FEEL WITHOUT THIS I WOULDN'T BE WERE I AM TODAY
I ACCESS MANY OF THESE TO GET SUPPORT BECAUSE OF MY MLD LEARNING DIFFICULTIES AND NEEDING HOUSING BENEFITS, HOUSING SUPPORT
I'VE WORKED HARD ALL MY LIFE. DONE 5 YEARS IN HM FORCES (2.5 YEARS ON "ACTIVE SERVICE") I'VE REAL MOBILITY PROBLEMS I'M ALSO DIABETIC I'VE PAID EXCESSIVE INCOME TAX, COUNCIL TAX, VAT, ROAD AND INSURANCE TAX AND TRAVEL TAX WHY SHOULD I BE TAXED FOR BEING OLD BY A REDUCTION IN SUPPORT SERVICES?
CUTTING BUDGET MAY REDUCE OVERALL SERVICE PROVIDED HOW CAN YOU GIVE A QUALITY SERVICE ON A REDUCED BUDGET SOMETHING HAS TO GIVE IN REALITY IT WILL BE THE SUPPORT PROVIDED ALL LIVING COSTS ARE GOING UP. YET YOU ARE EXPECTING SERVICES TO PROVIDE TOP QUALITY ON A REDUCED BUDGET
I DON'T WANT 408 TO BE CUT AS THEY ARE VERY HELPFUL WITH MORE THAN ONE THING
IF IT WASN'T FOR 408 I WOULD PROBABLY BE IN THE GUTTER :(
THE 408 (FOR YOUNG PEOPLE) HAS HELPED ME A LOT SINCE I HAVE BEEN COMING TO SEE THEM. THEY HELP ME WITH HOUSING AND I ALSO USED TO DO COUNSELLING AS WELL.
HERE AT 408 I GET A LOT OF SUPPORT WITH DELING WITH MY HOUSING SITUATION, MANAGING MY INCOME AND ANY BILLS THAT I DONT UNDERSTAND. IF THIS SERVICE WAS TO STOP I WOULD SURELY END UP IN DEBT AND A UNSUITABLE PLACE TO LIVE
I HAVE BEEN COMING TO 408 FOR NEARLY A YEAR NOW AND WHEN I STARTED GETTING SUPPORT FROM 408 I FELT CONFUSED, LONLEY, NO INDEPENDENCE AND WAS REALLY STRUGGLING WITH MONEY AND HOUSING AND EVER SINCE THEY STARTED GIVING ME SUPPORT I FEEL MORE HAPPIER IN MYSELF AND MORE SAFE AT HOME. I DONT FEEL LONLEY NO MORE CAUSE I KNOW I GOT SOMEONE THERE TO TALK TO
WITH OUT SUPPORT OF 408 I WOULD HAVE NO MONEY AND BE HOMELESS. IS IMPORTANT THE SUPPORT IS THERE
I FOUND ALL MY SUPPORT FROM 408 VERRY HELPFULL AND WITH OUT IT I WOULDNT HAVE WHAT I HAVE NOW
VULNERABLE PEOPLE NEED A LOT OF SUPPORT. I DON'T THINK YOU CAN SKIMP ON SUPPORTING PEOPLE, THE NEED IS THERE AND IF YOU DO NOT ADDRESS THE NEED PEOPLE WILL SUFFER. WE NEED MORE ORGANISATIONS LIKE IMAGINE TO HELP PEOPLE GAIN INDEPENDENCE AND GIVE THEM PRIDE IN THEMSELVES AND OTHER PEOPLE
REDUCE COST OF GARDENING BY PUTTING WHOLE GROUNDS TO GRASS
I BELIEVE THAT THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSABLE TOWARDS VUNERABLE ADULTS TO PROVIDE GOOD SERVICES TO THEM SO THEY CAN ACHIEVE SUCCESS WHERE THEY WOULD NORMALLY NOT BE ABLE TO FIND ANY VALUE IN THEMSELVES ESPECIALLY IF THEY COME FROM BROKEN DOWN HOMES. SOME OF THE SUPPORT CENTRES ARE THE ONLY SOURCE OF HOPE THEY HAVE OF BEING ACKNOWLEDGED AND ACCEPTED.
BECAUSE IM IN BAD HEALTH, I FEEL SECURE. IF IT CHANGED I WOULD FEEL VERY VULNERABLE
I LIKE LIVING ON MY OWN BUT WOULD FEEL VERY ISOLATED WITHOUT THE HELP GIVEN WHICH MAKES ME FEEL MORE SECURE. THE SERVICE WHICH HAS BEEN PROVIDED HAS BEEN EXCEPTIONAL. [Name Omitted] IS A GEM AND SHE MAKES ME FEEL LIKE I CAN ASK HER ANYTHING PLEASE DONT STOP THIS SERVICE
Do you have any other comments about this option?

ALTHOUGH I DO LIKE MY INDEPENDENCE I HAVE TO ADMIT THAT I DO NEED SUPPORT. [Name Omitted] & THE REST OF THE TEAM HAVE BEEN INVALUABLE TO ME. THE THOUGHT THAT THIS SERVICE MAY BE CUT HAS ME WORRIED. THE FACT THAT THERE IS A CARE LINE I FEEL THAT I AM BEING WATCHED OVER THROUGH THE NIGHT. THIS GIVES ME GREAT PEACE OF MIND. PLEASE! PLEASE DO NOT REDUCE THE SERVICE CARE WE GET.

THE GOVERNMENT/COUNCIL ARE SUPPOSED TO BE INCREASING PEOPLES FEELINGS NOT PUTTING THEM FURTHER INTO DISPERE. WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO LOOKING AFTER THE COUNTIES PEOPLE?

NO

IF YOU GET RID OF STAFF YOUR COSTS WILL INCREASE A GREAT DEAL BECAUSE PEOPLE WHO NEED THE SUPPORT WILL GET WORSE AND POSSIBLY END UP IN HOSPITAL.

THE SUPPORTING SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE ARE COMPLETELY ESSENTIAL TO MAINTAIN MY QUALITY OF LIFE AND INDEPENDENCE IN M OWN HOME WITHOUT THE SERVICES I WOULD FEEL EXTREMELY ISOLATED AND VULNERABLE. FOR EXAMPLE, MY WONDERFUL WARDEN, [Name Omitted], IS A VITAL LINK BETWEEN ME AND THE OUTSIDE WORLD AND COMMUNITY. SHE MAINTAINS CONSTANT CONTACT BY PERSONAL VISIT, TELEPHONE CALLS AND DROPS NOTES AND INFORMATION INTO ME - SHE HAS EVEN GONE AS FAR AS CONTACTING MY SONS AND DAUGHTER WHEN AN ISSUE HAS ARISEN. IN SHORT SHE IS A GOD SEND AND I REALLY DO NOT KNOW WHAT I WOULD DO WITHOUT HER. THE PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS TO THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICES WOULD BE DISASTEROUS NOT ONLY TO MYSELF AND MY NEIGHBOURS BUT ALSO TO THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE

IF ITS REDUCED I WOULD NOT SEE ANYONE. ITS GREAT TO HAVE SOMEONE TO TALK TO FOR A BIT EVEN IF ITS ONLY ONE A WEEK. I LOOK FORWARD FOR THEM ALSO PHONING ME TO SEE IF I AM OK AS I AM NOT SOMEBODY WHO CAN SPEAK TO A LOT OF PEOPLE. THEY ARE VERY LOVELY PEOPLE

I FEEL THE PRESENT SYSTEMS ARE OVERLOADED AND COULD DO WITH MORE FUNDING RATHER THAN LESS

THE BREAKING DOWN OF RESIDENTS FRONT DOOR TO OBTAIN ACCESS IF A PERSON HAS TAKEN ILL AND CANNOT OPEN THE DOOR. THIS CAUSES A GREAT EXPENSE. THERE SHOULD BE MASTER KEYS HELD ON THE PREMISES THEREFORE CUTTING DOWN COST OF REPAIRS ETC., AND HAVING TO ALERT UNNESSARY PEOPLE

THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE BUDGET SHOULD NOT BE CUT. THE SP MANAGER IS ESSENTIAL TO THE ESTATE COMMUNITY OF O.A.P.S IT IS NECESSARY TO KNOW SHE IS THERE. SHE CHECKS EVERY WEEK, ANY PROBLEMS ARE DISCUSSED. SHE KEEPS US INFORMED OF ANY CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM

OUR COMMUNITY OF SHELTERED HOUSING FUNCTIONS VERY WELL AT THE MOMENT AND ANY CUTS TO THE BUDGET COULD ONLY HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT. THE LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE FOR SOME RESIDENTS WOULD BE A MAJOR BLOW. WE HAVE AN EXCELLENT SUPPORT VISITOR IN [Name Omitted] WHO MANAGES US VERY WELL AND PROVIDES ALL THE INFORMAITON AND HELP WE NEED - NOTHING IS TOO MUCH TROUBLE FOR HER. WHY CHANGE THINGS THAT WORK PERFECTLY WELL?

