

**Report to:** Cabinet

**Date of Meeting:** 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012

**Subject:** Transformation Programme & Revenue Budget 2012 - 2015

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

**Wards Affected:** All

**Is this a Key Decision?** Yes

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

**Exempt/Confidential** No

---

### **Purpose/Summary**

This is a further report on the development of the 2013 to 2015 Budget Plan. In particular the report presents a further set of savings options for consideration by Cabinet as the next stage of achieving a balanced budget. Many of the additional savings options are presented to seek approval for appropriate consultation only at this stage.

The report contains a number of Annexes listed below for ease of reference:

Annex A Work Programme Timetable

Annex B Review of Street Lighting

Annex C Option to be redefined

Annex D Further information on options previously considered

Annex E External Funding – funding ceasing or reducing

Annex F - Ways of Working - Options on which various approvals are sought

Annex G Subsidies and Charges - Options on which various approvals are sought

Annex H Standards of Service - Options on which various approvals are sought

Annex I Vulnerable People - Options on which various approvals are sought

### **Key Messages**

- The Council's final level of funding will not be known until the Government announces the local government grant settlement in late December and it is anticipated that the gap will increase
- The Council continues to face a significant challenge which is made much greater by the fact that the Council's spending has already reduced by £64 million over the last two years
- In November 2012 the Council approved the implementation of savings totalling £15.549m representing 36% of the currently estimated £43.7m savings

- All stakeholders must continue to look for any savings that can be made and ideas continue to be welcomed
- The Transformation Programme continues to look at the longer term way we deliver our services
- The overall 40% reduction will have a significant impact on the level and depth of services to our communities
- The Government's Autumn Statement was announced on 5<sup>th</sup> December. It is not possible to extrapolate Sefton's position from this statement. However the Statement confirmed the continuation of the Government's austerity measures and therefore it is appropriate for the Council to continue to plan for significant reductions in Government funding

## **Recommendations**

### **Cabinet is recommended to**

- a) note that figures in these annexes are working assumptions of options to be considered and the figures should not be seen as predetermining any decisions. Many of these options remain subject to consultation and engagement, and any figures indicated are being used to facilitate outline budgetary forecasting only.
- b) note the work programme timetable contained in Annex A

### **Annex B – Review of Street Lighting**

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

## **Terms & Conditions**

- d) agree the continuation of consultation with Trade Unions and employees, as required, given the need for budget savings with a view to the implementation of potential changes in terms and conditions. These potential changes will focus but not be limited to upon the changes described in para 4.2
- e) consider and agree that should it be appropriate the Chief Executive is authorised to dismiss and re-engage those employees of the Local Authority, not including schools, who are employed on Local Authority terms and conditions in order to enable a change to those terms and conditions and achieve necessary savings.
- f) note that any action taken in respect of this delegation would be reported back to Cabinet during the required notice period and before the termination and re-engagement was actioned.

## **Options still subject to consultation**

- g) note that the options identified in para 4.7 are still subject to consultation and further reports will be presented before any final decision is considered

## **Annex C Community Meals Option to be redefined**

- h) consider the revised option(F1.6) para 4.8
- i) agree the introduction of a more cost effective, streamlined model for Community Meals which will enable Sefton residents to access a range of meal options
- j) agree that Officers commence a consultation and engagement process with partners, employees and Trade Unions
- k) agree that Officers prepare for implementation at the earliest opportunity including the issuing of required notices
- l) agree that Officers commence the conversation with current service users as to how the service will change including support for the transition period between the subsidised to the non subsidised model

## **Annex D Further information on options previously considered**

### **Option E2.1**

- m) consider and take account of the additional information provided
- n) approve the outcomes of review of the commissioning of all residential care beds
- o) note that officers will continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions
- p) agree the creation of 3 additional Social Worker posts from within the existing budget
- q) recommend to Council a budget reduction of £1m over a 2 year period

### **Option F1.5**

- r) consider and take account of the additional information provided including the background documents
- s) approve the completion of actions required to achieve change including the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notifications
- t) recommend to Council a reduction of the subsidy by £40k

## **Annex E External Funding**

- u) authorise the Chief Executive and officers to take the necessary steps to adjust staffing levels in light of those and other circumstances as set out in para 5.

## **Capital Programme**

- v) authorise the Strategic Director (Place) in conjunction with the Head of Corporate Legal Services to negotiate and conclude a commercial settlement with the main contractor for the Southport Cultural Centre (the Atkinson) if it can be shown to be in the Council's best interests, subject to final consultation with the Cabinet Member (Children, Schools, Families and Leisure). The details of any such settlement will be reported back to a further meeting of Cabinet.

## **Annex F Ways of Working – Options for consideration**

- w) consider the options presented and approve the recommendations as described in Annex F

## **Annex G Subsidies and Charges – Options for consideration**

x) consider the options presented and approve the recommendations as described

## **Annex H Standards of Service - Options for consideration**

y) consider the options presented and approve the recommendations as described

## **Annex I Vulnerable People - Options for consideration**

z) consider the options presented and approve the recommendations as described

and

aa)note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in Annex B, C, D, E, F, G, H and I in making its recommendation to Council

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

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

### **Reasons for the recommendation**

The recommendations in this report, if approved, are another step in agreeing the 2013/14 budget and a two year budget plan. At this stage there are broadly sufficient options to meet the forecast budget gap assuming the Cabinet approves the reports recommendations. However additional budget savings and options will need to be identified should the savings gap increase and/or those options currently identified are not approved or delivered. It is a legal requirement to set a balanced budget and to ensure the medium term financial position is robust.

Early consideration of budget options continues to be essential as this supports informed decision making, including the consideration of the outcome of any consultations undertaken, the impact of any decisions to be made and any steps that can be taken to mitigate the impact of a decision.

## **FD 1991/12 What will it cost and how will it be financed?**

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

The Council continues to forecast a significant budget gap over the period 2013/14 - 2014/15 requiring estimated savings of at least £43.7m. The Government is expected to announce the local government grant settlement in the week ending 21<sup>st</sup> December 2012. It remains unclear at this stage whether the position for 2014/15 will also be clarified at this point. The confirmation of external revenue support from Government will provide greater clarity of the Council's saving requirement for next year, but should hopefully give an indication of the issues to be addressed in 2014/15.

The level of uncertainty is high because the Government has only recently completed the consultation on the localisation of business rates and the financial implications of new Local Government funding regime. Further uncertainty exists around the proposed changes in key grant funding especially Early Intervention Grant.

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

No specific Capital Investment costs have been identified at this stage. Any identified Capital Investment will be subject to a robust business case which demonstrates pay back period appropriate to the budget reduction being considered. Any costs arising from investment will be factored into the net deliverable savings.

The report includes reference to the Capital Programme in para 6. This includes details of impacts on the Capital Programme in relation to Southport Cultural Centre and the potential capitalisation of Disabled Facilities Grant spending may have an impact on revenue spend.

### **Implications:**

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

#### **Legal LD 1308/2012**

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

#### **Human Resources**

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

**Equality**

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

**Impact on Service Delivery:**

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

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

Ongoing public consultation includes

- a questionnaire available on the Councils website and in libraries
- a budget questionnaire
- focus groups and a telephone survey on setting a balanced budget
- also bespoke consultations ongoing e.g. libraries and Cemeteries & Cremation charges

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

Further information is contained in the annexes of this report.

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

Further options will be presented to Cabinet as they are formulated.

**Implementation Date for the Decision**

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

**Contact Officers:**

Margaret Rawding, Head of Corporate Finance & ICT

Tel: 0151 934 4082

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

Jan McMahon, Head of Transformation Services

Tel: 0151 934 4431

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

**Background Papers:** The following documents can be accessed by these web links:

F1.5 Allotments (Annex D)

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sched=doc&cat=13410&path=13193>

Ways of Working (Annex F)

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sched=doc&cat=13411&path=13193>

## 1. Introduction/Background

- 1.1 A budget gap of at least £43.7m is forecast over the next two years with further reductions anticipated in following years. At its meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 Council approved budget cuts totalling £15.549m, which had previously been the subject of appropriate consultation.
- 1.2 Consultation and engagement activity continues on a number of the other specific options and a wider range of thematic options previously considered by Cabinet. This will ensure that the views of interested parties will be available to the Council prior to making its final decisions. The Council will therefore be able to take the consultation and engagement activity into account when the final budget plan for 2013/14 and 2014/15 is agreed.
- 1.3 In September 2012 Cabinet approved the commencement of consultation on a range of more complex thematic options with multiple implications and potential cumulative effects. At that stage these thematic options were identified for high level consultation and did not include any estimate of savings. The themes being considered include:
  - Ways of Working
  - Subsidies and charges
  - Standards of service
  - Commissioning
  - Economy & Tourism
  - Voluntary Community & Faith Sector
  - Vulnerable People – Personalisation, Day Opportunities and Intermediate Care
  - Early Intervention & Prevention
- 1.4 This report presents formulated options associated with these themes for Cabinet to consider.
- 1.5 The achievement of a balanced budget still remains a very significant challenge for the Council. The options and timetable within this report provide Cabinet with further downsizing, streamlining and specific options that could contribute to this. The Council has a legal responsibility to set a balanced budget by 10<sup>th</sup> March 2013. The late notification of the Government Grant Settlement is creating a significant amount of uncertainty and is hampering the future financial planning and budgeting.
- 1.6 The figures quoted in Annexes B, C, D, E, F, G, H and I of this report are estimates of the financial impact to support the budgetary planning process and should not be seen as predetermining any decisions. Cabinet is asked to note that figures and phasing in

these annexes are working assumptions of options to be considered and the figures should not be seen as predetermining any decisions. Many of these options remain subject to consultation and engagement, and any figures indicated are being used to facilitate outline budgetary forecasting only (recommendation a).

- 1.7 The table below identifies the current budget gap assuming all savings previously presented to Cabinet are implemented and achieve working assumption values.

### **Summary of Savings Previously Presented to Cabinet**

£m

#### **Budget Gap - Cabinet June 2012**

**43.700**

#### **Options Approved by Council 22 November 2012**

Business Efficiencies -11.680

Consultation (Internal) Options

- Integration -1.250

- Specific Options -2.309

Consultation (External) Options

- Specific Options -0.310

Total Options Approved by Council 22 November 2012

**-15.549**

#### **Options Previously Presented to Cabinet Still Subject to Consultation**

Business Efficiencies -0.537

Consultation (Internal) Options

- Terms and Conditions -6.000

- Senior Management -0.150

- Consultation (Internal) Options -1.000

Consultation (External) Options

- Specific Options -3.598

Consultation (External) Library Service (option B)

-0.400

Total of Options Still Subject to Consultation

**-11.685**

#### **Total of Savings Previously Presented to Cabinet**

**-27.234**

#### **Revised Budget Gap Assuming all savings are implemented and achieve working assumption values**

**16.466**



## **2. Work Programme & Approach**

- 2.1 Annex A details the agreed work programme, it is important to note that these activities will be supplemented as required in order to ensure that timescales are maintained. Cabinet is asked to note the work programme timetable contained in Annex A (*recommendation b*).

## **3. Reviews**

- 3.1 **Street Lighting** – As part of the Budget process for 2012/13 Cabinet requested that Officers undertake a review of Street Lighting (see Annex B).
- 3.2 Cabinet is asked to consider proposals in Annex B, recommend their approval to Council and authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately pending final decisions (*recommendation c*).

## **4. Options Previously Approved for Consultation & Engagement**

- 4.1 **Terms & Conditions** – In September 2012 Cabinet agreed that Officers commence a consultation process with employees and Trade Unions (including but not limited to) to secure an agreement on the terms and conditions. Officers have continued consultation with the Trade Unions in respect of a package of terms and conditions measures which would have identified in the order of £6m reduction to the 2013/2015 budget gap. This is in addition to the current 4 day unpaid leave arrangement continuing.
- 4.2 The areas on which the Senior Officers consulted concern the continuation of an incremental freeze, the non awarding of a national pay rise (if it were to be made), the removal of contractual weekend enhancements, a reduction in non contractual overtime rates, the removal of retainer pay, an increase in car parking charges and a reduction in car mileage rates. All other terms and conditions areas were open for discussion. Officers sought from the Trade Unions whether they would agree to any terms and conditions measure which would realise savings against the Council's forecast budget gap.
- 4.3 The three joint Trade Unions (GMB, UNISON and UNITE) explained in consultation that they would not sign a collective agreement to make changes to terms and conditions and that if the Council were to make any changes in terms and conditions, that this would need to be by dismissal and re-engagement of employees. This includes any terms and conditions arrangements in respect of a continued unpaid leave period over the Christmas period 2013-14 and onwards.
- 4.4 It must be emphasised that the dismissal and re-engagement of employees would not mean job losses for individuals, but would offer continued employment on a basis of an agreement to work to a changed contract of employment reflecting terms and conditions which would give a budgetary saving. The aim of making the changes in terms and conditions would be in order to realise budget savings and avoid further options being taken in relation to service reduction and loss of employment. Consultation with the trade unions is ongoing, although given their position, the dismissal and re-engagement of employees (whilst not leading to any job losses) is not without risk in terms of challenge.