HAD MY SAY, THANKING YOU

THESE SERVICES ARE VITAL FOR THE MOST VULNERABLE IN OUR SOCIETY. BY CUTTING FUNDING THIS WILL PUT A GREAT BURDON ON THEM AND THE AGENCYS AVAILABLE. NHS, DOCTORS, POLICE, SOCIAL SERVICES ETC. AND HAVE IMPACT ON THEIR FAMILIES AND COMMUNITY. MONEY SHOULD BE TAKEN FROM THE THE RICHEST COUNTRYS IN THE WORLD. EVEN WITH THE CREDIT CRUNCH. THE INTRODUCTION OF CHARGES FOR THESE SERVICES IS A TAX ON THE SICK AND DISABLED.

THIS SERVICE IS MOST IMPORTANT BY CUTTING THE FUNDING THIS IT WILL HAVE GREAT BURDEN ON POLICE, SOCIAL SERVICES.

Do you have any other comments about this option?
I FEEL THAT UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD FRONT LINE SERVICES BE REDUCED.
I WOULD LIKE TO SEE MORE OF WHAT SUPPORTING PEOPLE IS ACTUALLY BEING SPENT ON AND NOT JUST A LIST OF SERVICES
NONE
NO
no
I need support and help and feel I could not cope, this is making me very anxious.
It is sad that services to help the most vulnerable are at threat. More and more people will need similar help to what my nan received due to rising gas and electric prices
the focus appears to be on reduction of services - why not propose an increase in services – we all appear to have bought in to, or been brainwashed into believing "There Is No Alternative" [Name Omitted] - well maybe there is and who knows - "fortune favours the brave"
From what we believe Sefton council's energy team received a modest sum of approx £55K pa to employ two workers and cover basic expenses. We are aware that last year all Supporting People services absorbed a 5% cut already. Due to the fact they only receive a modest budget, they are already working very efficiently. For the £55k invested annually, not only do they assist approximately 800 Sefton households per year but within the first two years of operation, levered in £1,151,000 to assist Sefton residents to live safely and independently in their own homes, along with hundreds of referrals to various other partnership agencies for a wide range of additional support. As well as the positive difference they make through added value referrals. Without the AWW not only would Sefton residents suffer but the 800 households they deal with per year would have to be dealt with by other council departments (predominantly social services) and it is estimated that fuel poverty costs NHS £2m per year in an area equivalent to the size of Sefton (these figures are only likely to increase due to the current economic climate).
Our service is low cost and we cannot reduce our costs any further. Feedback from our customers tells us that they do not want to move to a different model of service delivery. If funding is reduced or withdrawn this could place our existing customers into financial hardship and may deter new customers from choosing our service.
No
An increase in outreach support should not reduce the number of services provided by LEO project but would compliment the work done whilst the client is resident at the project
I think providers should also look at their support charges as some appear relatively high.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already provides great value for money £55k pa = 2 workers and generating £90,000 additional income for residents • Service won the regional footprint award and came runner up nationally in the NEA awards due to the best practices demonstrated in partnerships, value for money and fuel poverty alleviation. • Service may be abolished but demand for service won't - increasing demand on social services and health services. • Demand growing each year due to reduction in national resources, reduction in income, increase in energy bills, • Service assists most vulnerable in Sefton's Community
Over 500 councillors have signed a letter urging town halls in England to avoid making disproportionate cuts to services supporting some of the most vulnerable people in their communities, some of which are sefton councillors, how can this option be put out for consultation if they are supporting the exact opposite? The council should take part in other grant earning schemes such as the social care efficiency programme, where by each council is given an amount for adult social care this would reduce pressure on

budgets.
It's outrages and the most vulnerable will be left to pay again
Do you have any other comments about this option?
i have a history of being in and out of jail, i got help last time i came out and i would probably be in the same boat if i didnt have a service to help me. They gave me a place to live and helped me get on some college courses, I now work as a volunteer for a service to help other people who think theres no way out. The money it costs putting someone in and out of jail and failed tenancies homeless hostels and all that must be loads support services are well cheaper it wouldnt make sense to get rid of them, if you do youll regret it
To my knowledge, there are only 2 people working on fuel poverty - which would bring a tiny saving, set against the lives and health improved and all the grants and incomes benefited - avoiding serious impacts and costs across social and health care. It seems an ill thought out cut, when this fuel poverty service is needed more than ever.
no
it shouldnt be reduced
No
no
The fuel poverty service has built up very specialist knowledge and is respected Nationally , winning regional recognition in 2 consecutive years for what has been achieved. Without the Supporting People funding the 72 preventable deaths a year that the service saves are at risk every winter (this is against a challenging back drop of 3 harsh winters and rising energy prices). The service helps 800 households a year get heating or save money on bills through insulation and advice. This year due to other cuts the service expects to hit its 760 household target by January and is likely to assist in excess of 900 homes. 30% of those households are referred by Social Care services and Children schools & families.
Older people have contributed during their working lives and deserve to at least be safe, comfortable and healthy in their remaining years. Previous cuts have resulted in fewer residential care places being funded by Social Services. In turn this has resulted in people remaining in sheltered housing without the level of care they should receive. Any further cuts would only serve to worsen the situation and shorten the lives of the most vulnerable.
This programme enables vulnerable adults to live as independently as possible,the proposed cuts would be madness.
The AP scheme is already looking at ways to improve services and maximise resources with safeguarding those who use our service as our main focus. Any further reductions to carers payments may jeopardise the future of the placements.
there are clearly areas where savings can be made there is a need to look at the in house services collecting and monitoring information which is just keeping staff in jobs not adding anything to the evidence to prove worth not all the options listed in the first section are followed through to the subsequent sections , why not have some decisions already been made SP shouldn't be propping up what other depts should be paying for , remember prevention is better than cure .
I appreciate the task is not an easy one, and theres more to come. i wish you well in the

decisions that have to be made.
i think sefton should identify supporting people services that people are willing to pay for e.g nursery, adult learning, playbarn, cafe, financial advice etc etc and then set up a social enterprise that can reinvest the surplus into contributing to the supporting people services that you currently provide.
I dont understand why such alot of money is being suggested to be taken off supporting people when I cannot find information about other care services having there money taken off them, I think all care services should be looked at not just those who cant come to social services and ask for money.
Do you have any other comments about this option?
It would make more sense to look at the cost benefit analysis of the programme to make a decision where savings can be made. Besides looking at this tool to see that supporting people saves local authorities money and the central government making a statement which was on a national news bulletin, that local authorities have not received a reduction for support services and therefore there should be "no excuse" for savings to be made in this area, Looking at press articles for the programme, 551 councillors signed a letter submitted by the national housing federation to demand a rethink on cuts to supporting people, of which at least 5 of sefton councillors signed, giving that the letter clearly highlights and warns "that without early identification and support, vulnerable individuals will reach crisis point as their needs escalate and become more severe, leading to greater demand on acute health services, the criminal justice system and carers", how can the same councillors then decide to make such a disproportionate cut to the supporting people services in sefton? These councillors need to stand up and be counted when the decisions are being made, protecting the most vulnerable constituents within their wards who will no doubt feel the effects of what this reduction would mean if this goes forward. It will be those same councillors who when asked who will have to say they signed a letter for no cuts to be made and allowed the allowed the option to go through in their own borough. Using freedom of information responses it appears that the supporting people budget has already had around a 19% reduction by the fact that government awarded Sefton 8.2m for 11-12 within the overall grant to the L.A, however supporting people has not received 8.2m for 11-12, and again the local authority will receive in the published local government finance settlement for 12-13 an amount of £8.035m, so where as the consultation states that the grant will be reduced by 44% if 3.7m is left the actual true % reduction is 53.95%, how can the council justify such a disproportionate reduction in comparison to the overall % that needs to be saved.
My main comment is that any option should take full consideration of the individual characteristics of each service provider and not just reflect a standard percentage reduction across all services.

Appendix 2 – Other Documentation Representation

Supporting People

Consultation with Clients

Venue: Windsor Court
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 10.00am
SP Staff: Sue Kearney

How many clients present: Drop in during "Breakfast Club"
No of completed forms at visit: 6

NOTES:

We were invited to attend the "Breakfast Club" which is a drop in type of event so we spoke to people who had come to the communal room for this.

6 people completed the questionnaires while we were there and 4 took the questionnaires away with them and promised to complete them later.

We left a number of blank questionnaires with the scheme manager with a promise for us to ring next Tuesday to see how many had been completed and returned. We have offered to pick up completed questionnaires.

There were no issues arising with regards to the questionnaire.

Venue: Aindow Court
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 11.15
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 15 Clients & 1 Staff

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire, the first 30 minutes of the visit were taken up with areas of concern that clients had regarding a lack of communication with the provider around the fact that their accounts were in many cases showing arrears, in some cases it was between £500.00-£600.00, Lesley McCann explained that although payments had ceased to the Provider for a period due to ongoing contractual issues, an interim payment to cover this period had been paid 2 months ago, and a further payment was made last month so although the full arrears would not have been cleared, the clients accounts should not be showing as heavily in arrears, Lesley McCann requested that the Scheme Manager to contact the Contract Manager Name Provided to address the clients concerns.

4 clients required assistance around the completion of the questionnaire.

12 blank questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Anchor Court
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 10.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 7 Clients & 1 Staff

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

4 Clients requested assistance with completion of the questionnaire.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Bailey Court
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 1.30pm
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 6
No of completed questionnaires: 0

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

All present requested to take the questionnaires away to complete.

The scheme warden promised to distribute other questionnaires and we promised to ring Tuesday 29th November to arrange collection of completed questionnaires.

The scheme warden said that they were expecting members of the local community to come to the scheme for bingo and she was asking if any of them wanted to complete a questionnaire.

There were no issues arising with regards to the questionnaire

Venue: Bosco Society – Bosco House
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 11.00 – 12.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 20 Clients, 4 Staff, 1 partner and 3 interested others

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were two questions with regard to the questionnaire.

Question 1 - surrounding the term "Generic" for a client group was asked.

IM explained that this client group is for a universal referral and that any of the other client groups could access these services.

Question 2 – asked by the partner with regards to what they were in regards to service user/provider etc.

KL answered that they were in the other box, and they should insert what they were.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Pierhead Housing - Chestnut Court
Date: 21 November 2011
Time: 2.00 – 3.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 7 clients & 2 Staff Members

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire.

3 clients requested help filling in the questionnaire.

KL & IM facilitated these requests.

Venue: Christopher Taylor House
Date: 23 November 2011
Time: 2.00 – 3.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 16 Clients & 1 Staff member

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire.

A number of residents requested help filling in the questionnaires this request was facilitated by SK & SW.

12 blank questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Delph Court
Date: 22nd November 2011
Time: 2.00 – 3.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 13 Clients & 1 Staff member

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no questions with regards to the questionnaire.

5 clients requested help filling in the questionnaire and this was facilitated by IM & DS, questions then arose around Generic & Home improvement agency client groups that were explained to be universal client referral scheme and small adaption's to peoples tenancies to keep them independent.

12 blank questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Eton Court
Date: 22nd November 2011
Time: 12.00 – 1.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 6 Clients & 1 Staff member

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were three questions with regard to the questionnaire.

Question 1 – Will this affect my job?

[Name Omitted] answered that at present it was only an option however if the proposals that are recommended to go forward are the full 44% of Supporting People funding reduction then a further decision will then have to be made to decide what services reduce or cease.

Question 2 – How does this consultation for the whole of Sefton cost?

[Name Omitted] answered that she would ask the question and answer as soon as possible.

Question 3 – How much paper had Sefton MBC used on this consultation?

[Name Omitted] stated that she could only answer for the Supporting People team and as of today 1 box with 5 reams have been used.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Guardian Court
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 10.15
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 10 Clients & 1 Staff

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

3 clients requested assistance with the completion of the questionnaire.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Hawthorne Court
Date: 23 November 2011
Time: 3.30
SP Staff: [Name Omitted]

How many clients present: 9 Clients & 1 Staff member

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were questions with regard to the questionnaire.

Question 1 – Is there any point in filling in the questionnaire as the decisions are already made.

[Name Omitted] answered that no decisions have been made and that by filling in the questionnaire you will have your voice heard.

Question 2 – Why are the council cutting the Older People budget when the other client groups like offenders get funding from probation.

[Name Omitted] answered that all older funding streams were amalgamated into one central pot of money that was the Supporting people grant in 2003, this grant was ring fenced until recently when it became part of the directorate allocation of money.

Question 3 – Will this cut affect this service?

[Name Omitted] answered that if the full amount of money is cut then the governance group will then have to decide what services are to be affected.

Question 4 – When will the decision be made on the cuts?

[Name Omitted] informed that the decision will be made on 16th February 2012

Question 5 – Can we fill in the questionnaires and post them back?

Venue: Anchor - Holly Court & Silverdale (Joint Meeting)
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 10.00 – 11.00
SP Staff: [Name Omitted]

How many clients present: 15 clients & 2 Staff

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There was one question with regard to the questionnaire.

Questions surrounding the term “Generic” for a client group was asked.

[Name Omitted] explained that this client group is for a universal referral and that any of the other client groups could access these services.

Some clients requested help filling in the questionnaire.

12 blank questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: James Horrigan Court

Date: 22nd November 2011
Time: 3.30 – 5.15
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 40 Clients & 5 Staff

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no direct questions with regards to the questionnaire.

There were a number of clients that requested help in filling in their questionnaires. IM & DS facilitated these requests.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Maple Court
Date: 22nd November 2011
Time: 10.00 – 11.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 30 Clients & 2 staff

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were two questions with regard to the questionnaire.

Question 1 – What is Generic in terms of a client group?

[Name Omitted] explained that this client group is for a universal referral and that any of the other client groups could access these services.

Question 2 – What is Home Improvement Agency in terms of a client group?

[Name Omitted] explained that this client group is for small adaptations to a tenancy to allow a client to remain independent; any of the other client groups could access these services.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Maryfield
Date: 23 November 2011
Time: 2.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 12 Clients & 1 Staff member

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire.

A number of clients requested help filling in the questionnaire [Names Omitted] facilitated this request.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Poulton Court
Date: 22nd November 2011
Time: 2.00 – 3.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]
How many clients present: 17 clients & 1 Staff member

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were questions with regard to the questionnaire.

Question 1 – What % is the 20million saving needed against the overall budget.

[Name Omitted] answered that she didn't have an exact figure and would email the scheme manager with the answer.

Question 2 – How do you expect me to complete the form if I have not got an exact amount of money?

[Name Omitted] answered that she was asking the group to take part in the Supporting People consultation and that all other consultations are available to complete via Sefton.gov.uk

Question 3 – Can I go and see my MP about this?

[Name Omitted] answered yes you can go and see both your local councillor and MP at your own discretion.

Question 4 – Can I have a copy of what has been spent on individual client groups and have you got balance sheets of all your providers for the previous year.

[Name Omitted] answered that she did not have provider balance sheets, however that she would be able to send information on the budget spend of the Supporting people budget for the previous.

12 Questionnaires were left at the scheme

Venue: Queen Elizabeth Court
Date: 22nd November 2011
Time: 11.00 – 12.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]
How many clients present: 8 Clients & 1 Staff Member

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire.

12 blank questionnaires were left at the scheme.

Venue: Roger Arden Court
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 11.00am
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: various

No of completed questionnaires: 0

NOTES:

The scheme manager had been called to cover another scheme (Brian Cummings Court) and so wasn't present that morning. We waited in the communal area and a couple of residents stopped on their way through and we explained why we were there.

They brought a couple of people to meet with us and took blank questionnaires.

The scheme warden returned just before we left and we gave him a number of questionnaires. He informed us that there was a residents meeting arranged for 22nd November and that he would distribute questionnaires at that meeting.

We promised to ring Tuesday 29th to arrange to pick up completed questionnaires.

Venue: SEAD Project – Merton House
Date: 21st November 2011
Time: 3.00 – 4.00
SP Staff: [Names Omitted]

How many clients present: 8 Clients & 1 Support Worker

NOTES:

We distributed the questionnaires to those present and then explained why the consultation was taking place.

There were no questions with regard to the questionnaire, however some of the clients referred to the quality of the service/accommodation and questioned the difference between their service and another local hostel.

The Forum support worker answered by saying that this was Forum's decision on how their service and accommodation was budgeted.



Sefton

Get Involved Group And Sefton Council

Consultation Session for People with a Learning Disability

Where:
Goddard Hall
297 Knowsley Road
Bootle
L20 5DF



The theme:
**Spending Cuts
Have
Your
Say**



Sefton Council has to **cut its spending** on local services. This affects **you**, your family, your friends and neighbours.

This is a **"drop in"** consultation meeting. This is your chance to have **your say** about what services are most **important to you**.

Turn up between **1.00pm** and **before 4.00pm** to look at the choices, talk to council officers and **make your views known**.

When:  **Monday 19 December 2011**



Start

Finish



To Margaret Carney C.E.O.

Re: Sefton's Transformation Programme 2011-2014

I am writing on behalf of 250 members of Southport Older Persons' Forums. The Forums meet in Maghull, Bootle and Southport. Members have asked me to respond on their behalf to the proposals in the Transformation Programme document.

The Forums welcomes the chance to take part in this consultation process but is worried that some of the proposals will undermine effective support systems for elderly people to remain in their own homes.

The Forums are extremely concerned about the proposal to reduce eligibility for care, as this inevitably means that older people with substantial needs will no longer be able to access the support they need (E2.10). This may well be a false economy since it will hasten the loss of independence and quite possibly the need for other, more expensive NHS or residential care.

Grave concerns were also raised about the reduction to the Supporting People budget (E2.1)– especially to the Affordable Warmth Team, they provide valuable assistance to older people who would otherwise possibly become part of the dreaded winter statistics.

The Forums believe that specialist transport services are vital and must be continued and certainly not reduced (E2.3). The Forum is opposed to raising charges for specialist transport services (E2.4).


Many services help people to remain independent for longer and enjoy their lives. We are concerned that some of these proposals – such as abolishing the mobile library service (E3.13) – will have an impact on isolated and vulnerable older people and reduce their quality of life.

Finally, many older people attending the Forums were very disturbed by the proposal to increase the charges for burials and cremations (E5.7), which clearly has a much bigger impact on older people and their partners than any other section of the population.