- 4.5 To bring in changes for April 2013 notice would need to be served before the end of December 2012, so that it could take effect on or before 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013.
- 4.6 Given that ongoing consultation with Trade Unions and employees (*recommendation d*) is taking place and consideration is to be given to identifying further savings options and terms and conditions matters, it is requested that should it be appropriate the Chief Executive is authorised to take any necessary actions at any point in time including dismissing and re-engaging those employees of the Local Authority, (not including schools), who are employed on Local Authority terms and conditions in order to enable a change to those terms and conditions (where the Local Authority is able to change terms and conditions) and achieve necessary savings (*recommendation e*). Any action taken in respect of this delegation would be reported back to Cabinet (*recommendation f*). The report back to Cabinet would take place after letters advising employees of dismissal and re-engagement have been issued but prior to those events being actioned . For example if the Council wished to dismiss and re-engage employees to take effect on 1<sup>st</sup> September a report would be considered by Cabinet within the three months leading up to that date.
- 4.7 **Options still subject to consultation** - In September 2012 Cabinet agreed the commencement of consultation, engagement and informing processes with the community, partners, key stakeholders, employees and Trade Unions. Cabinet will recall that the options identified in the table below are still subject to consultation;

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Change Proposal</u>	<u>Working Assumption</u> <u>£000</u>
C3.1	Infrastructure & Investment Programme	Re-integration, re-commission and restructuring of services – Built Environment	500
C3.2	Home Improvements	Housing Improvement Agency service brought in house	37
F1.1	Car Parks (including management)	Non cancelling PCN for incorrect display of ticket or blue badge	150
F1.2	Grounds Maintenance	Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for adult football/sports users/bowlers	85
F1.3	Grounds Maintenance	Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for organised junior sports activities	50
F1.4	Cemeteries and Crematoria	Increase burial and cremation charges	400
F1.6	Vulnerable People	Removal of subsidy for Community Meals	247
F3.1	Commissioning	Decommission VCF youth & early Childhood Services	283
F3.2	Health & Well-being	Remodel Day Opportunities	1,790
F3.3	Vulnerable People Commissioning	Reduced Adult Social Care VCF Commissioning	300

F4.2	Commissioning	Review VCF	267
F4.3	Commissioning	Double Rating	33
<b>Total</b>			<b>4142</b>

- 4.8 Officers have continued to explore these options and in light of this work, further analysis and change in circumstance officers have identified that option F1.6 removal of the subsidy for community meals should be redefined. The Council has a duty to provide welfare services for the disabled etc where they have an assessed need. This can include access to a meals service. How the service should be provided is entirely a matter for the Council, provided that the service meets the Service Users assessed needs. Officers now recommend that Cabinet consider the alternative more cost effective model of provision that will deliver a saving of £200k (as described in Annex C) and approve the associated recommendations (*recommendations g to l*).
- 4.9 **Further Information** E2.1 Children's Social Care – Cabinet should be aware that in order to reduce the number of beds by 11 by 2013 the use of Melrose House will be redefined. This will have an impact on current service users and employees at this base. Cabinet consider the updated option (as described in Annex D) and approve the associated recommendations (*recommendations m to q*).
- 4.10 **Further Information** F1.5 Allotments – As Cabinet are aware the National Allotment Society (NSALG) has written to the Council, voicing its concerns about the proposed increase in allotment fees and charges. The Allotment Act and case law suggests that increases in allotment fees should only be made in line with those for other recreational facilities. Relevant case law is (Harwood v Borough of Reigate & Banstead) [1982] 43P&CR 336.
- 4.11 Officers have further reviewed option F1.5 alongside other options relating to potential increases in fees for other recreational facilities and established that the option to increase is not disproportionate.
- 4.12 Cabinet is asked to give consideration to the updated option F1.5 in Annex D and associated background documents and approve the associated recommendations (*recommendations r to t*).
- 5. External Funding**
- 5.1 In September 2010 Cabinet approved a prioritisation process associated with external funded activity. The Council currently receives £14m from various external funding sources excluding service level agreements.
- 5.2 Funding of £2.3m received to support the activities described in Annex E is at risk of or will cease or reduce by in 2013/14.
- 5.3 The Chief Executive has a mandate to manage the staffing resource level of the Council. Circumstances are frequently changing in the current economic environment which mean that projects and funding cease or reduce and/or new priorities emerge. Accordingly the Chief Executive seeks authority for herself and officers to take the necessary steps to adjust staffing levels in light of those and other circumstances. Such steps would include

consultation and engagement processes with Cabinet Member, employees and Trade Unions and potentially, reduction in hours, reduction in staffing levels (voluntarily or compulsorily), placing employees at risk etc.

- 5.4 Government changes to the way schools are funded take effect in April 2013. The funding for behaviour support will be part of individual schools budgets from April 2013. The new service will trade with schools but it will not be known what schools will buy back until the end of February at the earliest. Therefore, in order to ensure any liability to the Council is minimised the current service needs to be decommissioned by April 2013 when the funding changes come into force and the process started to place staff at risk of redundancy if schools do not buy back the new traded service. The resource and structure for the new traded service will be commensurate with workload going forward. Once it is known what schools will buy back a resource appropriate to the continuing workload will be retained. The cost of the associated activity to the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding is £570,000, and these actions will potentially create capacity within the DSG so that schools can choose how to allocate this resource. Cabinet is asked to mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with partners, employees and Trade Unions (*recommendation u*).
- 5.5 In addition, schools now employ their own teaching assistant resources as required. From April 2013 the Local Authority will not have the funding to maintain the supply pool and to minimise any risk to the Local Authority it is proposed to decommission the teaching assistant supply service when the Council's funding stops and staff will be made at risk of redundancy if schools do not want to employ the staff directly. The cost to the DSG is £41,000 again these actions will potentially create capacity within the DSG so that schools can choose how to allocate this resource. Cabinet is asked to mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with partners, employees and Trade Unions (*recommendation u*).

## **6. Capital Programme**

- 6.1 An update report was presented to July Cabinet in relation to the potential overspend, within the Capital Programme, on the Southport Cultural Centre (the Atkinson). Cabinet resolved that the Strategic Director (Place) and the Head of Corporate Legal Services explore the potential for minimising and/or recovery of the additional costs incurred.
- 6.2 Since that time discussions have taken place with the main contractor which have the potential to result in a commercial settlement that will minimise the Council's financial liability. Due to the timescales involved Cabinet is requested to authorise the Strategic Director (Place) in conjunction with the Head of Corporate Legal Services to negotiate and conclude a commercial settlement if it can be shown to be in the Council's best interests, subject to final consultation with the Cabinet Member (Children, Schools, Families and Leisure). The details of any such settlement will be reported back to a further meeting of Cabinet (*recommendation v*).
- 6.3 In addition officers are exploring the potential to fund all Disabled Facility Grants from capital resources which may generate a revenue budget saving.

## 7. Towards a Balanced Budget - Further options for consideration

- 7.1 As mentioned earlier in the report September 2012 Cabinet approved the commencement of consultation on a range of more complex thematic options with multiple implications and potential cumulative effects. Cabinet will recall that the current consultation on developing the budget plan will report to Cabinet in January 2013.
- 7.2 In developing options to enable Cabinet to develop a two year budget plan Officers have assessed all services against the following criteria; -
- Specific legal requirement which cannot be breached
  - Contractual requirement which cannot be renegotiated in the next two years
  - Professional Judgement
    - Specific statutory or professional guidance
    - Personal judgement based on local knowledge
  - Risk not acceptable
    - real and present danger to life and limb
    - consequences on the most vulnerable are unacceptable
    - Reputation

This report now presents the options formulated to date for consideration by Cabinet. It must be recognised that these further options are far reaching and contain significant implications for recipients of these services and the communities of Sefton. This is unavoidable given the planned reduction in Government Funding to the Council.

- 7.3 **Ways of Working** - The Council delivers and commissions a complex range of services and is looking to transform the way in which these services are delivered. The Council is committed to improving efficiency and effectiveness across services. The options developed to date associated with this theme are now presented to Cabinet for consideration. Cabinet is asked to consider the options and recommendations in Annex F.

- 7.3.1 **Downsizing & Streamlining** – the Council continues to seek ongoing efficiencies which will have manageable impacts on service quality and quantity. The table below contains a number of proposals (D1.1 to D1.13) to be noted and recommended to Council for immediate approval (*recommendation w*). When developing these proposals Officers have taken account of the resilience of the service and are satisfied that there will be little or no impact for service users. Should service issues emerge then officers will take proportionate and necessary steps to address those issues for example liaison with service users. In particular the planned integration of Public Health has enabled Officers to identify a number of business alignments and new ways of working that will support the service moving forward. The working assumptions associated with these proposals indicate that these changes will achieve savings of £1.977m.

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Working Assumption</u> <u>£000</u>
Early Intervention	D1.1	Integrated Youth Support & Targeted Youth Support - Budget re-alignment following the cessation of a contract	92

& Prevention		with one provider. Contract ceased and work will be subsumed within the wider team. Plus the deletion of a vacant post.	
	D1.2	Substance Misuse Budget re-alignment to Drug Action Team DAT - the service is managed and delivered from within the Drug Action Team.	124
Learning & Support	D1.3	School Improvement Budget re-alignment – supplies and services	9
	D1.4	Budget re-alignment Welfare & Pupil attendance – teaching element to Dedicated Schools Grant	25
	D1.5	School Admission- Supplies & Services – reduction in administration/printing costs	19
	D1.6	Budget re-alignment Connexions – make use of Council accommodation, no impact on service users	60
Children's Social Care	D1.7	Social Care Commissioned Services – travel, supplies and services. To recommission Council Children's Social Care travel (vehicle hire, leasing and taxis)	100
Economy	D1.8	Relocate staff from the Investment Centre, to Magdalen House	48
	D1.9	Budget re-alignment of salaries to be funded from grants, contracts and reserves	116
Democracy	D1.10	Budget re-alignment - Members Allowances as agreed by July 2012 Council	147
Corporate Support Services	D1.11	Risk Management (insurance)	50
	D1.12	Procurement ICT and Financial Support	50
Council	D1.13	Public Health Integration efficiencies	1,137
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,977</b>

7.3.2 **Options where internal consultation is required** – Annex F contains a number of additional options requiring internal consultation for consideration. Cabinet is asked to consider these options (D1.14 to D1.21) and approve the associated recommendations (*recommendation w*). Updates will be provided to Cabinet in January with a view to Cabinet considering options for recommendation to February 2013 Council. The working assumptions associated with these options indicate savings of £0.844m. Cabinet should be aware that officers will comply with HR policies and procedures and this will include regular HR monitoring reports to the Cabinet Member Corporate Services and Performance.

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Working Assumption £000</u>
Vulnerable People	D1.14	Assessment & Care Management Teams – Reconfiguring of teams and skill mix.	208
	D1.15	Reconfiguration of the Supporting People Commissioning team	186
Learning & Support	D1.16	Reduce School Targeted Intervention	100
Early Intervention & Prevention	D1.17	Healthy Schools – Transfer the function of co-ordination and consultant roles to schools	60

Children's Social Care	D1.18	Social Care – Central Management & Support Costs – A restructure and a re-alignment of duties to remaining posts.	100
Street Scene	D1.19	Building Cleaning – change of frequency in office cleaning	100
Environment	D1.20	Trading Standards – staffing restructure	50
Corporate Commissioning	D1.21	Communications- Integration of Staff	40
<b>Total</b>			<b>844</b>

**7.3.3 Options where external consultation is required** - Annex F proposes a further package of potential budget options on which approval to commence consultation and engagement activity with the community and specific groups of service users is sought. The potential impact and risks associated with these options have been assessed based on current knowledge and understanding. Cabinet is asked to consider and approve the recommendations for options D1.22 to D1.29 in Annex F. The working assumptions associated with these options indicate savings of £0.634m. This approach will enable the Council to make informed decisions in respect of the two year budget plan.

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Working Assumption £000</u>
Health & Wellbeing	D1.22	Pilot external management arrangements for Crosby Civic Hall with the option of closure if unsuccessful	46
Early Intervention & Prevention	D1.23	Aiming High – Review of Integrated Short Breaks	55
Street Scene	D1.24	Cleansing – cease provision of free plastic sacks excluding those premises which are currently identified as 'difficult to access'	60
Economy	D1.25	Cease subscription arrangement to Mersey Forest Voluntary reduction of working hours	51
Corporate Commissioning	D1.26	Governance & Civic Services – Mayoral services - reduce the function of Mayor to the statutory minimum (that is to Chair the Council meeting).	102
	D1.27	Corporate Commissioning and Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service – rationalise service	200
	D1.28	To reduce funding to Voluntary, Community, Faith organisations	90
	D1.29	Double Rating	30
<b>Total</b>			<b>634</b>

**7.4 Subsidies & Charges** – The Council funds services through various means including fees and charges where this is legally possible. In setting charges the Council will take account of various factors including who benefits, the outcomes achieved and the impact that price has on future demand. In effect the charging mechanism reflects the extent to

which the Council is able to subsidise the services it provided. The options developed to date associated with this theme are now presented to Cabinet for consideration. The working assumptions associated with these options indicate savings of £0.362m Cabinet is asked to consider the options and recommendations in Annex G (*recommendation x*).

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Working Assumption £000</u>
Built Environment	D1.30	Pest Control – introduction of a charge	30
Investment & Infrastructure	D1.31	Parking – Car Parking – On and Off street parking charge increases and the introduction of new on street parking charges	332
<b>Total</b>			<b>362</b>

7.5 **Standards of Service** - Many services are currently delivered to specified customer service standards, frequencies and hours of service. As budgets reduce the Council will need to consider the viability of the continued application of these standards as it may no longer be possible to meet customer expectation in all areas. The options developed to date associated with this theme are now presented to Cabinet for consideration. The working assumptions associated with these options indicate savings of £0.902m Cabinet is asked to consider the options and recommendations in Annex H (*recommendation y*).

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Working Assumption £000</u>
Street Scene	D1.32	Closure of all public conveniences across the Borough	52
	D1.33	Cleansing – reorganisation of the workload and work patterns of the Rapid response teams	50
Environment	D1.34	Further deferment in the re-instatement of highway management funding	800
Total			

7.6 **Vulnerable People** - The Council's aspiration for Vulnerable People Social Care services is one of quality, using prevention and earlier intervention to help people retain independence for as long as they can. At the same time ensure that the Council supports vulnerable people to remain safe at home, giving them the opportunity of control over services to meet their assessed needs. Reducing resources means that cushioning the impact on vulnerable people becomes increasingly difficult but the Council will continue to seek, where possible, to cushion the impact on the most vulnerable and maintain the longer term strategic view in the context of the current financial realities. The options developed to date associated with this theme are now presented to Cabinet for consideration. These options total £7.116m. Cabinet is asked to consider the options and recommendations in Annex I (*recommendation z*).

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Working Assumption £000</u>
D1.35	Section 117 After Care funding – The Council will pursue, with our Health colleagues, identification of service users who	200



	receive 117 funding and request reviews to see if they still require this provision.	
D1.36	Community Health - prioritise and undertake reviews of service users currently in nursing care to ensure that they are supported appropriately	400
D1.37	Assistive Technology– increase the use of equipment that enables service users (vulnerable people) to remain in their own homes with minimal outside support	200
D1.38	Increase charges for a range of services, these are an increase of charges to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of disposable income (currently 80%) - Currently Service users will contribute 80% of their disposable income toward their care or service costs and this option will mean a change in Council policy so that 100% of disposable income is considered in the financial assessment process.</li> <li>• Reduce disability related expenditure (DRE) which presently stands at £16.00 per user per week to £11.00 per week. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> <li>• Couples – disregard income buffer when assessing care needs. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> </ul>	564
D1.39	Remodel all current day care and transport	from 1,400
D1.40	Recover surplus, unspent Direct Payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150.	752
D1.41	Respite – offer to be reduced of from a range up to a 2 weeks per year	from 1,900
D1.42	Revise Re-ablement model – To obtain, one year only, funding available from Health of £900,000 to enable more users to go through an improved re-enablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short & long term care.	1,200
D1.43	Further incremental reductions in housing related support	500
<b>Total</b>		<b>From 7,116</b>

7.6 **Economy & Tourism** - In addition to the above, activity is progressing to assess the potential for the creation of a Business Improvement District (BID) for Southport, aimed at generating increased business rates in order to benefit the BID area. The BID shadow Business plan will be available during spring 2013 and the ballot of affected businesses, during autumn 2013. This process will identify what activity is planned that is relevant to the Visitor Economy.