The Forums recognise the financial challenges facing the Council but has a duty to reflect the views of its members and the wider older population. Within the document it does appear that Sefton MBC is looking to save just over £1m per year from children and families but more than £11m per year from the older people's budget.

The Forums would like to thank you for the opportunity to take part in the consultation and would be very willing to provide further feedback if this would be helpful.

Margaret Lambert
Facilitator, Sefton Older Persons Forum



Letter received from: [Name Omitted], Chief Executive Officer.

Following the invitation to complete consultation questionnaires, I have decided to write to you to clarify the position in relation to Light for Life's funding through the Supporting People Programme and the impact of its potential reduction or cessation.

Light for Life provides Southport and its surrounding areas with a Housing Centre staffed by three centre workers funded, in the main, by the Housing Department with a small contribution from SP. The overheads for the centre are also met by Housing. The centre provides initial information and guidance to people experiencing housing difficulties, either homeless, threatened homeless or those experiencing difficulties with landlords and other tenants. The centre conducts Housing Need Assessments, akin to those carried out by the Council's own centre in Bootle, with follow-up support via a Bond Scheme (which costs the Council nothing) and referral to the Floating Support team – funded entirely by Supporting People. The service also provides quarterly landlord evenings offering information and support to PRS landlords operating across the borough, and has recently invited representatives of RSL'S who now attend these events.

Prior to employing the Floating Support workers, eviction rates were very high in the north of the borough and the bond scheme experienced a high claim rate too. Since tenancy support to this vulnerable group was introduced, both eviction and claim rates have dropped significantly and growing numbers of people are achieving greater independence from services and agencies as a result. The benefits to clients are many. Workers act as a liaison between landlord and tenant, reducing the risk of eviction, intervening in disputes and working with clients to minimise conduct and behavioural issues which may result in them losing their home. Workers are trained to support clients to achieve accredited courses alongside their personal support plans which underpin their journey to greater independence.

Homelessness and threatened homelessness is often a cyclical situation and Light for Life is committed to keeping an open door to members of the public, regardless of their circumstances and history. The charity has an excellent track record of supporting extremely vulnerable people with a range of complex additional needs which has often resulted in a reduction in the need for other agency support, which is better for the client. Clients are well known to the organisation which means that support to the most appropriate type of service and outcome is swift.

Light for Life provides additional benefits to the client which are made available outside of the funding it receives from Supporting People. As a charity, Light for Life works hard to fundraise and work with other charitable organisations to ensure that all clients have access to furnishings, white goods and food at a time when they are most vulnerable and have nothing. The charity is able to be flexible in its spending of some charitable income to ensure that a persons basic needs are being met.

The charity has recently undergone a review of its services and in April 2011 took the decision to make efficiencies to ensure that the services remained good value

for money. To this end, back room costs have been reduced and a new team created combining Centre and Floating Support staff to further reduce both staffing and accommodation costs at a time when both were on the increase. We believe that the operating model now adopted provides an excellent, holistic and seamless services to some of the most vulnerable people in the borough.

A reduction or cessation of the current funding package through Supporting People would result in a serious impact on the residents of the Southport area, costs for the Council and further costs incurred through a rise in evictions, homelessness, bed and breakfast options and referral to services, currently minimised through the charity's support interventions.

The combined package of Supporting People and Housing Funding enables the Centre to provide this holistic and timely service, avoiding the additional costs which would be necessary if the Council were to fund and staff its own provision in the north of the Borough. Our links to PRS landlords is second to none, providing quick access to properties for clients and support to both landlords and clients to sustain the tenancy. This has been achieved through intensive work over a number of years and the relationship is one of trust and mutual respect. Removal of LFL's service will inevitably result in fewer landlords being prepared to accommodate vulnerable people at a time when changes to the Benefit system are already weakening their attitude to tenants who are claimants. I stress that this is a 'combined package' and removal of SP funding would result in closure of the centre and cessation of services. There is a contract in place through Housing to provide services until March 2013, initially, but this can only be achieved with a continuation of funding through SP.

There are organisations that currently benefit from Supporting People funding who would be in a position to claim their monies from other sources following some fairly straightforward changes. Light for Life's services cannot be funded in any alternative way and whilst monies from Housing many continue to be available, the income from SP is vital to complete the services offered by the charity.

I hope that the information I provided speaks for itself, but I would be happy to discuss our situation in more detail if necessary. You will have received completed questionnaires or letters from staff and trustees of the organisation which will reflect the charity's position and thoughts about any option to reduce/cease funding.

Please let me know if you require any further information,

[Name Omitted], Chief Executive Officer.

Excerpt from a letter to the Leader and Chief Executive Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council,

Thank you for the opportunity provided to partner organisations such as ourselves to consult on the proposed budgetary cuts within SMBC.

Having assessed the options being consulted upon we have responded where we feel there is a potential significant negative impact on the lives of our residents, the long term sustainability of the Borough of Sefton and on our business.

Whilst appreciating the immensely difficult task facing the Council, we worry that some of the cuts proposed, particularly to the Supporting People Programme will put many vulnerable people across the borough at risk and will provide a false saving which will result in higher costs to the public purse in future years.

Not all the options we have responded to are formally open for public consultation, however, we feel the impact will be such on our tenants that we ask the Leader and Chief Executive to consider all of the comments we have made below.

Roy Williams Chief Executive One Vision Housing

Section E2: Older People E2.1 Supporting People E2.2 Supporting People Commissioning

The current cost of the Supporting People Programme to Sefton Council is £6.757m. The proposed cuts being consulted upon are up to £3m, a maximum cut of 44%.

It is widely accepted that the Supporting People Programme saves money in the long term as it allows individuals to maintain independent living. The preventative work delivered through the SP Programme reduces the burden on other statutory services at a later date such as the NHS and Police.

The programme has never been in higher demand and with Sefton's population aging at the current rate there will be 23,700 additional people aged 65+ by 2033 (from 55,300 to 79,000) By 2033, Sefton will have approximately 16,165 people aged over 85 requiring even more intensive specialist support.

What does Supported Housing offer Sefton?

Each SP funded service supports people in maintaining independent living in their own homes. As a result:

- There is a reduction in the use of care or nursing homes – the support we provide helps people to maintain their independence for a longer period.
- People are supported to sustain their tenancies which has a positive effect on the number of homeless applications and the use of B+B provision.
- Hospital beds are freed up – if people have a home and support service to go to then they can be discharged in a timely manner.
- People coming out of prison -can be housed at an earlier opportunity therefore allowing early prison release plus reducing the risk of re-offending.
- Ex-offenders – can be housed and supported with their issues – this reduces the risk of re-offending, which has an impact on probation the service and the police
- Support is provided to victims of Domestic Violence which reduces the need for and cost of B+B provision within the local authority.
- Supported living placements are available for people with learning disabilities – reduces the impact on families and respite services.

SP funded services often pick up issues which affect people in terms of keeping them safe within their communities through education, safety plans and effective support.

The Supporting People Programme is key in providing stable and sustainable communities.

What is the value of Supported Housing?

In addition to the social, health and welfare benefits of the SP Programme, there is clear evidence to show that the SP Programme provides a net saving to the public purse.

A report commissioned by The Department for Communities and Local Government in 2008, carried out by Capgemini compared the cost of current SP services compared with a range of potential adverse events that might occur to clients if SP services weren't available.

Capgemini worked out that on average, for every £1 spent on the SP Programme, £2.11 is saved.

What is the Steer from Government?

Central Government has been explicitly clear to Local Authorities proposing significant cuts to the Supporting People budget. In a letter to the Daily Telegraph earlier this year (18th March) Housing Minister Grant Shapps said that: 'Local authorities need to cut costs. But this shouldn't mean targeting disproportionate spending reductions on programmes that support the most vulnerable.' Eric Pickles, the Community Secretary has also said that: 'Most sensible local authorities will come to the conclusion that £1 spent on Supporting People will probably save them £5 or £6 further down the line.'

What are the options?

We understand that the Local Authority needs to make cuts across its budget but we feel the Supporting People budget should be protected from cuts based on the evidence that SP funding in fact saves money in the longer term.

However, what is tough for the Council is that they will not be the 100% beneficiary of this investment and future saving.

We propose that for 2012/13 SMBC reconsider making any cut to the budget for Supporting People. Instead, we ask that SMBC work with the beneficiaries to educate them to the savings they are receiving and the impact on them if SP Programme is reduced including the long term, adverse financial impact on their services.

By using a Local 'One Place' approach, and pooling resources across the Local Strategic Partnership, there should be an opportunity to reduce over time the Councils contribution to the Supporting People budget, whilst maintaining or ever developing the budget to provide increased savings across partners.

Implications for OVH:

Supporting People funding within One Vision Housing, funds support to over 1600 properties, including funding 18 Scheme Managers and 2 Team Leaders who provide 15 minutes per week support to each of our clients.

This support includes but is not limited to:

- Ensuring their Health and Wellbeing – by direct support or referrals to other agencies
- Providing advice and support on benefits maximisation and affordable warmth
- Safeguarding-raising awareness of safeguarding issues and raising alerts where necessary
- Referrals to Occupational Therapist to ensure people can continue to live in their own homes with the help of aids and adaptations
- Support with drug and alcohol issues
- Linking clients to other agencies to support their cultural and social needs, helping them build networks, get involved and remain active and avoid becoming isolated

From our financial profiling we know that a 10% cut in the SP funding we receive would lead to a staff reduction of 2 personnel. This would mean approximately 160 clients who currently receive support will not.