## 8. Delivery of the Budget Plan

8.1 It is anticipated that by March 2014 the Council will still be spending £242.1m (net) on delivering services to the community of Sefton excluding school based expenditure. In recent years efficiencies have formed a significant part of Council budget reductions, however, as Members are aware it is now increasingly difficult to identify such opportunities.

8.2 The options presented in this report are evidence of the unprecedented challenge faced by the Council. The decisions that the Council will need to take over the next few months will be crucial to the development of robust implementation plans. Timely decision making will support the planning process and enable Officers to identify the

capacity required, effectively allocate resources, manage dependencies, align activities and manage accountabilities.

- 8.3 Implementation plans have already been drawn up for the proposals approved by November 2012 Council. The financial delivery profile associated with these has also been further developed. Following Cabinet's consideration of the options presented in this report further planning work will be completed that will the Council to manage this period of change. These plans will be revised if, during consultation, the Council can find alternative ways of funding the budget gap.
- 8.4 Members should be aware that the options presented for consideration in this report, if approved, would require appropriate consultation, a number of policies to be updated, a considerable number of service user reviews to be undertaken by the Adult Social Care team, ICT solutions to be updated etc. The lead in times associated with these and other activities will be crucial in delivering against the budget plan. The approvals that Cabinet give will enable Officers to prioritise, schedule and complete the work required within the budget plan period. The effectiveness of this planning activity relies heavily on the timing of the decision making process.
- 8.5 The current budget process aims to deliver a balanced budget for 2013/14 and a two year robust budget plan. This will enable capacity to be released from identification of budget options towards the reshaping of the Council and the achievement of priorities within significantly reduced resources.

## **9. Consultation & Engagement**

- 9.1 As mentioned earlier in the report an initial package of potential budget options was approved by Cabinet, 13<sup>th</sup> September 2012, to commence consultation and engagement. Consultation activity continues with service users, the community, partners, key stakeholders, employees and Trade Unions. A questionnaire has been developed and is available on the Councils website, and in libraries, seeking views in relation to the thematic budget options. A telephone survey is in the process of being commissioned which similarly will provide insight to inform the budget setting process. Consultation Plans have been developed for the majority of the thematic options, and have been considered by the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel. A number of options within Annex I have already been considered and further reports will be taken back to the Panel in January 2013 as part of the ongoing consultation and engagement processes. Those that have not yet been considered by the Panel will also be presented in January
- 9.2 The community and partners can access the You Choose budget simulator on the Councils website. The simulation tool aims to raise awareness of how the Council is currently resourcing its priorities, and encourages them to have a go at setting a balanced budget. The website also provides links to the budget consultation currently underway.
- 9.3 The consultation and engagement on the Sefton Strategic Needs Assessment has been completed, and a feedback report has been developed in draft, to enable feedback to be given as part of the consultation and engagement on the draft Health and Wellbeing Strategy. As part of the process of engagement on the SSNA, feedback was received which can inform the budget setting process. The consultation and engagement on the

Health and Wellbeing Strategy will run in parallel with the budget consultation and will inform the budget setting process in the New Year.

- 9.4 In order to ensure that members of the public who do not have access to the internet, can give us their views, an engagement plan has been developed for the draft Health and Wellbeing Strategy, which provides a range of other opportunities where the community, stakeholders and others can give their views through a variety of different means on the priorities identified in that draft strategy. In addition, the details of the budget options, contact details and copies of the surveys' being undertaken will be made available through libraries, One Stop Shops and Town Halls.
- 9.5 Media briefings and media releases continue to be issued to sign-post interested parties to the full range of options and further explain the financial position of the council. A number of broadcast interviews have taken place and further activity is planned with regard to promoting the need for the council to make such significant savings. Considerable coverage has been generated in local and regional press, TV and Radio, with regard to the level of savings needed in Sefton. This has led to awareness of the consultation processes being heightened in the public domain and greater understanding of the need to reduce the budget in such a way.
- 9.6 Weekly meetings continue with the Trade Unions. Proposals from departments are in different stages of consultation.

## **10. Equality Act 2010**

- 10.1 As the Council continues to put actions into place to set a sustainable budget plan for 2013/14 and 2014/15 there is a need to be clear and precise about our processes to ensure we are meeting our duties under the Equality Act. The Council constantly builds in to its thinking the equality implications to changes in services and mitigating risk as appropriately as possible. This research and subsequent findings are put before Members in the form of quality assurance statements or reports to ensure that Members make decisions in an open minded balanced way showing due regard to the impact of the recommendations being presented in compliance with the Equality Act 2010.

## **11. Risk Management**

- 11.1 The Council continues to regularly review strategic and operational risks and put in place measures to manage those risks. However it must be stressed that reductions of the level required by Government cannot be achieved in a risk free environment. There will be significant risk associated with the budget options.
- 11.2 All options contained in Annexes B, C, D E, F, G, H and I have been risk assessed by the relevant senior officers with mitigating actions identified where possible.
- 11.3 Cabinet is asked to note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in Annex B, C and D in making its recommendation to Council (*recommendation aa*).
- 11.4 Offices continue to monitor risks and issues, escalating significant risks and issues to Cabinet as appropriate.

## 12. Conclusion

12.1 At this stage of the budget process the overall financial summary is as follows

	£m
<b><u>Budget Gap - Cabinet June 2012</u></b>	<b>43.700</b>
<b><u>Options Approved by Council 22 November 2012</u></b>	
Business Efficiencies	-11.680
Consultation (Internal) Options	
- Integration	-1.250
- Specific Options	-2.309
Consultation (External) Options	
- Specific Options	-0.310
Total Options Approved by Council 22 November 2012	<hr/> <b>-15.549</b>
<b><u>Options Previously Presented to Cabinet Still Subject to Consultation</u></b>	
Business Efficiencies	-0.537
Consultation (Internal) Options	
- Terms and Conditions	-6.000
- Senior Management	-0.150
- Consultation (Internal) Options	-1.000
Consultation (External) Options	
- Specific Options	-3.598
Consultation (External) Library Service (option B)	-0.400
Total of Options Still Subject to Consultation	<hr/> <b>-11.685</b>
<b><u>Total of Savings Previously Presented to Cabinet</u></b>	<hr/> <b>-27.234</b>
<b><u>Revised Budget Gap Assuming all Savings Previously Presented to Cabinet are Implemented and Achieve Working Assumption Values</u></b>	<hr/> <b>16.466</b>

## **New Items Presented to Cabinet 13 December 2012**

### Reviews

- Street Lighting -0.064

### Further Options for Consideration

#### Ways of Working

- Downsizing and Streamlining -1.977

- Consultation (Internal) Specific Options -0.844

- Consultation (External) Specific Options -0.634

Subsidies and Charges -0.362

Standards of Service -0.902

Vulnerable People -7.116

Total of New Items Presented to Cabinet 13 December 2012 -11.899

### **Revised Budget Gap Assuming all Savings Presented to Cabinet are Implemented and Achieve Working Assumption Values**

4.567

- 12.2 The remaining budget gap of £4.5m may be addressed through the anticipated reduction in levies, changes in Council Tax funding and the use of capitalisation, if appropriate. Clearly these remaining decisions will be considered by Cabinet in January following the announcement of Government funding levels in late December.
- 12.3 It can be seen that the Council currently has broadly sufficient budget options to cover the forecast budget gap of £43.7 million. However this assumes that all identified options are approved and delivered in full. This position is far from ideal and therefore officers are continuing to assess Council services for further options and this will continue until the final budget is set.
- 12.4 There is also a significant risk that the forecast gap will increase when the Government announces its final settlement later this month.
- 12.5 Subject to the risks identified above the Council is still on course to deliver and agree a two year budget plan. This approach will enable;
- officers to create the capacity to further develop and facilitate delivery against implementation plans and to concentrate on reshaping and transforming the Council to deliver essential services in the current economic climate
  - our services users, partners, local businesses and the voluntary, community and faith sector to prepare for the potential changes
  - greater scope to identify alternative solutions to current delivery models
  - appropriate workforce planning and less uncertainty for our staff

12.6 This is a time of unprecedented change for the Council and Sefton communities. Over the period of the Government's current Comprehensive Spending Review savings of over £100 million will have been identified and delivered. The impact on Council services has and will be significant. The Government's Autumn Statement was the precursor for the Local Government Settlement due out later this month and indicated a continuation of the current austerity measures, with Councils facing even greater percentage reductions than previously indicated. The precise impact for Sefton will not be known until January.

## Annex A

<b>Timetable Strategic Leadership Team (SLT) 2012/13</b>		
13 <sup>th</sup> September	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ budget changes not requiring consultation with the public nor containing employee redundancy implications</li> <li>○ options requiring internal consultation only</li> <li>○ public engagement feedback</li> <li>○ options requiring external consultation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
18 <sup>th</sup> September	Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress report</li> </ul>
11 <sup>th</sup> October	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ feedback from Overview &amp; Scrutiny (Performance &amp; Corporate Services)</li> <li>○ proposals (internal)</li> <li>○ Recommend any budget savings to Council for implementation</li> <li>○ Libraries Review options</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 <sup>nd</sup> November	Public Engagement and Consultation Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special meeting to consider phase 2 consultation on the Library Review.</li> </ul>
6 <sup>th</sup> November	Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress report 2012/13 approved budget savings</li> </ul>
8 <sup>th</sup> November	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback on any consultations which have been completed</li> <li>• Recommend any budget savings for implementation</li> </ul>
9 <sup>th</sup> November	Public Engagement and Consultation Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Public Engagement and Consultation Plans</li> </ul>
22 <sup>nd</sup> November	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Cabinet recommendations</li> </ul>
13 <sup>th</sup> December	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify any further options for consultation</li> <li>• Update on Government Grant if available</li> </ul>
15 <sup>th</sup> January	Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress report</li> </ul>
17 <sup>th</sup> January	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback on any consultations which have been completed</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend any budget savings for implementation</li> <li>• Schedule of fees and charges</li> </ul>
18 <sup>th</sup> January	Public Engagement and Consultation Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Public Engagement and Consultation Plans</li> </ul>
24 <sup>th</sup> January	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback on any consultations which have been completed</li> <li>• Recommend any budget savings for implementation</li> </ul>
31 <sup>st</sup> January	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback on any consultations which have been completed</li> <li>• Recommend any budget savings for implementation</li> </ul>
14 <sup>th</sup> February	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend any budget savings for implementation</li> </ul>
19 <sup>th</sup> February	Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Revenue Budget for 2013/15 for comment</li> </ul>
28 <sup>th</sup> February	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No budget activity scheduled</li> </ul>
28 <sup>th</sup> February 2013	Budget Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of Budget and Council Tax</li> </ul>



## Annex B

### **Review of Street Lighting**

#### **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 As part of the Transformation Programme & Revenue Budget review for 2012 – 2015, a street lighting consultation has been undertaken on the Council's website. The consultation commenced on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2012 and ended on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2012. The consultation reference number is 732.
- 1.2 Sefton currently has 31,500 street lights, 1,100 illuminated bollards and 1,963 illuminated traffic signs. These account for 30% of the Council's electricity bill and 23% of baseline carbon emissions. In terms of saving energy costs and reducing carbon emissions taking action on street lighting is a priority.
- 1.3 Sefton's Carbon Management Plan has a target to reduce energy costs and emissions of green house gases by 25% by the year 2016. Current deficit reduction plans imposed by central Government make finding savings in terms of energy costs imperative. As a result, consultation was undertaken in order to ascertain the views of the communities of Sefton on a range of options related to securing energy cost savings while continuing to provide street lighting that meets the needs of our communities.
- 1.4 A copy of the consultation document is provided below.

#### **2.0 REVIEW 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.

### 3.0 CONSULTATION

3.1 The key basis of the consultation was to seek public opinion regarding the options for revising the existing street lighting delivery regime including the consideration of switching street lights off at certain times, resulting in subsequent cost and carbon savings. The public were asked their views about under what conditions residents would find the proposed revisions to the street lighting regime acceptable, in respect of options set out at 3.2 (below).

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

- Switching to Light Emitting Diode (LED) lighting Proposal 1 in Survey
- Installation of more energy efficient bulbs Proposal 2 in Survey
- Switching off street lights between certain times Proposal 3 in Survey

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

### 4.0 CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

4.1 522 responses were received. Of these, two were identified as being outside Sefton, so were discounted from our analysis. Of the 520 responses, 272 (52.31%) were identified as being from PR8 / PR9 postcodes, i.e. Southport / Ainsdale / Churchtown / Banks areas, so this must be borne in mind when considering whether this is truly representative of the overall Sefton response. The breakdown of responses from each area is given below:

Postcode	Area	No of Respondents	% of Total
Blank	Unknown	6	1.15%
L10	Aintree	5	0.96%
L20	Bootle	32	6.15%
L21	Litherland	22	4.23%
L22	Waterloo / Seaforth	30	5.77%
<b>L23</b>	Crosby / Thornton	<b>69</b>	<b>13.28%</b>
L30	Netherton /Ford	15	2.88%
L31	Maghull / Lydiate / Melling	34	6.54%
L37	Formby	29	5.58%
L38	Hightown	4	0.77%
L39	Ormskirk	2	0.38%
<b>PR8</b>	Southport / Ainsdale	<b>133</b>	<b>25.58%</b>
<b>PR9</b>	Churchtown / Banks	<b>139</b>	<b>26.73%</b>
		<b>520</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

4.2 The responses to the three main proposals were as follows:

- **Proposal 1: (Q7) Replace existing bulbs with Light Emitting Diode (LED) lighting:**

**83.82% (435)** “Strongly agree” or “Agree” with this proposal.

- **Proposal 2: (Q8) Replace existing bulbs with energy efficient bulbs:**

**69.17% (359)** “Strongly agree” or “Agree” with this proposal.

- **Proposal 3: (Q9) Switching off street lights, in areas where it would be safe to do so, between midnight and 6am:**

**52.02% (270)** “Strongly disagree” or “Disagree” with this proposal.

4.3 The survey also asked two questions relating to street lighting being used as a potential deterrent against anti social behaviour, and one regarding whether respondents felt safe to walk in their road at night with the current street lighting. The three questions were:

- Q.2: How would you rate the current lighting levels in your road / street, such that you feel safe to walk in it alone at night?
- Q10: "The current lighting level in your road / street, performs well as a deterrent of anti social behaviour?"
- Q11: "Good quality lighting can be used as a potential deterrent of anti social behaviour?"

	Q10: "The current lighting level in your road / street, performs well as a deterrent of anti social behaviour?"		Q11: "Good quality lighting can be used as a potential deterrent of anti social behaviour?"		Q2: "How would you rate the current lighting levels in your road / street, such that you feel safe to walk in it alone at night?"		
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>19.65%</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>37.57%</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>25.05%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>29.48%</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>39.31%</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>40.85%</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Don't Know</b>	12	2.31%	1	0.19%	126	24.28%	<b>OK</b>
<b>Neither Agree or Disagree</b>	137	26.40%	59	11.37%			
<b>Disagree</b>	65	12.52%	32	6.17%	34	6.55%	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	41	7.90%	19	3.66%	12	2.31%	<b>Very Poor</b>
<b>BLANK</b>	9	1.73%	9	1.73%	5	0.96%	<b>BLANK</b>
	<b>519</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	
		<b>49.13%</b>		<b>76.88%</b>		<b>65.90%</b>	<b>90.17%</b>
	<b>Strongly agree / agree</b>		<b>Strongly agree / agree</b>		<b>Excellent / Good</b>		<b>Excellent / Good and OK</b>

- 4.4 Interestingly, although 76% of respondents believe that street lighting **can** be used as a deterrent against anti-social behaviour, only 49% of them say they believe that the **current** lighting performs well as a deterrent. However, in response to Question 2, “How safe is it to walk down their street with the current lighting”, 65% felt it was “Excellent” or “Good”. In addition a further 24% felt that it was “OK” – giving a total 90% positive response with regard to this issue. Given the limited scope of information available for Question 10 - with regard to how they believe it could perform better as a deterrent - we don’t believe there is any further action we can take in this respect. However, it is important to note that 76% of respondents feel that it **can** be used as a deterrent, and 90% feel that the current lighting is Excellent / Good or OK in relation to how safe it made them feel whilst walking in it alone at night.
- 4.5 A section was also given for respondents’ “Comments”. Not surprisingly, many of the people who completed the “Comments” sections felt strongly that switching the lights off would be a “Burglars Charter”, lead to more crime, etc. Some commented that replacing existing lights with LEDs would need fewer lamps to be lit, given that LEDs are brighter. There were also suggestions about motion sensor lamps, and installing the new “Cats Eyes” in dark cul-de-sacs.
- 4.6 Q12 asked “It is a good idea to request more help from the public to advise the Council of street lighting problems?” In response to this 462 - 89% of all respondents - “Strongly agree” or “agree”.
- 4.7 One of the respondents who were excluded from the survey – because he lived in Kent – took it as a marketing opportunity for “Induction Lighting”. He said (sic) “Whilst LED lighting is 'in vogue' for new street lighting installations, it is neither the most efficient, nor the most cost-effective solution currently available. Induction lighting has a lamp life approximately double that of LED, it has lower energy consumption than LED, and far simpler and cheaper end-of-life disposal costs. I would wish Sefton Council to commit itself to new lighting that is more expensive, less energy efficient, and with lower maintenance costs, than lighting technology and products now becoming available.
- 4.8 A further question was “If you would like to receive feedback on this consultation or to be contacted regarding any of the issues raised please give your contact details below”. 192 (37%) of the respondents gave contact details of a postal address or E Mail address in relation to this question. (Of the 192 requesting feedback, 96 of them “Disagreed” or “Strongly disagreed” with switching the lights off.) A response will, therefore, need to be created for these 192 respondents.
- 4.9 Further questions were answered as follows:-

		Excellent	Good	OK	Poor	Very Poor	Don't know	BLANK	Excellent & Good & OK
Q3	How well are the street lights maintained in your road / street, (i.e. are they kept lit)?	31.35%	43.08%	19.81%	3.08%	1.35%	0.58%	0.77%	<b>94.23%</b>

Q4	What do think of the visual condition of the street lighting columns in your road / street? (i.e. Rust, Damaged Concrete..... etc)?	12.88%	39.23%	34.04%	8.08%	2.50%	1.92%	1.35%	<b>86.15%</b>
Q5	In the event that the street lights are not working, how would you rate the services for ensuring repairs are undertaken promptly?	10.58%	32.88%	24.04%	7.31%	1.73%	21.92%	1.54%	<b>67.50%</b>
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither Agree or Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>BLANK</b>	<b>"No trees in my street"</b>	<b>Strongly Agree &amp; Agree</b>
Q6	How well does the current street lighting in your road / street allow you to see people & colours clearly?	12.50%	31.92%	33.27%	16.92%	4.04%	0.19%	1.15%	<b>77.69%</b>
Q15	Street Lighting can often be obstructed by trees when they are not cut back, is this the case in your street?	6.73%	16.92%	15.96%	20.96%	8.46%	6.54%	24.42%	<b>23.65%</b>

4.10 Questions 1, 13, and 14 related to contact details and comments which, whilst not reported in this report are available

## 5.0 POTENTIAL FUTURE DELIVERY INITIATIVES FOLLOWING CONSULTATION

5.1 In summary the analysis has shown that the overall street lighting delivery service is held in high regard from the responses received. It has been a worthwhile exercise to determine levels of satisfaction with the current service whilst eliciting opinion on some possible future delivery proposals. With the future financial pressure it will be critical to ensure resources are allocated on a priority risk basis, which may unfortunately bring about some reduction in perceived service delivery. The key highlights were that;

- Good quality lighting helps residents feel safe to walk alone at night
- The implementation of LED's was slightly preferred to energy efficient lamps.
- Turning lights off in areas where it was safe to do so received a majority negative response rate.

5.2 **Possible sites for turn off 12 - 6am (Proposal 3)** – This possibility received a high negative response. Cabinet may wish to consider that two local authorities are known to have switched off a proportion of their street lighting recently. Bingham and Keyworth in Nottinghamshire and Milton Keynes in Northamptonshire have both subsequently reinstated the lights following strong representation from residents and the latter following a death which was claimed to be as a result of the lights being turned off. Turning off all lights on Urban Motorways appears to have been accepted by the public generally. However, whether such an option would be acceptable in respect of the local road network, given the wide range of obstructions that may be experienced, is a key issue.

However, should Cabinet be minded to approve it would require a low to medium investment to implement with circa a 4-year payback period. It is recommended that any pursuance of this proposal should be subject to local acceptance and on trial basis only to establish any detrimental associated effects. Depending on the output of the lamp, this proposal would save between £10 and £103 per column per year in energy saving terms.

It is worthy of note that the electricity providers are currently reviewing tariffs to mitigate any potential losses due to the changing market usage of street lighting requirements. It is possible therefore that future Tariff changes will reduce / negate savings secured via turning off street lights.

The potential savings to be secured via turning off street lights are illustrated below using the example of the A565 / A59;

Apart from peak traffic times i.e. 16:00 to 20:00 hours, substantial sections of the A565 and the A59 carry limited vehicular or pedestrian traffic and yet the total energy consumption for both installations is circa 770,000KWh at a cost of £71,800.00 per year.

Based on current tariffs by reducing or switching off the power between 24:00 and 06:00 hours it could save up to £31,000.00 per year by simply replacing the photo electric cell at a cost of £42.00 per unit. Alternatively, consideration could be given to switching off every other light thereby leaving half the installation operational outside of peak times. Turning off half of the lights would offer half of the saving above. Another advantage of such a system is that the payback period would be less than one year.

- 5.3 The A565 / A59 could act as a pilot scheme for alternate extinguishment, with the pilot reviewed prior to the 2014/15 financial year in order to assess impact on public perception and also to quantify accurately, cost savings.
- 5.4 **Convert High Pressure Sodium (HPS) to CDO-tt & control gear. (Proposal 2)** - Medium investment required to implement with circa a 5-year payback period. There was strong support for this initiative with 69.17% either agreeing or strongly agreeing however this should be read in association with 5.4 below.

There are approximately 4500 high pressure sodium lamps that remain in residential areas that are suitable for conversion to Ceramic Discharge Outdoor lighting (CDO-tt). As well as delivering white rather than orange light, CDO=tt will cut energy consumption by up to 40%. Replacement of sodium lighting will require investment of £231,000 and yield a saving of £46,000 in energy costs and £3,000 in Carbon Tax costs per annum, thus achieving payback during year 5.

- 5.4 **Light Emitting Diode (LED) 35w & 50w with Control gear (Proposal 1)** – The unit cost would be high with a significant investment required to replace existing luminaires with LED alternatives, although they would yield greater savings than alternatives in terms of energy costs and maintenance requirements. However, the initial investment will mean that payback is achieved only during year 12 at the earliest.

## 6.0 CURRENT AND FUTURE INITIATIVES OUTWITH THE SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

### 6.1 Current Initiatives due for Completion 2012/13

- 70w Son to 50w CDO-tt 9192 replacement
- LED illuminated Bollards 1181
- LED illuminated Traffic Signs 1963
- LED Pilot Projects 164 various Watt outputs

All of the above have been undertaken to make energy savings and also assist with the consultation process. They have been the subject of previous reports and approvals.

- 6.2 **Structural testing programme** – Circa 1800 steel columns are to be structurally tested to establish a risk based approach for the strategic replacement of ageing stock and ensuring best value and minimised future maintenance where applicable. This has been established using Technical Report 22 guidelines and it is hoped this representative sample of testing will highlight any risks the Council needs to mitigate. Based on the ongoing results of this testing, potential removal of lighting columns may be inevitable until sufficient funding is established for a strategic replacement programme. In the event of any column removal, the cost of individual removal would be **£460** however subsequent savings per column would be circa **£30** per year in energy and maintenance expenditure. By not replacing lamp columns, the Council will save circa £580.00 + energy and maintenance costs of £30.00 per year per column.

Current revenue allocations allow approximately 225 lighting units to be replaced each year. If we continue, it will take over 40 years to clear the back log of age expired equipment and this doesn't allow for future equipment exceeding their action age by which time it is likely all stock will require replacement.

To clear the current backlog of age expired lighting equipment within 5 years, the Council would need to replace approximately 2000 lighting columns per year until 2018 at an annual cost of £2.2M

- 6.3 **Possible Variable Lighting Levels** - This is a possible option for inclusion in both lamp replacement and LED programmes. It may increase savings by an additional circa 15% but installation costs are still high with pay back period around 8 to 10 years. It is worthy of note that the electricity providers are currently reviewing tariffs to mitigate any potential losses due to the changing market usage of street lighting requirements. Cabinet should note that this particular question was deliberately omitted from the consultation for two reasons. Firstly, the level of dimming would not be so substantial as to be particularly noticeable over a given area, and secondly, there was concern that inclusion would jeopardise the integrity of the results regarding lighting switch off.

- 6.4 **Structural replacement programme, possible use of Slipper Columns** - Circa 10,000 columns are beyond the TR22 suggested life expectantly period. These columns may still have serviceable life and will be subject to the structural testing programme identified in section 6.2 above. There may be an opportunity to

replace defective columns using an innovative column which will negate the need for Distribution Network Officer (DNO) disconnection & reconnection at circa £800 per unit, therefore potentially allowing 2 units to be installed for the price of one currently. This system allows for a new sleeve to be 'slipped' over the existing column over the base of the existing column following removal of its shaft. In this way, a section of the existing failed column can remain in-situ with the protective sleeve around it so there is no requirement to pay the electricity company to disconnect and reconnect the supply. The Council is not allowed to undertake the disconnection and reconnection itself. The cost of bringing all columns to TR22 standard within 5 years is circa £10m, however based on the current level of investment circa 15,000 columns will be beyond the TR22 suggest life replacement period in 5 years time.

- 6.5 **Cast Iron / Conservation Area replacement programme** - Circa 70 columns are beyond the suggested life expectancy period. There may be an opportunity to replace defective columns using refurbished Cast Iron columns with integral doors. The cost of bringing these to the current TR22 standard is circa £80k.
- 6.6 **Further Research and Development of new products in the marketplace.** Officers will continue to investigate the market, seeking innovative ways to maximise efficiency and minimise the Councils Risk. This will include further investigation into 'induction lighting' as identified in section 4.7

## 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 It is recommended that selected lengths of the A565 / A59 be subject to a 12 month pilot during 2013/14 where alternate columns are switched off outside of peak traffic flow times. During the pilot, public perceptions and cost savings can be assessed. Further activity will be undertaken during the pilot to identify further stretches of road across the borough where off peak traffic flow is such that alternate extinguishment is viable. This option will secure a saving during 2013-14 of £15,000.
- 7.2 In addition, it is requested that officers be authorised to further explore the potential for varying the lighting levels at the appropriate locations throughout the borough, on a trial basis, to establish the effects, opinion, costs and potential savings of this option.

Due to the multiple variations that exist and depending on what type of mechanism is required to affect reduced power, it is difficult to be precise on actual costs and savings without identification of a particular area or scheme. By way of an indication, individual costs per unit will vary between £25.00 and £200 with potential savings of up to £107 per year per lighting point per annum based on current tariffs. If approved, this will be the subject of a further report.

- 7.3 A programme of LED replacement luminaires would require investment of £4,13m with a payback period of 15 years. Given that the energy saving over the CDO-tt lamps is not significant and the 'lead in' cost of LED replacement, it is recommended that the ongoing programme of LED replacement in bollards and street signs only should continue, but there be no introduction of a programme of LED replacement of street lighting.



- 7.4 Works to replace the remaining 4500 high pressure sodium lamps with energy efficient CDO-tt lamps has many advantages. As well as providing white light, this method has potential to reduce energy by a further 460,000 KWh per year with a payback period of circa 5 years. The cost to convert the remaining 4500 units would be £231K with a subsequent annual energy saving of £46.3K with a further smaller saving related to Carbon tax. It is requested that Officers identify the funding source required to deliver this programme in one year thus achieving total annual savings of £49,000, thus achieving payback during year 5.
- 7.5 A successful trial has now been carried out in the Formby area using the “slipper lighting column” described in section 6.4 of this report. The main advantage of this method is that it will reduce the cost of replacing a lighting column by at least 50%. Whilst this method will not be suitable for all lighting columns, it is estimated that it can be used for at least 60% of existing age expired equipment with a potential to save several million pounds against conventional methods of replacement during future years. It is recommended that Officers be authorised to further explore potential sites for the initiative and report back with potential costs for limiting the current risk to the Council in more effective maintenance of existing lighting stock.
- 7.6 In terms of columns that require removal due to being defective / dangerous, it is recommended that where it is considered that removal represents no significant additional risk, and then the existing column is removed and not replaced, thus saving the cost of installation, re-connection and energy / maintenance costs. (circa £825 per column in year 1 and a recurring £25 saving per column in future years).
- 7.7 Recommendations 7.5 and 7.6 will not deliver energy savings or indeed reduce overall expenditure. However, they will ensure that the council can deliver a larger annual programme of essential column replacement, thus mitigating the risk of column failure and potential legal action i.e. personal injury/ insurance claims.