A maximum 44% cut would lead to 8 personnel. This would mean approximately 640 clients who currently receive support would not.

The knock on impact of these cuts will be that our vulnerable clients will be unable to independently sustain their tenancies which will lead to:

- Increased use of hospitals and residential care and the resultant increased cost of providing these services
- Increased pressure on the Councils Statutory services including Homelessness as people fail to sustain tenancies
- Increased risk of re-offending as people do not enter supported and therefore more sustainable tenancies
- Reduced level of support to victims of Domestic Violence which in turn will increase the need for and cost of B+B provision within the local authority.
- Reduced number of supported living placements available for people with learning disabilities – therefore increasing the impact on families and respite services.
- Increased levels of Anti Social Behaviour
- Increased number of older and vulnerable people suffering social isolation



5 December 2011

Ms Margaret Carney, Chief Executive
 Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council
 Town Hall
 Lord Street
 Southport
 PR8 1DA

2nd Floor
 84 Market Street
 Birkenhead
 Wirral
 CH41 6HB

Telephone: 0151 649 9718
 Facsimile: 0151 650 0682
 E-mail: info@forumhousing.co.uk
www.forumhousing.co.uk

Dear Ms Carney

Re: Sefton Supporting People Providers' Forum

I am writing to introduce myself as Interim Chair of the above and hope you may have some time in the near future to meet up.

As Providers we were appreciative in 2010 that whilst the Council gave consideration to how it might make immediate savings that delivery of the Supporting People Programme was regarded as Critical.

This meant that the finances for the Supporting People Programme were not subject to reduction.


A request was made however for Providers to offer up a 5% saving or be subject to a value for money exercise (the choice being the Providers), in order as I understand it, to balance the Supporting People Programme budget, by achieving savings from Providers.

I advise of this against the backdrop of the current consultation.

Aligned to the request was an offer that contracts could then be extended to 1st October 2010. We then especially appreciated the further contract extension to March 2011.

This has meant that services have continued to be delivered to vulnerable people, albeit inside a reduced funding envelope.

We are as Providers, staff and service users contributing to the current consultation in respect of the reductions of £25/£20 million that the Council has identified as savings to be made in 2012/13.



Patron: Right Reverend Keith Sinclair, Bishop of Birkenhead

Chairman: Mr. C. Drake

Chief Executive: Mrs. C.A. Allen

Birkenhead Forum Housing Association Ltd. A Charity incorporated as an Industrial and Provident Society under the reference number 10269R.
 Registered with the Tenant Services Authority / TSA, the Regulator of Social Housing - L1299 Affiliated to NHF
 Registered office: 2nd Floor 84 Market Street, Birkenhead, Wirral, CH41 6HB

Members of: Housing Ombudsman Service Social Housing Pension Scheme



We understand very clearly the Council's most difficult position.

We are however somewhat dismayed to read that £3 million is identified as a reduction on the Supporting People programme budget. This is in effect a 44% reduction for a service the Council deemed Critical twelve months ago.

We do sincerely hope that contributors to the consultation will see the value of Supporting People services.

I know I am making constant references to the Supporting People programme and budget however, I am aware that this no longer exists as an entity, old habits die hard.

I have over the last 12 months had many conversations with Angela White Chief Executive of Sefton CVS and she has indicated to me your continued support of the Voluntary, Community Faith Sector.

Many of the Supporting People Providers fall into the above category. This brings me to my final point...

Given the Council's timeline for meetings to agree a balanced budget for 2012/2013, I see it as entirely possible that the Supporting People team will not enter into dialogue with Providers until February 2012 at the earliest. Current Supporting People contracts expire on the 31st March 2012.

Would it be your intention to commit, as you did last year, to an extension to the contracts in order to allow Providers to manage a way through, whatever this may be?

I know Providers are once again extremely anxious about the future, for their organisations and for their service users and staff.


As I have said, we fully understand the Council's dilemma in respect of financial resource and we would wish to be able to offer solutions once the consultation period has ended.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter.

I am only sorry we haven't met face to face before I had cause to write.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely



Chris Allen (Mrs)
INTERIM CHAIR
PROVIDERS FORUM

Part B – “Framework” Budget (as presented to Cabinet 16 February 2012)

Cabinet on 16 February 2012 considered and approved a “Framework” Budget in order for Council to consider, potentially amend and subsequently approve a balanced Revenue Budget for 2012/13. The following identifies the issues / proposals that were considered in preparing the “Framework” Budget as presented to Cabinet.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Council is legally required to fix its budget and set a Council Tax for 2012/13 by 10 March 2012. A special Budget Council meeting has been arranged for 1 March 2012 for this purpose.
- 1.2. This report identifies proposed amendments to the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and the expected charges on the Council for 2012/13 from the various levying bodies. In addition, Cabinet is recommended to consider a “Framework” Budget to enable Council on 1 March 2012 to deliberate upon, on 1 March 2012. The latest financial position for the years 2013/14 and 2014/15 are also included for information.
- 1.3. The “Framework” Budget for 2012/13 includes the assumption that the Council Tax Freeze Grant (for 2012/13 only) will be accepted and that there will be **no increase** in Council Tax. Should Members approve any additional items, or amend items already included, the content of the “Framework” Budget will need to be updated.
- 1.4. The abolition of the capping regime and the introduction of a referendum based system, if local authorities want to increase Council Tax higher than Government prescribed limits, are also considered. The maximum Council Tax increase allowed in Sefton without going to a referendum is also highlighted.

2. Medium Term Financial Plan Update

- 2.1. On 26 May 2011 Cabinet approved the assumptions that underpin the Authority’s MTFP for 2012/13 to 2014/15. The Council on 27 October 2011 approved further changes to these assumptions. In addition, in October and November, Council approved a number of savings which reduced the budget gap. Cabinet on 2 February 2012 recommended a number of further savings proposals to Council for approval. If Council on 16 February 2012 approves all these savings, the revised budget gaps are as follows:

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m
Forecast Residual Net Saving Requirement	9.780	10.210	11.620
Change Proposals (Low/Medium risk items)	-1.269	-0.003	0.400
Change Proposals (Organisational changes, with no consultation required)	-0.288	-0.114	0.000
Updated Forecast Residual Net Saving Requirement	8.223	10.093	12.020

2.2. Officers have been reviewing the assumptions included in the MTFP in the light of additional information and decisions made by Cabinet. This has resulted in a number of proposed changes to the MTFP which are discussed in the following section.

2.3. Proposed Changes to the MTFP

2.3.1. Cabinet on 19 January 2012 approved the opening of Southport Cultural Centre with a limited but appropriate programme of activities. This has added £0.398m to the MTFP in 2012/13 with a further £0.324m in future years.

2.3.2. Cabinet on 19 January 2012 approved the setting of the Council Tax Base for 2012/13. This will generate additional Council Tax receipts in 2012/13, reducing the budget gap by £0.055m.

2.3.3. Sefton has received notification that its two largest levies are to decrease in 2012/2013. The Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority Levy will decrease by £0.091m. The Merseyside Recycling and Waste Authority will decrease by £0.360m.

2.3.4. Cabinet on 19 January 2012 approved the award of contracts for the provision of Domiciliary Personal Care for Vulnerable Adults. The MTFP had previously assumed a provision for inflation on these contracts. In addition, the reduced cost of contracts has resulted in savings to the Council. The overall impact of these changes is a reduction in the budget gap of £0.733m from 2012/13.

2.3.5. The MTFP previously assumed that the total cost of the Carbon Reduction Commitment, including schools, would have to be borne by the Council. The Schools' Forum has agreed that individual schools should contribute for their share of the cost. The overall impact of this is a reduction in the budget gap of £0.250m from 2012/13.

2.3.6. Council on 27 October 2011 approved a £0.700m saving on the Merseyside Connexions contract from 2012/13. The negotiations for the Merseyside

wide agreement have now been finalised. This has resulted in further savings of £0.200m in 2012/13 with an additional £0.136m from 2013/14.

2.3.7. Cabinet on 26 May 2011 approved the inclusion of £1.500m in the MTFP for Disabled Facilities Grants due to the potential significant reduction in capital grants available to fund this expenditure. Following the announcement of the Capital Grant allocations for 2011/2012 it is expected that only £1.000m will be required as a revenue contribution to fund the total cost of the programme. Therefore, this reduces the budget gap by £0.500m.

2.3.8. Cabinet on 23 June 2011 approved the use of New Homes Bonus to partially fund both contractual obligations and the costs of future activity in respect of Housing Market Renewal. The Council has now received a Capital Grant of £3.4m towards the cost of completing the programme. In addition, the allocation of New Homes Bonus in 2011/12 and 2012/13 is greater than previously anticipated. After allocating the amount of New Homes Bonus required to fund the Housing Market Renewal Programme, £0.811m of the grant can be transferred to revenue to reduce the budget gap from 2012/13 onwards.

2.3.9. Due to interest rates being forecast to remain low for the next two years and the availability of low cost short term borrowing, it is anticipated that further savings can be made on the Council's Treasury Management costs. These factors have resulted in further anticipated savings of £0.300m in 2012/13 with an additional £0.100m from 2013/14. It is not currently expected that these savings will be achievable in 2014/15.

2.3.10. Due to there being no local elections in 2013, there will be a saving of £0.100m in 2012/13 and a further £0.100m in 2013/14. The total saving of £0.200m will need to be added back into the budget in 2014/15.

2.3.11. Trade Union Facility Time is provided to staff members within the core Authority and to staff in schools. In past years, this latter element has not been charged to schools. The proposal is a re-alignment of these costs which will enable a reduction of £0.012m to the Authority's core budget.

2.3.12. The contract for Grounds Maintenance has been re-negotiated and extended, with the resultant reduction in expenditure for the period of the contract.

2.4. Previously Agreed saving options

2.4.1. There are a number of savings agreed during the 2011/12 budget process that are now not considered to be achievable. These have been added back to the budget increasing the budget gap pending further consideration of the issues.

- a) Terms and Conditions – The Council agreed various changes to Terms and Conditions to achieve budget savings of £3.000m in 2011/12. Part of this saving was achieved by the utilisation of a one-off budget

available in 2011/12 only. This has resulted in a shortfall of £0.454m in the achievement of this saving in 2012/13. In addition, it was assumed that further savings of £1.000m would be achievable in 2012/13. There is therefore a total shortfall of £1.454m from 2012/13.

- b) Capita Contract –The Council approved savings of £0.112m in 2011/12 rising to £0.224m in 2012/13 on the Capita Contract as part of the reduction in General Corporate and Departmental Support costs. As the contract is to cease and be brought back in-house in 2013 the saving will not be achieved pending a review of the service.
- c) Subscriptions – The Council approved a saving of £0.028m from 2012/13 by agreeing to the withdrawal from the North West Employers Organisation from April 2012. Although notice has been served this could be rolled forward twelve months so that the Council has the organisation's support during a period of significant change to the workforce. If approved, the saving will not be achievable until 2013/14 at the earliest.

2.4.2 A separate report on the agenda considers the withdrawal from the Local Government Association, with an associated saving of £0.060m, currently built into the budget for 2012/13. Should the decision be to continue with membership, then the MTFP and "Framework" Budget will need to be amended accordingly.

2.5. Other Changes beyond 2012/13

2.5.1. As part of the Terms and Conditions savings approved during the 2011/12 budget process, agreement was reached to freeze increments for 2011/12 and 2012/13. Therefore, without further agreement, increments will become payable from 2013/14. The MTFP does not currently include this potential cost. The anticipated cost of paying increments is £1.737m from 2013/14 with a further £1.500m in 2014/15.

2.5.2. The Government grant that contributes to the cost of Housing and Council Tax Benefit administration is significantly reducing. It is anticipated that the grant will reduce by £0.250m in 2013/14 and a further £0.250m from 2014/15.

2.6. Summary of proposed changes

2.6.1. The changes to the MTFP outlined in the report have the following impact on the budget gaps for 2012/13 to 2014/15.

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m
<u>Forecast Residual Net Saving Requirement (following Cabinet on 2 February 2012)</u>	8.223	10.093	12.020
<u>Proposed Changes to the MTFP</u>			
Southport Cultural Centre	0.398	0.324	0.000
Council Tax Base	-0.055	0.000	0.000
Levies	-0.451	0.000	0.000
Domiciliary Personal Care for Vulnerable Adults	-0.733	0.000	0.000
Carbon Reduction Commitment	-0.250	0.000	0.000
Connexions	-0.200	-0.136	0.000
Disabled Facilities Grants	-0.500	0.000	0.000
New Homes Bonus	-0.811	0.000	0.000
Treasury Management	-0.300	-0.100	0.400
Elections	-0.100	-0.100	0.200
Re-Alignment of Trade Union Facility Time	-0.012	0.000	0.000
Landscape Services – Grounds Maintenance contract renewal	-0.130	0.000	0.000
	-3.144	-0.012	0.600
<u>Previously Agreed Saving Options</u>			
Terms and Conditions	1.454	0.000	0.000
Capita Contract	0.224	0.000	0.000
NWEO	0.028	-0.028	0.000
	1.706	-0.028	0.000
<u>Other Changes beyond 2012/13</u>			
Increments	0.000	1.737	1.500
Housing and Council Tax Benefit administration subsidy	0.000	0.250	0.250
	0.000	1.987	1.750
<u>Updated Forecast Residual Net Saving Requirement</u>	6.785	12.040	14.370

3. Levying Bodies

3.1. The Council is required to pay levies to a number of external bodies. The expected levy amounts to be paid in 2012/13, and their impact on Sefton's budget compared to 2011/12, is shown in the table below. A number of these bodies have not yet formally approved their levies as at the time of writing the report.

<u>Levying Body</u>	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Change £
Integrated Transport Authority	25,773,000	25,682,000	-91,000
Waste Disposal Authority	12,974,007	12,613,601	-360,406
Environment Agency	147,584	147,584	0
Port Health Authority	79,500	79,500	0
Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	58,661	59,248	+587
	39,032,752	38,581,933	-450,819

The above figures have been built into the “Framework” Budget for 2012/13, considered below.

4. Police and Fire Authority Precepts

- 3.1 The Merseyside Police Authority and the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Authority are due to meet on 16 February 2012 and set their budgets / precepts for 2012/13.
- 3.2 The current financial planning for the Fire and Rescue Authority relies on a 4% increase in Council Tax for 2012/13, but a final decision will not be taken until the above date.
- 3.3 With regard to the Police Authority, no firm recommendation is being made regarding the level of the precept.

4 Additional information on savings options

4.1 Cabinet on 2 February also agreed the following items were not in a position to contribute to the budget savings for 2012/13. Council is asked to confirm that these items are not to be included in the “Framework” Budget.

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendation
E1.3	Children’s Transport	Reduce planned expenditure through increased efficiency	a) agree that it is not currently feasible to identify a budget reduction associated with the discretionary element of children’s transport
E4.3	Capita Contract	Reduction and restructuring of a range of services currently delivered as part of the “Core” Contract	b) agree that the achievement of this savings will be delayed in light of the decision to terminate the Capita contract
E5.6	Home Improvements	Bringing the Home Improvement agency service for DFGs, in-house	c) agree that a formal procurement process to provide the Home Improvement agency service be approved
E6.10	Floral Hall	Retendering / disposal of Southport Theatre & Convention Centre	d) agree that Officers re-consider the best means of securing a cost saving while continuing the activity of the complex, either through re-tendering or consideration of sale of the complex in the future, subject to the required approvals.
E2.10	Fair Access to Care Criteria	To review Sefton’s application of the Fair Access to Care Criteria with a proposal to raise the adult care eligibility	e) agree a wider review of the activities and resources associated with the application of the FACS criteria, to be completed by October 2012 with recommendations to Cabinet in November 2012

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendation
		threshold to 'Critical' only	

Attached at **Annex A** is an extract from the 2 February 2012 Cabinet report which provides further background to the above.

4.2 In addition, the option to dispense with Mayoralty and Twinning (E6.1) is not considered to be in a position to progress until a further mini-review is undertaken.

4.3 At Cabinet on 2 February 2012, further information was requested for a number of the saving options. This information has been prepared and can be found on the Transformation update report elsewhere in this agenda. A number of these items are included in the "Framework" Budget shown below.

5 "Framework" Budget for 2012/13

5.1 Under the Council's Constitution, a Budget / Council Tax level has to be recommended to Council for consideration. The following "Framework" Budget has been prepared in order to fulfil the Constitutional requirement. The decisions agreed at the 2 February Cabinet meeting have been incorporated into the initial budget gap. Proposed amendments to the assumptions built into the Medium Term Financial Plan, considered earlier in the report, have been included in the table as a single line.

5.2 At the Cabinet meeting, Members are able to add, or delete, items contained within the "Framework" Budget, BUT the overall position must remain as a balanced budget. The position for the following two years (2013/14 and 2014/15) are shown for completeness, but do not form part of the "Framework" Budget.

5.3 In line with the previously approved policy, the use of one-off balances (£2.5m) has been assumed in the "Framework" budget as set out below. This resource has been included to allow for the phasing of two projects relating to the Re-commissioning of Nursing and Residential Care and the Supporting People changes.

5.4 The table below presents a position which results in an overall surplus (£0.346m). In addition, Members may wish to identify new / alternative options which could be included in the "Framework" Budget. Members should note that if savings greater than those required are identified, then an option could be taken out of the 2012/13 budget process, but agreed for implementation in 2013/14 i.e. taking a longer term view of the budget process, or used to reduce the use of one-off resources in 2012/13. Any reduction in the use of one-off resources built into the budget would provide a

greater buffer within the year, should any shortfalls in the savings be identified.