## Annex C

Cabinet is asked to

- consider the revised option(F1.6) below
- agree the introduction of a more cost effective, streamlined model for Community Meals which will enable Sefton residents to access a range of meal options
- agree that Officers commence a consultation and engagement process with partners, employees and Trade Unions
- agree that Officers prepare for implementation at the earliest opportunity including the issuing of required notices
- agree that Officers commence the conversation with current service users as to how the service will change including support for the transition period between the subsidised to the non subsidised model

### **F1.6**

<b>Service Description Community Meals</b>
The provision of Community Meals Service to 332 vulnerable adults (as at November 2012). This service is provided by Sefton New Directions, Women's Royal Voluntary Services (WRVS) and in partnership with the Place and People Directorates.
<b>It is proposed to liaise with current service users on the following change –</b> To introduce a more cost effective, streamlined model for Community Meals which will enable Sefton residents to access a range of meal options.
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> There has been a fall in demand for the service in recent years and it is anticipated that this trend will continue. Sefton saw a 21% reduction in the number of clients having meals delivered between the end of year 2009/10 and end of year 2011/12 figures. Nationally there was an average fall of 45.5% in the number of clients having meals delivered between over the same period. The majority of Local Authorities have moved away from a direct meals service and towards arrangements with external providers for the supply of hot and re-heatable meals.  In recent years the market associated with this area of service delivery has expanded to include major supermarket and specialist meal delivery. These types of solutions are available widely at reasonable cost and can be accessed on-line and via the telephone.
<b>The following activity will change –</b> Sefton residents will be signposted to a variety of alternative solutions. The Council will no longer co-ordinate or commission this activity. Current services users (332 as at November 2012) will be assisted in sourcing alternative solutions.
<b>Impact of Service Change –</b> <b>Service Users –</b> The assessment of need of an individual who is eligible under Fair Access to Care must take account of their need for nutrition and meal provision and in line with current procedures this will be included in their care/support plan. The Council will ensure that the range of available choices is discussed with the individual and a suitable arrangement put in place for them to access community meals from a variety of providers. The current service users will be supported in the transition arrangements, for those who qualify under the Chronically Sick & Disabled Persons Act 1970 or the National Assistance Act 1948 the Council will ensure that an appropriate solution is sourced. For all other service users they will have the

opportunity to select the best arrangement for their individual circumstances.

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

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

**Equality Impact Assessment – See below**

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

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

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

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

**Staffing: 3**

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

**Saving 2013/14 (#): £200,000** Year

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

The saving breakdown is as follows:

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

## **Equality Analysis Report** Community Meals.

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

Currently the recipient of the meal **and** the Council jointly pay for each meal delivered (Council is paying for the current 'meals on wheels' infrastructure and delivery services). The recipient pays between £3-4 per meal.

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

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

### **Ramifications of Proposal:**

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alternate operators would provide a service, but officers need to ensure that the current recipients fully understand what is happening and can access the new service. Officers

need to allow for people's age and levels of understand when putting the new proposals forward to recipients.

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

Ethnicity	Proportion
White - British	99.7%
White - Irish	0.3%
Grand Total	100.0%

Client Category	Proportion
Dementia	4.3%
Frailty/temporary illness	34.0%
Learning disability	0.3%
Mental health	3.4%
Other vulnerable person	4.9%
Physical disability	44.8%
Sensory Disability-Deafblind	0.9%
Sensory Disability-Dual sensory loss	0.9%
Sensory Disability-Hearing impairment	1.5%
Sensory Disability-Visual impairment	4.6%
Grand Total	100.0%

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

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

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

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

As such it is advancing the opportunities of this group.

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

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

The Council in making this change continues to meet PSED

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

1. Inform and support current service users as to the choices on offer.
2. Monitor performance and feedback.

## Annex D

Cabinet is asked to consider the further information provided and approve the recommendations as described

<b>Ref</b>	<b><u>Service Area</u></b>	<b><u>Option</u></b>	<b><u>Recommendations</u></b>
E2.1	Children's Social Care	Review commissioning of all residential beds for children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider and take account of the additional information provided</li> <li>• approve the outcomes of review of the commissioning of all residential care beds which will mean that the number of residential care beds will reduce by 11 note that officers to will continue consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>• agree the creation of 3 additional Social Worker posts (the cost of these posts to be realised from the placements budget)</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £1m over a two year period</li> </ul>
F1.5	Parks & Green Spaces		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider and take account of the additional information provided including the background documents</li> <li>• approve the completion of actions required to achieve change including the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notifications</li> <li>• recommend to Council a reduction of the subsidy by £40k</li> </ul>

## E2.1

### **Service Description: Children's Social Care**

Reduction in the use of Children's residential care beds and increase in the number of foster care places for adolescents. Implementation of Early Help models of service delivery to reduce over time the numbers of children entering costly social care services.

**It is proposed to continue with consultation with a view to implementing the following change** Review of the commissioning of all residential care beds both in-house and commissioned from a 3<sup>rd</sup> party to reduce the absolute number of residential beds by 11 by 2013 to bring Sefton more in line with statistical neighbours.

Seek permission to create three additional social worker posts from the existing placements budget approx. £150,000 to accelerate the recruitment of new foster carers for adolescents to ensure that by 2014/15 the majority of adolescents are placed in foster care and not significantly more expensive residential care. The cost of these posts to be realised from the placements budget.

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

The overall reduction of residential care beds will produce a cashable saving, to be determined, by the end of 2013/14 financial year, assuming the absolute number of care places does not rise above the current 410.

With agreed additional social work posts in the fostering service the emphasis will shift to recruiting carers for adolescents.

If by 2015 the number of children in care has fallen in line with statistical neighbours then we can expect to realise further savings by also assessing the commissioned packages of care at optimum and efficient levels.

On the current trajectory this number will not reduce without a shift in the way we work. If we are to support families earlier in their difficulties care must be taken to ensure sufficient resource within early intervention services to prevent increased referrals to children's social care were intervention costs are higher at each stage of the process.

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

There will be a positive drive to reduce the number of young people placed in residential provision. It will always be the case that residential care is the correct, preferred option for some children so it cannot be assumed that numbers can continue to shift until there are no residential beds.

### **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – Positive impact for young people who have increased chance of family life.

**Partners** – N/A

**Council** – Potential closure of one Care Home resulting a reduction in costs (mothball costs to be retained) and improved Ofsted profile.

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

**Type Inform**

**Consult**



Internal consultation with workforce in accordance with HR procedures

**Proposed Timeline:** Consultation on residential services commissioning completed by December 2012. Council needs to agree a strategy for early intervention that is agreed by Cabinet, the Children's Trust Board, Local Safeguarding Children Board to ensure a shared understanding and commitment from partner agencies. Agreed strategy December 2012. Implementation plan including disestablishment and re-establishment of reconstructed generic workforce April 2013

Workforce continues to be informed and consulted through a series of meetings and workshops covering the option and its relationship to early intervention service redesign

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

**Equality Impact Assessment** – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a technical change and is satisfied that service user needs will continue to be met. Each service user is subject to regular assessment and this assessment meets the requirements of the Equalities Act.

Officers continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.

**Legislation Considered** - Ofsted Inspection of child protection including early help provision.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Early intervention identifies children as yet, 'below the radar' who need to enter into child protection or looked after provision. Mitigation – recruitment of three additional Social Workers.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
£ 12,272, 600 ( placements only)

**Saving 2013/14:** £500k  
**Additional Saving 2014/15:** £500k  
**Investment Required:** £ Nil  
**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 12** note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal

## F1.5 Allotments

### Service Description: Parks and Greenspaces Service: Subsidies to Allotment users' fees and charges

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

The 'paid for' facilities include 13 allotment sites.

The income in 2012/13 to the Council from fees and charges for these services was £29K (for all allotments). As part of the 2012/13 savings, the costs of utilities were also charged to each site (total 18K).

Users currently pay £36 for a full sized plot, plus utility costs. Comparative costs for Council allotment rents across neighbouring and other north-west Councils currently range from £21.50 to £140.00 per annum for a large plot, with an average (across 15 nearby local authorities) of approximately £51. Some Councils make an additional charge for water and others offer concessions for senior citizens, unemployed or disabled. The national average cost in 2011 was £43 (source - briefing note from Association for Public Service Excellence, March 2011). However, many other Local Authorities are currently reviewing their allotment rents and pricing policy.

In essence despite these increased charges for the use of allotments, these remain a subsidised service. A subsidy under these proposals will remain.

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

Increase allotment fees and charges by an average of £40 per plot per year (depending on plot size). Reduce the subsidy for allotments by £40,000 per year.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** The Council can no longer afford to provide the current range and level of subsidy.

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

Allotment rents will be increased by an average of £40 per plot per year (depending on plot sizes)

The table below summarises the anticipated average cost to the users (in place of existing fees and charges and utilities costs 2012/13).

	No of facilities	Approx. number of users (2012/13)	Current actual costs for providing facility  (This is a <b>guide only</b> based on averages, each user group will be consulted about their specific charges, which vary depending on facilities used at each site)
			<b>See note 1</b>
Allotments	14 sites (currently c. 840 plots +300 half plots)	1100	Users currently pay £36 for a full size plot, with utilities added separately. This proposal would increase this to £76 for a full size plot, with utilities added separately

**Note 1.** In some instances the relationship with individual users is via agreements with Allotment Associations. The fees/charges levied on individual users by the associations may be higher than this to cover their other costs and aspirations. It is likely that an open book approach will need to be adopted in the future where actual costs are passed on, with the addition of an agreed management fee for the association.

**Note 2.** It should be noted that associations retain a portion of the fee's they collect. As such, although existing plot fees are, for example, £36 for a full size plot, which the income to the Council is only £25 per plot amounting to £12k (total). The increased charges will apply to all allotment holders, whether the agreement is directly with the Council, or with a Management Association.

#### **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Previously use of facilities was heavily subsidised by the Council and users generally paid only a small proportion of the actual costs associated with their activity. The 2012/13 savings round has already increased costs. Therefore the proposed further increases in income will mean that users are paying significantly more than they are currently.

It should be noted that there is a waiting list for allotments of roughly 150% of the plots available. It is possible that waiting lists might reduce in light of increased costs.

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

**NB** It may be that the 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. This would be outside of Council control.

**Council –** New agreements are already being drawn up with users/ user groups to ensure that the payment of utility charges is formally agreed. Should a further increase in plot charges be agreed, 12 months notice of this increase and a further amendment of legal agreements would be required.

NSALG have offered to meet the Council to explore if ways can be found to improve the allotment service, without increasing rents. The Council already works closely with the NSALG, and will continue to do so.

NSALG also make comment on the Council's decision not to consult on the proposed rental increases but to inform. As extensive consultation took place last year regarding allotment and sports user fee/charge increases and burial/cremation increases, the Quality Assurance Group and the Consultation & Engagement Panel of the 21<sup>st</sup> September confirmed that there was no requirement for additional consultation on this option as the extensive 2012/13 budget options consultation had already taken place. The Equalities Impact Assessment also identifies that consultation took place during the period October 2011- January 2012 on the changes to charges and was reported to Cabinet and Council in February 2012 and this proposal draws on those previous findings and links to that consultation, this is in line with government guidance on not over consulting and the Consultation and Engagement Panel agreed with the approach.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform

Consult

Engage

Partnership

**Proposed Timeline:****Enact by April 14**

- An allotment forum was held on 24th April 2012, with invitee's from all Associations and sites in the borough. This discussed and explained the impact of savings that had been taken to date and discussed ways forwards for groups to minimise their outgoings/ take on self management (At least one Allotment Association is considering full self management)
- All Members of the Allotment Forum will be written to and informed about the proposed fee increases, and site notices with the same information will be posted at all sites.
- An ongoing dialogue takes place with the regional representative of the National Association of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG). In particular, specific meetings have taken place on 18th April and 20th Sept 2012.
- Cabinet at its last meeting had representations from the NSALG drawn to their attention as they had been received shortly before the meeting. The NSALG set out its concerns in detail.
- A further letter has been received from a tenant at Queensway Allotments, Crosby, which asks for it to draw to Members attention.

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

**Equality Impact Assessment – See assessment below**

**Legislation Considered** - Section 10 of the Allotments Act 1950 means that allotments can be let at a such rent as a tenant may be reasonably expected to pay for land if let for such use on the terms on which it is in fact let.

Allotment Act and case law suggests that increases in allotment fees should only be made in line with those for other recreational facilities. Relevant case law is (Harwood v Borough of Reigate & Banstead) [1982] 43P&CR 336

In the Harwood case, the High Court found that rent increases for allotments must be in line with increases in charges for other recreational amenities provided by the Council and that allotment charges should not be raised in isolation as this would be discriminatory unless there were very special circumstances relating to allotments.

In essence, Sefton's change option F1.5, proposes a rental increase (for a full size 300yd plot), from £36 in 2013/14 to £76 in 2014/15. This represents an increase from £31 in 2011/12 to £76 in 2014/15 (three year period).

Fee increases are also being applied/have been proposed for other recreational activities provided by the Council (bowling, football, cricket and rugby). Some of these are

currently deferred following the Council meeting in November 2012. These proposed increases are on the basis that the users will pay for the Grounds Maintenance costs associated with their facility (Change Proposal F1.2). The actual costs which the user will pay depends on many variables, such as how the Management Associations / Leagues etc choose to apportion the costs, whether they agree to a reduction in standards or reduce the number of pitches etc.

The predicted increase in costs for all of the recreational activities concerned are significantly higher than the proposed increase in allotment rents.