5.5 The following table identifies savings options that have been included in the “Framework” Budget: -

	Ref:	Categorisation / Service	2012/13 Budget	2013/14 Budget	2014/15 Budget
			£m	£m	£m
		Residual saving requirement following 2 February Cabinet	8.223	10.093	12.020
		Less MTFP adjustments (above)	-1.438	+1.947	+2.350
		Revised Budget Gap	6.785	12.040	14.370
		Low and Medium Options			
1	E3.14	Arts & Cultural Services – Crosby Civic Hall	-0.044	0.000	0.000
2	E4.4	Grass Cutting – Reduce Frequency	-0.050	0.000	.0.000
3	E6.6	Public Conveniences – Market Test	-0.100	0.000	0.000
4	E6.7	Tourism - Reduction	-0.090	0.000	0.000
		High Impact Options			
5	E4.6	Recharge sports users and allotment holders the costs of provision of utilities	-0.059	0.000	0.000
6	E4.7	Recharge formal sports users the costs of grounds maintenance	-0.061	-0.050	0.000
7	E4.8	Closure of aviary, nursery shop and the fernery at Botanic Gardens and conservatory at Hesketh Park	-0.050	0.000	0.000
8		Parks Greenspaces, Coast & Countryside Redesign	-0.250	-0.330	0.000
9	E2.6	Re-commission Nursing and Residential care	-1.500	-1.500	0.000

	E2.7 E2.9				
10		Supporting People	-2.000	-1.000	0.000
		Reviews			
11		Voluntary, Community Faith Review	-0.170	0.000	0.000
12		Assessment & Care Management - Community Care Practitioners	-0.257	0.000	0.000
13		Use of One-off savings to fund the part year impact of lines 9 and 10	-2.500	+2.500	0.000
		Total surplus (-) / Gap	-0.346	11.660	14.370

5.6 Attached at **Annex B** are brief descriptions of the saving options included above.

5.7 Having considered the information in the Transformation report, Cabinet is asked to refer its consideration of the above budget to Council.

5.8 A full service analysis of the “Framework” budget is attached at **Annex C**.

6 **Referendum system for Council Tax increases / Council Tax Freeze Grant**

6.1 Members will be aware of the abolition of the Council Tax Capping regime and the introduction of a referendum of the local electorate should authorities wish to have a Council Tax increase above a threshold limit.

6.2 For Metropolitan Authorities, the threshold announced for 2012/13 is 3.5%. However, further details were issued in late January which identifies that the total Council Tax increase has to be split into two elements – Council services and levying bodies.

6.3 The implication of this change is that if a reduction / increase in levy is agreed by such bodies, the full impact of this is assumed to be passed directly onto the Council Tax payer. The impact of this is that the **headline threshold of 3.5% is now not be feasible** for Sefton. The introduction of the calculation

means that not all councils across the country are treated the same. For example, county councils have such costs within their own budget (i.e. the services are not provided by a levying body), and would not be affected.

- 6.4 **Based upon the indicative figures that have been released by the levying bodies, Sefton's maximum Council Tax increase for 2012/13 would be 1.94%. On an ongoing basis, the maximum Council Tax increase for Sefton will be 2.36% (if the threshold remained at 3.5%).**
- 6.5 Discussions have taken place with the DCLG, who have confirmed our understanding of the methodology and are comfortable with the implications. Representations have been made to the Local Government Association, who are taking this issue up with the DCLG; a response is awaited.
- 6.6 Members are aware of a new Council Tax Freeze Grant, equivalent to a 2.5% increase in Council Tax, available to those authorities that freeze or reduce their Band D Council Tax in 2012/13. For Sefton, the indicative grant level is £2.947m. The major difference compared with the 2011/12 Grant is that in 2012/13 the additional resources will only be a one-off. The saving requirement would only be reduced for one year i.e. the budget gap for 2013/14 would increase.
- 6.7 For 2012/13, the Council is faced with a decision to either accept the Council Tax Freeze Grant, or to increase the Council Tax. The MTFP / "Framework" Budget assume that the Freeze Grant will be taken.
- 6.8 An increase in Council Tax to the maximum allowed, without a referendum (1.94%), would generate approximately £2.3m, i.e. £0.6m less than would be received from Council Tax Freeze Grant. Further savings to meet this shortfall would need to be identified for 2012/13 (or the use of further one-off resources) in order for a balanced budget to be achieved.
- 6.9 The introduction of a Council Tax increase in 2012/13 would however generate additional resources to the Council in the longer term, as the base level of Council Tax would be increased for future years. Based upon a Council Tax increase of 1.94% in 2012/13, this would generate an additional £6.3m over the four year period 2012/13 to 2015/16.

7 Recommended Budget / Council Tax for 2012/13

- 7.1 The Council must set a budget and the Council Tax by 10 March 2012 at the latest. As Members are aware a Council meeting to determine the budget has been arranged on the 1 March 2012. The Council's Constitution requires the Cabinet to propose a budget to Council.
- 7.2 Members are asked to recommend the "Framework" Budget (or another amended, but balanced budget) and a Sefton Council Tax for 2012/13 to the budget meeting of the Council on 1 March 2012.

Extract from 2 February 2012 Cabinet report

Cabinet has agreed that the options set out below are not in a position to contribute to the budget savings for 2012/13 as detailed below.

“6. Options not to be progressed

- 6.1 As mentioned earlier in the report an initial package of potential budget options was approved by Cabinet, 13th October 2011, to commence consultation and engagement. Alongside this Officers have continued to explore these options and in light of this work, further analysis and change in circumstance Officers have identified that the following options are no longer feasible.
- 6.2 Option E1.3 Specialised Transport Unit – Children’s - A review of the limited use of the discretionary element. Section 509 of the Education Act 1996 (as amended) refers to provision of home to school transport is a statutory requirement. Pupils with a statement of special educational needs (SEN) who have transport needs written into their statement must be provided with free transport to and from school.

Councils are generally only under a duty to provide free transport to a child’s nearest suitable school where the child cannot reasonably be expected to walk, having regard to his or her SEN status. The nearest suitable school for a pupil with SEN may well be within statutory walking distance. If a child is attending a school of parental preference i.e. where the Council considers there is a suitable school nearer the pupil’s home, there is no duty to provide free transport.

If a school of parental preference is named on the statement, and the Council decides not to provide transport, the statement should make clear that it is the responsibility of the parents to arrange transport.

The statutory criteria are: distance to nearest appropriate school (2 miles for under 8s and 3 miles for over 8s), because of a disability or as part of their statement of special educational need.

The Council's policy allows for discretionary transport and all service users have been reviewed. This review had shown that there are only 4 discretionary users (as at December 2011) and in each case there would be no saving to the Authority if the provision was removed because the transport would still be required for others.

Specialist Transport Unit are looking into further efficiencies but given the efficiencies already made in bringing the budget overspend under control there are unlikely to be significant savings to be found.

Note that the estimated figure was originally £33,000 and £300,000 was erroneously entered.

Having taken into consideration the information provided above in relation to E1.3 Cabinet is asked to agree that it is not currently feasible to identify a

budget reduction associated with the discretionary element of children's transport.

- 6.3 Option E4.3 Reduction and restructuring of a range of services currently delivered as part of the "Core" Contract. Following the decision to terminate the Capita contract this saving cannot be achieved within the previously identified timescales but will be reflected in future service delivery cost savings from 2014/15 onwards.
- 6.4 Having taken into consideration the information provided above in relation to option E4.3 Cabinet is asked to agree that this option is no longer feasible within previously agreed timescales in light of the decision to terminate the Capita contract.

7. Options to be re-defined

- 7.1 During the consultation period Officers have continued to undertake further analysis and assess risk in relation to all options. In some instances it is no longer feasible to progress the option as previously described. The thrust of the following options now needs to be refocused as described below –
- 7.2 Option E5.6 Bringing the Home Improvement agency service for Disabled Facility Grants (DFGs), in-house. Officers have consulted with Finance, HR, and Legal. The HR/Legal advice identified a number of risks mainly relating to TUPE. Having considered these risks the assumed potential savings are too uncertain to progress. Officers are now looking to re-procure the HIA service. This may realise some savings in 2013-14, but this will not be known until tenders are received. Cabinet is asked agree that a formal procurement process to provide the Home Improvement agency service be approved.
- 7.3 Option E6.10 Retendering / disposal of Southport Theatre & Convention Centre - Following an exercise where expressions of interest were sought from potential operators of the complex, the three expressions received were evaluated. Only one had sufficient merit to consider progressing. It is clear that no saving will be secured via pursuing this single credible expression of interest. Therefore it is intended to withdraw the savings proposal at this stage and re-consider the best means of securing a cost saving while continuing the activity of the complex, either through re-tendering or consideration of sale of the complex in the future. Therefore, a revised savings proposal will be submitted in respect of the 2013/14 budget round. Cabinet is asked agree that Officers re-consider the best means of securing a cost saving while continuing the activity of the complex, either through re-tendering or consideration of sale of the complex in the future, subject to the required approvals.
- 7.4 E2.10 Fair Access to Care Criteria (FACS). Councils with adult social services responsibilities are required to use the FACS guidance published by the Government in specifying their eligibility criteria, describing those circumstances that make adult individuals, with disabilities, impairments and difficulties eligible for help. The FACS Criteria/framework is based on the

impact of “needs” on factors that are key to maintaining an individual's independence over time. The eligibility framework is graded into four bands, which describes the seriousness of the risk to independence or other consequences if needs are not addressed. The four bands are: Critical; Substantial, Moderate; and Low. Sefton’s current eligibility criteria are set at Critical and/or Substantial, this option would result in a reduction of those eligibility criteria to Critical only.