It is therefore clear that in its proposals to increase allotment charges, the Council is not contravening the principles established in the Harwood case as the proposed increase in allotment charges is not disproportionate to anticipated increases in charges for other recreational amenities such as bowling, football, cricket and rugby which are proposed to be increased by substantially higher percentages. As identified in the Work Programme in Annex A Cabinet will consider a full schedule of fees and charges in January 2013. Should there be any implications which adversely effect the proportionality of this option then this will be brought to Members attention accordingly.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –Risk:** Users may refuse to pay additional charges  
**Mitigating Action:** Formal agreements to be put in place

<b>2012/13 Service Budget: c £52,000</b> <b>Staffing: n/a</b> <b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Saving 2014/15: £ 40,000</b> <b>Investment Required: £ 0</b> <b>Staff at Risk: 0</b>	Full Year
--	---	-----------

## Equality Analysis Report

Reference: F1.5 Allotments

### Details of proposal

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

The 'paid for' facilities include 13 allotment sites. The income in 12/13 to the Council from FEES AND CHARGES for these services was £29K (for all allotments). As part of the 12/13 savings, the costs of utilities were also charged to each site (total 18K). Increase allotment fees and charges by an average of £40 per plot per year (depending on plot size). Increase the income from allotments fee's and charges by £40,000 per year.

### Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

Cost of running an allotment will go up for the user. This will affect those who cannot afford to pay more.

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

Allotments are available to use by any users, regardless of sex, gender, age, disability, sexuality, religion and or belief.

**Age and Gender**

Sefton Council research, reported to Cabinet and Council Feb2012, shows that allotment users are predominately older males. This is by chance (older males choosing to use allotments) rather than designed (council only allowing older males to use allotments).

As such, whilst there is a 'disproportionate impact' on this group it is not causally linked to Council's policy on the allocation of allotments, therefore whilst it is unfortunate that this group is facing higher fees to keep using the allotments, it's not discriminatory to increase the fees.

The allotment provision is not an essential front line service.

**Disability.**

Council is mindful of its need to make reasonable adjustments for people with disability. Whilst there is an expectation that people with a disability, if allotment users, would be expected to pay the increase alongside other users – in circumstances where the physical activity of being out in the open and working an allotments can be medically demonstrated to be part of a disabled person's therapy and treatment and there is a clear financial incapacity to pay the increase than concessions can be applied for.

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

**Consultation**

Consultation took place between 20<sup>th</sup> November 2011 and 16<sup>th</sup> 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

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 policy of who can use allotments is inclusive and non discriminatory under the equality act 2010
- The cost increase is not designed to hit any one particular protected characteristic
- The demographic of allotment users is circumstantial
- Reasonable adjustment for disabled users are in place
- The overriding need to reduce council spending is prior to the need of the user cohort, as allotment provision is not an essential front line service.

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

- Inform allotment users of impending changes.

## Annex E – External Funding

Activity Funded	External Funding Source	2012 / 13 funding	Number of staff supported
<b><u>Children &amp; Young People</u></b>			
Substance Misuse Advice Support and Help (SMASH)	Youth Justice Board	18,400	5.0
	National Treatment Agency (Department of Health) VIA DAT PCT	129,500	
Youth Offending Service	Youth Justice Board	370,200	30.0
	Probation Service	32,400	
	Police Authority	11,000	
	Sefton PCT	25,400	
Targeted Youth Support	Youth Justice Board	176,900	12.0
CWD Database (Disabled Childrens Register)	Sefton PCT	31,900	2.0
Families First (formerly FAST)	Skills Funding Agency	58,300	9.0
Adult and Community Learning	Skills Funding Agency	221,500	33.0



## **Built Environment**

Biodiversity and Access Project	Impact / Pathfinder	68,000	2.5
Estate Management - Sites of Special Scientific Interest	Rural Payments Agency	20,000	0.0
Cycling and Walking Initiative	Sefton PCT	82,000	3.0

## **Corporate Commissioning**

Independent Domestic Violence Advisor	Home Office	20,000	1.0
---------------------------------------	-------------	--------	-----

## **Adult Social Care / Health and Wellbeing**

Mental Health Co-ordinator	NHS Sefton	22,450	1.0
Social Marketing programme	Sefton PCT	51,000	3.0
Active Workforce	Various sources including Sefton PCT	50,000	3.0
Community Equipment Store	NHS Sefton	401,500	26.0
Various Social Work posts / Stores Manager	MerseyCare Hospice	335,550	9.0
Customer Access post	NHS Sefton	29,700	1.0
Valuing People	NHS Sefton	20,000	1.0

## Annex F - Ways of Working

Cabinet is asked to consider the options and recommendations contained in this annex

**Downsizing & Streamlining** – further information is available as a background document and has been provided to Cabinet under separate cover

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
Early Intervention & Prevention	D1.1	Integrated Youth Support (Targeted Youth Support & Strengthening Families Team) & Reduce YOS by £30,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the total budget re-alignment of £92k</li> </ul>
	D1.2	Offset Substance Misuse work from DAT Public Health budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the budget re-alignment of £124k to Public Health</li> </ul>
Learning & Support	D1.3	Budget re-alignment – supplies and services – Statutory Provision and Monitoring of Education Other than at School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the budget re-alignment proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £9k</li> </ul>
	D1.4	Welfare Officers-Pupil Attendance (Employment, Attendance and Enforcement) Reduction in payments to schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £25k</li> </ul>
	D1.5	School Admission, Appeals and Student Support – Reduction in administration costs (supplies and services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £19k</li> </ul>
	D1.6	Connexions – make use of Council accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £60k</li> </ul>
Children's Social Care	D1.7	Social Care Commissioned Services – travel, supplies and services. To recommission Council Children's Social Care travel (vehicle hire, leasing and taxis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £100k</li> </ul>
Economy	D1.8	Relocate Economic Development staff from the Investment Centre, to Magdalen House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £48k</li> </ul>
	D1.9	Budget re-alignment of salaries to be funded from grants, contracts and reserves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £116k</li> </ul>

Democracy	D1.10	Budget re-alignment - Members Allowances as agreed by July 2012 Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>note the budget re-alignment</li> </ul>
Corporate Support Services	D1.11	Risk Management (insurance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £50k</li> </ul>
	D1.12	Procurement, ICT and Financial Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the change proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £50k</li> </ul>
Council	D1.13	Public Health Integration Efficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider the integration efficiencies proposed</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of business efficiencies to the value of £1.137m from within Council resources</li> </ul>

### Options where internal consultation is required

<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Vulnerable People	D1.14	Assessment Teams – Reconfiguring of teams and skill mix. Care Management teams consist of social work and occupational therapy assessment, review and organise care and support for vulnerable adults.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> <li>note the intention to move away from a specialism model of delivery to a multi-disciplinary model</li> <li>note that changes to working practices will seek to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the service</li> </ul>
	D1.15	Reconfiguration of the Supporting People Commissioning team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
Early Intervention and Prevention	D1.16	Healthy Schools – transfer the function of co-ordination and consultant role to schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with partners, employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
Children's Social Care	D1.17	Social Care – Central Management & Support Costs – A restructure and a re-alignment of duties to remaining posts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>

Learning & Support	D1.18	Reduce the School Targeted Intervention team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
Street Scene	D1.19	Building Cleaning – change of frequency in office cleaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
Environment	D1.20	Trading Standards – staffing restructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
Communications	D1.21	Communications – staffing restructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to continue with consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>

### Options where external consultation is required

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
Health & Wellbeing	D1.22	Pilot external management arrangements for Crosby Civic Hall with the option of closure if unsuccessful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree the approach and cessation of £46k subsidy</li> <li>agree that officers will work in conjunction with the Cabinet member to evaluate the pilot</li> <li>should the pilot prove successful authorise officers to enter into an appropriate longer term arrangement</li> <li>should the pilot prove unsuccessful authorise officers to take the necessary steps to close Crosby Civic Hall</li> <li>recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £46k</li> </ul>
Early Intervention and Prevention	D1.23	Aiming High – Review of Integrated Short Breaks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
Street Scene	D1.24	Cleansing – cease provision of free plastic sacks excluding those premises which are currently identified as ‘difficult to access’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to continue with consultation and engagement processes (inform)with the community</li> </ul>
	D1.25	Cease subscription arrangement to Mersey Forest Voluntary reduction of working hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with partners, employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>

Corporate Commissioning	D1.26	Governance & Civic Services – Mayoral services - reduce the function of Mayor to the statutory minimum (that is to Chair the Council meeting).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with the community, partners, employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
	D1.27	Corporate Commissioning and Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service – rationalise service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with the community, partners, employees and Trade Unions</li> </ul>
	D1.28	Voluntary, Community, Faith – reduction in resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with the community and partners</li> </ul>
	D1.29	Double Rating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate officers to commence consultation and engagement processes with the community and partners</li> </ul>

## Options requiring internal consultation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Service Description** Healthy Schools

This function ensures the on-going improvement, development and promotion of physical and emotional health by providing accessible and relevant information and equipping pupils with the understanding, skills and attitudes to make informed decisions about their health.

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

Transfer the function of co-ordination and consultant roles to schools

**Rationale for service change proposal –** This is not a statutory function and because of successful initiative launches and monitoring this is now embedded within schools to take forward without coordination by the Council

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Co-ordination, monitoring and promotion of healthy schools and Personal, Social and Health Education agenda in accordance with national policies. Schools will be expected to provide this service themselves.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** none schools will be expected to provide this function to pupils

**Partners –** None

**Council –** None

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

**Equality Impact Assessment –** The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to staffing and process and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.

**Legislation Considered –** None

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Schools may not carry forward the Healthy Schools agenda. Public Health may continue to provide some support through a re-negotiated service level agreement for school health services

2012/13 Service Budget:  
£60,200

Staffing: 2

Saving 2013/14 (#): £35,100 Year  
Saving 2014/15 £25,100

**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: up to 2** note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option

**Service Description****Children's Social Care Central Management & Support Costs**

- Assessment
- Independent Reviewing Officers
- Child Protection Plans and Children in Need
- Children in Care

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

A restructure and a re-alignment of duties to remaining posts.

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

Re-engineering of Children's Social Care Management will produce efficiencies

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

Not applicable

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users – None Partners – None Council – None**

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Consult (Internal)

**Equality Impact Assessment –** The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that there will be little change to service delivery for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.

**Legislation Considered – Children Act 1989**

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –** The Council will need to maximise leadership for remaining staff in order to deliver the significant social care change agenda whilst reducing cost.

Capacity to support inspections and improve quality - All statutory responsibilities will continue to be met. Restructure may identify skills gap which will be addressed through an agreed training programme.

Pressure on case supervision and quality assurance will be mitigated by prioritisation of caseloads and implementation of the new Integrated Childrens System.

**Saving 2014/15 (#): £100,000 Year**

**Investment Required: £ nil**

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

**Service Description School Targeted Intervention**

LAs are responsible for taking a strategic role in supporting schools to improve and for monitoring schools' progress in responding to the challenges that are raised by School Improvement Partners and Ofsted in their evaluation of schools. The LA is responsible for designing, commissioning and brokering an appropriate support package for the school. The LA should also monitor the progress and success of this intervention.

**It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –**  
Reduced support to Schools or to deliver service in a different way, i.e. increased brokerage

**Rationale for service change proposal –** This element of the service is non-statutory. Schools are able to build on the current successes of supporting less successful schools.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Reduced monitoring by Intervention Officers. There will be increased resilience in schools utilising existing networks.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** - Schools could be required to find alternative provision in place of for intervention officers

**Partners** – None

**Council** – None

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

**Equality Impact Assessment –** The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is reduced Council intervention and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users as schools will be required to source this support. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.

**Legislation Considered –** Education and Inspections Act 2006

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Less resource to support schools in special measure category (OFSTED).  
Should more schools decide to become academies the risk is that the Government will reduce Councils funding by more than the savings identified.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
**£760k**

**Saving 2014/15 (#): £100,000** Year  
**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: up to 2** note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

**Partners** - N/A

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

A previous savings proposal has seen the amount of cleaning undertaken at ‘core’ facilities reduce by an average of 30%. This has proved difficult to quantify as the Building Cleaning Service raises a Journal Transfer against a budget code provided by the budget holder for that particular service area. Therefore, the saving remains at the budget source and needs to be vired accordingly from a wide range of cost centres.

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult

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

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

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

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

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
£648,000  
**Staffing:** 83

**Other Resources used:**

**Saving 2013/14:** £50,000 Full Year  
**Saving 2014/15:** £50,000 Full Year  
**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk:** TBC note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option. This option may require reduction in hours of some posts as opposed to redundancy

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

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

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

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

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (Internal)   
Partnership

**Proposed Timeline:** 6 months Consultation is ongoing in accordance with HR procedures. Implementation: (April 1, 2013)

Updates on the integration process have been ongoing with staff and there have been several meetings with service-managers and direct face-to-face updates on the process with the staff concerned. Several appearances have been made at the regular union update meetings and individual union and employee issues have been responded to. Frequent email updates have also been sent to the staff in scope and any queries responded to. The proposed draft job descriptions have been compiled circulated. Detailed discussions with HR colleagues have taken place and they are supporting the process. The process of consulting on the structure and draft Job Descriptions is ongoing.

Standard Council procedures will be observed in the instances where the Council is

required to inform the public	
<b>Equality Impact Assessment</b> – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this option is satisfied that there is no impact on service users. Officers continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.	
<b>Legislation Considered</b> – Statutory guidance on public/legal notices etc. The 2011 Government Guidelines for Local Authority Publicity.	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – Loss of information streams for residents, partners etc – mitigated by looking at delivering comms activity in a different way – e.g. digital by default. Risk of under achieving potential saving as further work is needed to identify all funding streams for existing staff. Saving may already be identified elsewhere in service areas. Potential loss of income for some service areas due to any reduction in marketing activity, however such income generators would be a prioritised area of activity within the new arrangements. The £40k is in addition to the £100k already approved by November 2012 Council; however it will not put further staff at risk. The true achievable savings will not be confirmed until the structure is populated and therefore the £40k is an estimate.	
	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £ 40,000      Full / Part Year <b>Staff at Risk: TBC</b>



## Options requiring external consultation

### **Service Description: Crosby Civic Hall**

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

To enter into an agreement for a Local Community Theatre Company to undertake a 3 month trial period to manage the Civic Hall on the Council's behalf from 2<sup>nd</sup> January to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013. If in the view of both parties the trial period proves successful the Council will seek to enter into a short term contractual arrangement, whilst maintaining and protecting the Council's long term interest in the site.

Should the trial period not be successful it is proposed to close the Crosby Civic Hall. The building will be completely closed and not available for any form of activity. The closure could also affect services to Crosby Library, which shares some utility services and other maintenance with this Civic Hall. This will require the building's energy and maintenance budget to be retained, thereby limiting the saving that could be achieved.

There are clear linkages between the possible future use of the Civic Hall and the outcome of the current Library Review consultation. Whilst maintaining a Library in Crosby is included as part of the consultation (Option B) the location of that Library has not yet been determined (Civic Hall / College Road (Carnegie) / or other alternative locations) and as such this could have a direct bearing on the future viability of the community use of the Civic Hall. Additionally, tentative discussions have taken place at the request of developers interested in the Civic Hall site which may result in a firm proposal being made to the Council as part of the Library Review consultation. Any long term decision on the future use of the Civic Hall must be informed by the outcome of the Library Review, once known, and any potential 3<sup>rd</sup> party proposals.

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

Following the consultation with user groups regarding the 2012/13 budget proposals to change the method of operation of the Civic Hall, it became increasingly evident that the proposed "latch key" option was unworkable as it would present too many risks to both the Council and independent hirers.

Officers have over the past 7 months met with other parties interested in operating the Civic Hall. Up until the beginning of November 2012 Officers had not been able to reach an agreement acceptable to both parties to operate the Hall. Due to the continued uncertainty about the Civic Hall's future the number of bookings in 2012/13 has reduced significantly, and there is currently little programmed use of the building beyond December 2012, with a few provisional booking from April 2013. An in principle agreement has been reached with a Local Community Theatre Company who have indicated that they will be able to attract users back to the Hall, whilst they evaluate the operational, statutory and maintenance requirements to effectively operate the hall.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** During the trial period there will be no change in service as the Local Community Theatre Company will be "managing" on the Council's behalf. Should an agreement be reached for their continued management of the facility the building will remain open but operated by a third party.

If the trial period is unsuccessful and the facility closes then all operations will cease including support to community groups using the centre in terms of a managed

licensed bar, entertainment and security.

In addition to service reductions the venue will not be available for meetings or Council events, any kind of hire for community or commercial purposes. The Hall is used for community consultation exercises, large community meetings, the local blood transfusion service, school speech days etc. and these will all have to find alternative venues.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** None if the hall remains open following the trial period. It is also used by the Crosby Music Festival, a number of amateur theatre groups, dance and drama schools, local schools for events such as speech days, local groups such as Weight Watchers, commercial operators organising trade fairs etc.

**Partners –** There are no external partners although any organisation expressing an interest in taking over the running of the Hall will be supported in examining that option.

**Council –** Efficiency saving. Should the facility remain open following the trial period it is likely that the level of saving achievable could increase from the current £46,000 identified. If the facility were to close there are a number of provisional bookings from April 2013. As early notice as possible should be given to these hirers to allow them to find alternative venues. The building will require mothballing.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

Extensive consultation has already taken place with regard to the operation of Crosby Civic Hall

**Equality Impact Assessment –** The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to management arrangements. Communications will be made with the new management group reminding them that they have to operate within the Equality Act.

**Legislation Considered -** Local Government Act 1972. The building's entertainment license will be allowed to lapse.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

- The trial period is unsuccessful and the facility closes.
- There are a number of other Halls and venues in the area which are accessible and available for community groups to hire. These include Maghull Town Hall, a number of community centres and church halls, and the Cultural Centre which is due to open in April 2013.
- The professional arts programme will continue in the borough. Existing bookings will be honoured until December 2012. Notice will be given for bookings already made for after that date.
- Any long term decision on the future use of the Civic Hall must be informed by the outcome of the Library Review, once known, and any potential 3<sup>rd</sup> party proposals.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
**£46,000**  
**Staffing: 0**

**Saving 2013/14 (#):** £ 46,000  
Full Year  
**Staff at Risk: None**

**Service Description Integrated Short Breaks for Children and Young People & Families**

Short Breaks offer meets the needs of children with disabilities. It is funded from Children With Disabilities and Early Intervention funds for specialist services, such as:

- Various help and support networking groups
- Opportunities to enjoy supported Family Activity days
- Opportunities for disabled children and young people to access sports, arts, and cultural activities
- Summer Play schemes, weekend and holiday activities
- Jake's World sensory centre
- Specialist short breaks such as Home Care/Home Sitting/Overnight short breaks

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

A review of the current Short Breaks Offer for children with disabilities. To be informed by a representative from 'Impact', a government organisation leading the development of the Short Breaks offer across the North West region.

The purpose of the review is to consider the capacity of need and to ensure short breaks are available and communicated to all carers of children and disabilities.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** Integrated Early Intervention and Prevention team, creating efficiencies within the Short Breaks service and offer. Not all children will need the same level of support and short breaks; some will need more than others because of the nature and severity of their child's disability. Some families may need more support because of their individual family circumstances. This review will assess the need and demand for short breaks to provide the right amount of support and short breaks at the right time..

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

It is expected that the Short Breaks offer will be more effective and efficient following a review due to commence in January 2013 as there is expected to be efficiencies in with better ways of delivery.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** - Revised short break offer to parents of children and young people with disabilities, this will be a more effective offer.

**Partners** – Commissioned activities will be reviewed

**Council** – None

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)

Consultation to commence following Cabinet approval

**Equality Impact Assessment** – Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward.

**Legislation Considered –**

Statutory provision from April 2011 to provide a range of short breaks – no guidance or case law.

The Children's Act 1989.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Ensure offer and communication is transparent and is informed by parental engagement. This will mitigate any challenge to a variation in the short term offer.

2012/13 Service Budget:  
£1.2m

Staffing:

Other Resources used:

Saving 2013/14 (#): £55k

Investment Required: £ Nil

**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: Nil**

**Service Description: Cleansing Services - Provision of Plastic Refuse Sacks**

Free clear plastic refuse sacks are currently provided twice a year to ~17,000 premises within the borough, with a total of 120 sacks issued to each premise per year. These premises are provided with a sack collection service as a wheelie-bin storage and collection service is not considered to be appropriate (restricted access/type of building/limited storage etc)

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

It is proposed to cease provision of free sacks to ~16,000 premises. This does not include those premises which are currently identified as 'difficult to access', which accounts for some 1,000 properties.

Currently only plastic sacks provided by Sefton Council are collected from the ~16,000 identified premises. Removal of free sack provision would require all bagged waste placed out for collection to be removed from outside households that receive a sack collection service. It would therefore not be possible to control this as has previously been done so by limiting the quantity of Council supplied bags, and only collecting such bags.

In 2009/10 there was 71,500 tonnes of residual waste collected in Sefton.

In 2010/11 there was 74,500 tonnes of residual waste collected in Sefton.

The removal of the provision of free plastic sacks may increase the overall amount of residual waste collected from these premises and therefore the total disposed of in a year. This may result in an increase of the levy paid by the Council to the Merseyside Recycling and Waste Authority (MRWA). Please see 'Risks & Mitigating Actions' for further information. However, should this occur, the increase in tonnage may be offset by a reduction in the amount of fly-tipped (bagged/side) waste removed from the areas where a sack service is provided.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** There is currently a large amount of fly tipping in alleyways to the rear of properties in receipt of free plastic sacks as only sacks issued by Sefton Council are collected from the front of the premises. Therefore, when householders have no 'Sefton issued' plastic sacks available, a significant amount of excess waste is 'fly tipped', predominantly in rear entries.

By collecting all sacks presented it is expected that fly tipping will decrease.

There is a saving of £60,000 by not issuing free plastic sacks.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Plastic sacks will no longer be provided free of charge. Residents will therefore need to provide their own bags for presenting rubbish to be collected.

It is expected that by collecting all rubbish presented outside properties there will be an increase in the amount of residual waste collected.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** - Plastic sacks will no longer be provided free of charge, service users will have to provide their own plastic bags/method of containment.

**Partners – N/A**

**Council** – There will be immediate annual revenue saving of £60,000 by not issuing sacks.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**  
 Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

Proposed Timeline Consult by February 2013 – (plastic sacks will have been delivered to all 'sack properties' in December 2012 covering the period Jan – June 2013. This allows consultation to take place in full prior to the next scheduled delivery in July 2013, also allowing full saving to be made if proposal accepted.

**Equality Impact Assessment** – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change in provision. However, the change means that residents will now have to provide their own 'bin bags'. The restriction on the type of bin bag has been taken away, so **any** plastic bag can now be used. As such there is no detrimental impact on any protected characteristic.

**Legislation Considered** – Within the Environmental Protection Act 1990 there is no requirement to provide plastic sacks free of charge to households.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions**– There is a risk that if all rubbish presented is collected there could be an increase in the amount of residual waste collected, however, this additional rubbish would more than likely be largely composed of rubbish which had previously been fly tipped. Therefore this may reduce the amount of fly tipped waste which would have a beneficial impact upon cleanliness within sack collection areas.

The Council will, subject to a successful bid for funding, add cardboard and plastic bottles to weekly recycling collections for the premises affected by this change. This should divert more waste from the residual waste stream to the recycling collections.

There is a potential Health & Safety risk in the way refuse may be presented for collection by households if black bags are not used. Instruction will need to be given to all affected households as to what is and is not acceptable in terms of rubbish containment when presenting for collection. Risk assessments of the operational collection process will need to be re-visited to take into account the variable nature of containment (bags) used by households that will continue to receive the sack collection service.

<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £60,000 (provision of plastic sacks)	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> <b>Investment Required:</b> <b>Staff at Risk:</b>	£60,000 None None	Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b> None	<b>Other Resources used:</b>		

**Service Description:** Economy & Tourism

Economic Development delivers on the Council's objectives for jobs and prosperity. It employs 55 people and is planning to spend £2.2 million in 2012/13. Cabinet decided that from April 2011 it should be funded from grants, contracts and reserves, from which the Council secured a revenue saving of £748,000 in 2012/13 and subsequent years.

As a consequence of further Cabinet decisions to restructure the former Planning & Economic Regeneration Dept, and to revise senior management responsibilities from July 2011, the revenue budget was amended to include a contribution to Economic Development of £251,800 in the 12/13 financial year and subsequent years.

This contribution pays for

- the salary of the Head of Economy & Tourism (£86,356 inclusive of NI, pay & super)
- the salaries of 3 staff (Environmental Regeneration Manager, 2 x Business Investment Officers) transferred from Planning & Economic Regeneration Dept to Economic Development (£120,388 inclusive), and
- £45,094 for supplies and services transferred from Planning & Economic Regeneration Dept to Economic Development. This code is currently over-programmed, with liabilities assigned to it of £32,803 (subscription to Liverpool City Region Local Enterprise Partnership), and £18,609 for a subscription to Mersey Forest (2 years remaining of a 5 year legal agreement, that started April 2010) – a total of £51,412.

**It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change - To reduce this contribution**

**Rationale for service change proposal**

The Council receives value from its subscriptions:

- Membership of the LCR Local Enterprise Partnership, which is the largest LEP in the UK and the lead organisation on Merseyside for jobs & prosperity and advocacy with government. Increasingly, the LEP will be the gateway for regeneration funding, and already manages Growing Places Fund. Participation will be essential to secure Sefton's fair share of post-13 European funding, worth in excess of £250m to Merseyside.
- Advice, assistance and access to external funding from Mersey Forest to stimulate the arboricultural industries and rural economy, reverse the longstanding tree cover deficit, particularly in south Sefton, invest in coastal and countryside habitats and their management, all used by residents and visitors. Mersey Forest has helped to bring 400 hectares of existing woodland into active management and has led on the GreenPrint for Growth Framework for North Liverpool and South Sefton. Mersey Forest project gearing (current year) is £5 for every £1 of partner contributions.

2. Saving. – this is a sustainable level of cost reduction based on

- Elimination of £18k subscription to Mersey Forest (while seeking to remain within the LA consortium that operates it, which will require negotiation with the accountable body Cheshire West & Cheshire to revise the Service Level Agreement)
- Saving of £33k by voluntary reduction of working hours by 2 Business

## Investment Officers

This sustainable reduction would retain:

- Subscription to the LEP (of which Sefton is a founding member)
- Head of Economy & Tourism post (which was confirmed in the 2011 senior management review, and is needed to protect the Council's client-side interest in the ED service)
- Salary cover from reserves and external grants for staff otherwise at risk who meet the business case (Environmental Regeneration Manager, 2 part-time Business Investment Officers). Specifically, the ERM will lead on port-related regeneration investment into south Sefton associated with SuperPort, and the BIOs will help lever in £1.2m of grant associated with the Business Support project of InvestSefton.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** – Reduction in level of service received from the Mersey Forest.

### Impact of Service Change

Service Users – impact to be reviewed with Mersey Forest.

Partners – Potential loss of cohesion across the city region if the core costs and co-ordinating role of Mersey Forest are not shared equally between the Local Authorities.

Council – financial saving

### Communications, Consultations & Engagement –

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

Proposed Timeline:

External consultation – Following 6<sup>th</sup> December Cabinet decision to approve options for external consultation, formal consultation with Mersey Forest will take place until end-January 2013. A report of consultation, an equalities report and a final recommendation will be completed for February Cabinet

Internal consultation – The necessary reduction in hours can be achieved by voluntary means.

Implementation: The public will be notified via E-consult website consultation form.

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

**Legislation Considered** Not believed to be any implications as the service has no statutory duties.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** - Potential liabilities on Sefton as a consequence of



withdrawing the subscription, to Mersey Forest. Consultation with Chester & Cheshire West will determine the likelihood and severity of this risk.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
£0.251k

**Staffing:** 55 (excl. Tourism)

**Other Resources used:**  
£2.2m (external funding)

**Saving 2013/14 (#):**  
**Staff at Risk: 0**

£ 51k Full Year

<p><b>Service Description: Reduce function of the Mayor to the statutory minimum</b> To cease all Mayoral activity apart from the statutory function to Chair the Council meeting.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b> The proposed change is to reduce the function of mayor to the statutory minimum (that is to Chair the Council meeting). The implications of this would be to delete 2 FTE posts and associated budgets.</p> <p>Residual functions such as responding to mayoral correspondence would need to be absorbed into existing structures within other teams.</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal – To reduce costs</b></p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> There will be no resource available for civic hospitality. Responsibility for responding to mayoral engagements will be transferred to an admin post. There would be complete reliance on the Mayor's Charity Committees to support the Mayor's Charity and to organise the Mayor's Charity Ball. There would be no mayoral allowance payable.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> None</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> Reliance on partners such as the Royal British Legion, Holocaust Memorial Day Trust, Mayoral Charity Committees to deliver residual events.</p> <p><b>Council –</b> A decision of the Council on the budget would be sufficient to reduce the civic hospitality programme.</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline <i>Consultation with staff will commence immediately after the option is accepted</i> Implementation: <i>Implementation will take place following the 3 month consultation period.</i></p> <p><i>External consultation done</i></p>
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>
<p><b>Legislation Considered -</b> s 2 of the LGA 1972</p>

<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – The main risk is around sensitive events such as Holocaust Memorial Day and Remembrance Services and the ability of partner organisations to continue the facilitation of these events.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £ £325k <b>Staffing:</b> 2  <b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14</b> This proposal would remove a further £101,800 The residual budget for 2013/14 would be £10,500  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 2</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>

**Service Description: Reduction in Corporate Commissioning and Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service**

**It is proposed to implement the following change** – To rationalise service delivery and reduce costs by £200,000, taking into account the outcomes of the domestic violence review.