Of those service users who have been allocated new services to date in the 2011/12 87% were categorised as having Critical risks to independence and 13% having only Substantial risks. This compares with 83% Critical, 17% Substantial in 2010/11 and 80% Critical, 20% Substantial in 2009/10. The proportions differ if analysed by location of care provision, with those in Nursing Homes having the highest proportion categorised as Critical (97%) and those with a community-based care package the lowest (83%) but as with the overall proportion there has been a shift towards Critical in the last 3-year period. The following table summarises the breakdown and associated cost:

Year	Critical*		Substantial Only		Total	
	Number	Cost (£)	Number	Cost (£)	Number	Cost (£)
2010/11	3754	11,771,804	743	1,439,729	4497	13,211,533
2011/12 **	3014	10,286,714	431	933,443	3445	11,220,157
* some service users will also receive some service relating to Substantial risks						
** this data only covers weeks 1-38 of the financial year 2011/12						

By definition a reduction in eligibility criteria has potential implications for compliance with the Public Sector Equalities duty as the affected service users will be individuals with physical, sensory, learning or cognitive disabilities and impairments, or from mental health difficulties.

The scope of the targeted consultation necessary is potentially very large. Those affected by the change may include:

- current adult service users who receive help in relation to Critical and also Substantial risks to independence and those with solely substantial risks (i.e. service users facing a reduction in help)
- Adult individuals not currently receiving help but whose risk to independence might be expected to progress to substantial (i.e. individuals who will not receive help in the future if/when they are assessed with Substantial risk to independence);
- Children & Young People (to whom the FACS criteria do not apply) who may currently receive help that would cease on their transition to adulthood.; and
- Carers of anyone in the above groups.

In addition, it would also be proposed to again undertake a wider non-targeted public consultation via e-consult.

There is a very strong likelihood of a reduction in eligibility criteria being challenged. There have been a number of successful Judicial Review challenges against decisions to reduce the eligibility criteria and the Council has already received one letter indicating that a challenge would be made on behalf of a resident.

The Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS) Budget Survey 2011 showed that at March 2011 of the 153 local authorities with adult social care responsibilities 6 had set their eligibility criteria at Critical only (Birmingham; Kirklees; Isle of Wight; Northumberland; West Berks; and Wokingham). Following challenge or an adverse Judicial Review Judgement three of those authorities (Birmingham; Kirklees; and Isle of Wight) have since reverted to Critical and/or Substantial, such that it is currently understood that there are only 3 local authorities at Critical only and 150 at a level less than Critical (i.e. Substantial, Moderate and a small number at Low).

There is also uncertainty in quantifying the actual saving that would be made as a result. Whilst it is possible to identify the cost of services provided to help those with Substantial risks to independence (approximately £1.4m in new services in 2011/12), it is extremely difficult to quantify the impact of not providing that help, in particular, to what extent, if any, that would result in an acceleration of an individual's progression to Critical risks to independence, the consequence of which could be a temporary saving but a longer-term increase in costs to the Council.

The process would require an extensive re-assessment of the needs and care packages of a large number of service users and this is likely to require significant additional resource in order to prevent failure of day-to-day service provision. Changed eligibility criteria could be immediately applied to all new assessments, but application of the changed criteria to existing service users would need to be carried out through a review of care needs, the extent of additional resource required would be determined by the speed with which reviews are undertaken (i.e. in accordance with the planned review timescales, or an expedited process to immediately review all service users). Cabinet is asked to agree a wider review of the activities and resources associated with the application of the FACS criteria, to be completed by October 2012 with recommendations to Cabinet in November 2012. Potential savings arising from this review would be realised in 2013/14."

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendation
E1.3	Children's Transport	Reduce planned expenditure through increased efficiency	f) agree that it is not currently feasible to identify a budget reduction associated with the discretionary element of children's transport
E4.3	Capita Contract	Reduction and restructuring of a range of services	g) agree that the achievement of this savings will be delayed in light of the decision to terminate the Capita contract

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendation
		currently delivered as part of the "Core" Contract	
E5.6	Home Improvements	Bringing the Home Improvement agency service for DFGs, in-house	h) agree that a formal procurement process to provide the Home Improvement agency service be approved
E6.10	Floral Hall	Retendering / disposal of Southport Theatre & Convention Centre	i) agree that Officers re-consider the best means of securing a cost saving while continuing the activity of the complex, either through re-tendering or consideration of sale of the complex in the future, subject to the required approvals.
E2.10	Fair Access to Care Criteria	To review Sefton's application of the Fair Access to Care Criteria with a proposal to raise the adult care eligibility threshold to 'Critical' only	j) agree a wider review of the activities and resources associated with the application of the FACS criteria, to be completed by October 2012 with recommendations to Cabinet in November 2012

Annex B

Further information on items contained in the Framework Budget

The proposals, consultation reports, equality assessments, risks and mitigating actions associated with the proposals below have been included in the Transformation Programme Report 2011-2014 that can be found elsewhere on the agenda.

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	For Cabinet consideration & subject to the final decision of Council
E3.14	Arts & Culture	E3.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the cessation of all Council originated activity at Crosby Civic Hall with effect from 30th June 2012 be approved and retain core supplies and service budget k) the venue be maintained in a useable condition • note that Officers will respond to any approaches or interested parties who wish to investigate opportunities to self manage the facility • Officers be authorised to prepare for implementation immediately then (subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions) issue relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if necessary, subject to the final decision of Council.
E4.4	Highways Maintenance	A further reduction in Highways Grounds Maintenance Works Budgets which will be delivered by a reduction in the number of cuts to all highway grassed areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> l) that a reduction of three cuts to all highway grassed areas at a saving of £50,000 be approved m) Officers are authorised to prepare for implementation immediately, including the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if necessary, subject to the final decision of Council
E6.6	Public Conveniences	Public Conveniences – Market Test	n) a formal procurement process to provide the public convenience operational service be approved

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	For Cabinet consideration & subject to the final decision of Council
			o) Officers are authorised to prepare for implementation immediately, including the issue of relevant contractual notifications, subject to the final decision of Council.
E6.7	Tourism	Review of Service	<p>p) That the Tourist Information Centre be relocated to the Southport Cultural Centre in 2013 resulting in a reduction to the Tourism budget of £90,000 be approved</p> <p>q) Note that £38K will be taken from the Tourism budget in the 12/13 financial year to achieve the £90K target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers be authorised to prepare for implementation immediately then (subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions) issue relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if necessary, subject to the final decision of Council.
Review	Older People	<i>Community Care Practitioner Review (CCP)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the approval of a re-organisation of the CCP staff to target resources more effectively and realise efficiencies. This could entail an immediate reduction in the levels of CCP's within the Adult Social Care Teams by four posts, resulting in a further saving of approximately £114K. • Officers be authorised to prepare for implementation immediately then (subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions) issue relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if necessary, subject to the final decision of Council.
Review	Commissioning	<i>VCF Review</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the approval of a budget reduction of £170k.

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	For Cabinet consideration & subject to the final decision of Council
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that the details of future savings are to be agreed with the Cabinet Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods
E4.6	<i>Landscape Services</i>	Recharge sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the approval of recharging sports users and allotment users the costs of provision of utilities
E4.7	<i>Landscape Services</i>	Recharge formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the approval of recharging formal sports users the costs of Grounds Maintenance
E4.8	<i>Landscape Services</i>	Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the approval of the Closure of Aviary, Nursery Shop and Fernery at Botanic Gardens and Conservatory at Hesketh Park • Officers be authorised to prepare for implementation immediately then (subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions) issue relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if necessary, subject to the final decision of Council.
<i>Landscape Services Change Proposals</i>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the approval of an in principle budget reduction of £380,000 in 2012/13 and £330,000 in 2013/14 (subject to the extension of the Grounds Maintenance contracts). Cabinet is also asked to agree that the specific details for re-engineering these services to achieve the savings stated above be delegated to and approved by the Cabinet Member Leisure and Tourism. • The outcome of the review will have an impact on a range of functions and areas and this may in turn impact on staffing levels.

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	For Cabinet consideration & subject to the final decision of Council
			<p>Should this occur Officers be authorised to prepare for implementation then (subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions) issue relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if necessary.</p>
Supporting People			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the approval of an in principle budget reduction of £2m in 2012/13 and a further £1m in 2013/14
Re-Commissioning of Nursing & Residential Care (E2.6, E2.7 & E2.9 - Review of policy – Quality Care Payments & Inflation Provision)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the conclusion of the consultation on the 2011/12 and 2012/13 fees the Council considers it is not in a position at the moment to determine the fee rates for the forthcoming financial year. It wishes to have the opportunity to consider further the risk assessment in relation to the same. It is also the Council's intention to explore alternative commissioning approaches. As such there is an ambition to realise a saving of £1.5m in 2012/13, by a combination of the costs of care and operational and commissioning efficiencies and a further £1.5m in 2013/14. If the review identifies that this is not achievable Members will be informed accordingly and reported back to Members thereafter the approval of an in principle budget reduction of £1.5m in 2012/13 and a further £1.5m in 2013/14

This page is intentionally left blank