**Rationale for service change proposal** – To reduce costs

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** –To ensure that key services can continue would mean that the following options need to be explored:

**Reduction in Overall Management Support** – Currently, there are two Service Managers and it is proposed that that this be reduced to one.

**Reduction and change in Domestic violence (DV) services-** DV services commissioned or delivered by the Council are being reviewed to ensure that they meet the needs of victims. The review has taken longer than anticipated as there have been two domestic homicides in Sefton which prompted two Domestic Homicide Reviews. This has meant that the final conclusions have yet to be reached as lessons will also need to be learnt from the Domestic Homicide Reviews. However, there have been common themes coming through both the DV review and the two Domestic Homicide Reviews. These relate to the need to refocus the governance arrangements and strategic approach to DV taken by Sefton and the need for clearer referral and support mechanisms for victims.

Potential solutions to reduce costs and provide a better service are as follows:

- Strategic expertise for DV can potentially be commissioned from a specialist DV provider to support the Council and partners.
- Integration of the Vulnerable Victim Advocate element within a specialist DV VCF organisation. The majority of DV advocacy services are based in specialist DV services in community/voluntary sector organisations to give them independence, so there is evidence that this is national good practice.

**Reduction in support for neighbourhoods.** Currently, engagement with Members and residents over neighbourhood issues is estimated at weekly calls of 150-200; site visits and walkabouts run at approx. 5 per week minimum; events can range from month to month but over last 6 months there has been one per month. Queries dealt with require a range of responses – some simple answers (simple due to knowledge of staff involved) and some more complex requiring engagement with a range of partners in order to get a response. These queries number at approx 100 per week (conservative estimate) and are generated by Members and residents.

There would be a reduction in neighbourhood support and the service would no longer be able to be point of contact for Parish and Town Councils, who would need to contact the relevant departments or Contact Centre. Town centre management and business engagement of small shops in deprived neighbourhoods would have to reduce proportionately. It would most likely mean that support for neighbourhoods would be focussed at areas of most need.

**Cease specialist equalities support.** Specialist equalities support is currently commissioned and it is proposed that this will end. This would potentially mean that there would be a basic level of service offered by CCNC. However, services would be expected to take more of a role in developing their own Equality Impact Assessments and ensuring that the Public Sector Equality Duties were met.

As the CCNC services reduce, there will be greater expectations on the remaining staff and priorities will have to be agreed with Councillors, residents, partners and communities.

**Impact of Service Change** – There will be consequences on service delivery and support for Councillors, residents and communities.

**Service Users** – A reduction in support for Councillors and residents, who have come to rely heavily on the service in the resolution of enquiries or complaints, would need careful management. Community resilience may be harmed by a reduction in neighbourhood support. Multi agency working and partnerships have been established based on localities which allow professionals to share both service and local knowledge to achieve the best for residents. Support for service users who are high risk victims of DV should improve as part of a wider wrap around range of services provided through a specialist VCF organisation

**Partners** – A significant proportion of the work of the service is partnership dominated. Therefore a number of links to services and external partners will be compromised. Service reduction may necessitate less coordinated and targeted work for the Bonfire and Halloween periods for example, which would impact on partners. The integration of the Vulnerable Victim Advocate Team within a specialist DV VCF organisation would need agreement from the relevant VCF partner.

**Council** – Reduction or loss of coordinated support and resource for Councillors within their wards and areas. This would involve a reduction in site visits and walkabouts with Councillors. There may be an impact in customer satisfaction with the Council. Support to town and village centres in the current economic climate is vital to the reputation of the Council amongst business leaders.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

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

**Proposed Timeline**

Implementation: This will inevitably need careful consideration as to how this will be taken forward as there are potential implications for staff in terms of potential integration within a VCF provider.

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

**Legislation Considered** – Crime and Disorder Act and Public Sector Equalities Duty

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – As the CCNC services reduce, there will be greater expectations on the remaining staff and priorities will have to be agreed with Councillors, residents, partners and communities to mitigate the impact on service users. A full service redesign will be necessary which could include more on-line information and increased information at or to customer access points.

<p><b>2012/13 Service</b>  <b>Budget:</b>£1.1m</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b>  <b>Other Resources used: -</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>     <b>£200,000</b>                      Full Year</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk:</b> 1 Service Manager VER, Possibly 5 staff affected note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>
--	---

<p><b>Service Description:</b> VCF Grants Grants to Voluntary, Community and Faith sector organisations.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b> To potentially reduce funding to VCF organisations who currently receive grant funding.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> One of the recommendations of Cabinet in September 2012 was to review the VCF sector and look at how it could support the delivery of Council priorities with a focus on protecting the most vulnerable and building community resilience.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The outcomes of the review will determine whether VCF activities will change, stop or significantly reduce.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users –</b> Some activities provided by the groups affected may have to stop. In some cases the Council only provides a contribution to the total cost of provision.  <b>Partners –</b> N/a  <b>Council –</b> Less support may be available to the Council from VCF organisations as capacity to respond to Council priorities may be reduced.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline (<i>January 2013</i>) Implementation: (<i>July 2013</i>)</p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered -</b> There is no specific legislation in relation to this.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> There is no legal requirement on the Council to provide grant aid; however the VCF sector does provide valuable services the Council is unable to provide. Risk the Council could be challenged against reducing resources in the sector. Manage by ensuring any proposals to reduce funding have considered equality impacts. Suggested reductions are for services not deemed as essential provision.</p> <p>Disintegration of relationship with VCF organisations affected – avoid by appropriate engagement about service changes and communication of decisions</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b></p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> N/a</p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b> -</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £52,500 Part Year</p> <p><b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £37,500 Full / Part Year</p> <p><b>Staff at Risk:</b></p>

<p><b>Service Description: Double Rating - Reduction in Ranger Service Support</b> Grant subsidy for parishes that are precepting bodies to compensate for the delivery of concurrent functions. These ex-gratia payments to parishes commenced in 1976/77 and were based upon acreage and a further £30,000 for ranger support.</p>			
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b> To reduce funding to Town Council/Parishes for double rating in line with reduction in Council support for Park Rangers</p>			
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Grant subsidy for parishes that are precepting bodies to compensate for the delivery of concurrent functions such as park rangers are subject to review in the light of the general economic situation.</p>			
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The park ranger service for the Council has been reduced in terms of management support and coverage in parks. It is proposed that the double rating subsidy is reduced from the budget to Parish and Town Councils.</p>			
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> Change in what is currently delivered in terms of quality</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> staffing implications to be determined by employing body</p> <p><b>Council –</b> Possibility that service standards may reduce, but Council will expect level of service equivalent to that provided by them with additional services provided by precept to Town/Parish Council.</p>			
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline Consultation by end of February 2013 Implementation: June 2013</p>			
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision.</p>			
<p><b>Legislation Considered -</b> The payment is made to supplement work carried out by Town Councils and Parishes that would normally be the responsibility of the Council there is no direct legislation covering this work however health and safety issues need to be considered in terms of access and visibility.</p>			
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> There is no legal requirement on the Council to provide grant aid; however, completely withdrawing this grant may lead to functions being handed back to the Council and hence additional resource requirements. Poor relationship with Parishes who may be reluctant to carry on services.</p>			
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £229,000</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> N/a</p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b> -</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £25,000</p> <p><b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £5,000</p> <p><b>Investment Required: £</b></p> <p><b>Staff at Risk: NA see above</b></p>	<p><b>Part Year</b></p> <p><b>Part Year</b></p> <p><b>Year?:</b></p>	



## Annex G – Subsidies & Charges

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
Built Environment	D1.30	Pest Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note the ongoing community consultation</li> <li>• consider the option below regarding the introduction of a charge</li> </ul>
	D1.31	Car Parking – Car Parking – On and Off street parking charge increases and the introduction of new on street parking charges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mandate officers to conclude consultations and conduct the relevant statutory notifications to increase charges under the relevant legislation</li> <li>• mandate officers to conclude the necessary statutory processes to introduce new charges for both on and off street parking under the relevant legislation</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

Assume 4.5 pest control officers and 0.5 enforcement officers.

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

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

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

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

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

### **Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – Residents may be requested to pay for treatment or be subject to enforcement action. Residents may choose not to use the Council service and would

<p>have access to local Pest Control companies listed in the Yellow Pages.</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Sewer baiting programme funded by United Utilities (UU) may be affected.</p> <p><b>Council</b> – Estate management may need to provide alternative commercial pest control treatment contracts. Fees would be collected on line and via normal banking processes.</p> <p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> – the current budget plan consultation includes principles relating to the introduction of charges, including Pest Control and the outcomes of this will report in January</p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline <i>Community consultation is ongoing</i> Implementation: <i>1<sup>st</sup> April 2012</i></p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment</b> – Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Prevention of Damage by Pest Act 1949 – Duty to keep borough free of rats and mice. Duty to keep own land free of vermin.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> –</p> <p>There is a risk that pest control becomes less effective and the borough may see a rise in vermin and public health pests with consequent public health implications. The Council’s statutory pest control duties, such as the use of enforcement powers to deal with infestation issues, are not affected by this option. The Council would also continue to provide advice and information to the public on pest control matters.</p> <p>The impact will be highest in the most deprived areas where currently over 50% of service users live. 43% of service users are on Council administered benefits.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £184,000 <b>Staffing: 5</b> <b>Other Resources used:</b> UU Sewer baiting contribution</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £ 20,000 Part Year <b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £ 10,000 Full Year <b>Staff at Risk: TBC</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal Net posts 0 but posts may need to be changed from treatment officers to enforcement officers in order to address failure to treat amongst those unwilling to pay.</p>

**Service Description:** Parking Service parking charges

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

The introduction of a mixture of Parking Charges including On and Off street parking charge increases and the introduction of new on street parking charges.

1. Introduce Charges on Crosby / Waterloo seafront car parks - requires £100k investment which available in earmarked reserves
2. Remove free half hour parking in Crosby Village
3. Introduce charges on car parks at: Sumner Road, Formby, Marian Square, Netherton, Verulam Road (Botanic Gardens), Southport. - requires £38k investment.
4. Off-Street parking charges to increase by approx 30% across the borough
5. On-Street parking charges to increase by approx 30% across the borough

**Rationale for service change proposal –** The Council was due to review its parking tariffs in 2013/14. Consideration has been given to the levels of charges compared with other boroughs and the maximisation of resource balanced with cost of the service.

In the case of Crosby Village, the changes would bring charges in line with Waterloo.

Changes to parking charges are one part of a wider strategy that is designed to manage demand, help cut down on traffic volumes and encourage residents and visitors to consider sustainable transport options such as walking, cycling and public transport. Recent independent research carried out for the government showed that people base their choice of shopping venues on a whole range of factors, not just parking prices.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Number of car parks where parking is free will reduce.

New on street parking will be introduced. The enforcement activity of our enforcement contractor NSL would be spread more thinly to ensure enforcement takes place across new areas.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Motorists will be faced with charges on car parks which have not previously been charged for or increased charges on existing car parks / on street spaces

**Partners –** Would have impact on enforcement activity of our enforcement contractor NSL. Would not require increase in level of resource but existing resource will be spread more thinly to ensure enforcement takes place.

**Council –** Income will be generated.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

Partnership

Items 1 - 3 would be subject to formal consultation and would have to be advertised and any objections considered.

Items 4 & 5 would be by notice so that would just be informing.

Proposed Timeline To be determined based on boroughwide or localised implementation. Implementation: 01.04.2013

In light of the potential impact on the retail trade in Southport, a discussion on the issue of car parking and charging has been arranged for the meeting of the Southport Partnership of December 6th 2012. It is intended to invite stakeholders to suggest options for the future of parking charges in Southport particularly and the borough generally. The outcome of this event will be considered and options brought forward for Cabinets consideration in January 2012.

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

**Legislation Considered** – increases in parking charges and introduction of new charges can be made by Notice or Order under Sections 35, 45 and 46 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – The income figures it is suggested are achievable from an increase in parking charges are estimates and are based on a continued drop in parking number of approx 5% per annum. Significant increases in charges such as those proposed could lead to resistance by the public who may park elsewhere (car parks owned by others) or chose not to make the journey to park. It should also be noted that overall parking numbers and Penalty Charge Notices issued are continuing to fall, this is a pattern be repeated throughout the region and whilst some account has been taken of this in forecasting income levels, future usage cannot be guaranteed.

For new charges on car parks which are currently free to park, there will be resistance from motorists to the charges, this could lead to increase parking on adjacent on-street areas, with the consequent need for expenditure to introduce additional restrictions on these streets.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
-£1,171,150  
**Staffing: 0**  
**Other Resources used:**

**Saving 2013/14 (#):**      **£332,000** Full Year  
**Staff at Risk: 0**

## Annex H – Standards of Service

<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
	D1.32	Closure of all public conveniences across the Borough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>mandate officers to commence consultation with the community and partners as appropriate to effect this change</li></ul>
	D1.33	Cleansing – reorganisation of the workload and work patterns of the Rapid response teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>mandate officers to commence consultation with the employees and Trade Unions as appropriate to effect this change</li><li>note the reduced standards of service that will occur should this budget reduction be agreed</li></ul>
	D1.34	Further deferment in the re-instatement of highway management funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>approve the further deferment of £800k</li></ul>

**Service Description: Cleansing Services – Public Conveniences - Closure**

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

5 x 'Danfo' pay-to-use units: 3 in Southport (Promenade, Eastbank Street, 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. The toilets are currently cleaned by the Cleansing Services Rapid Response Team.

Savings identified in previous years has reduced the cost of the service to £92k per annum.

The 'Danfo' 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.

Public conveniences are also provided at Shore Road, Ainsdale under the management of the Coast and Countryside service, which is also part of Street Scene. For consistency it is recommended that this facility be included in any decision to cease to provide the public convenience service, any saving will be used to offset the approved saving target of £30k in 2013/14 arising from re-engineering of this service.

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

It is proposed to close all of the public conveniences across the Borough, including the current 'pay-to-use' units. To cease the public convenience service.

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

A number of the current public toilets operated by the Council are 'pay to use'. Even with the income generated from these facilities there is still a net cost to the Council of operating both the pay-to-use and the remaining free-to-use toilets.

By ceasing to provide public toilets a saving of £52k per year would be generated. This is less than the current cost of operating the service due to the ongoing costs of 'mothballing' the facilities, coupled with NNDR charges and utilities standing charges.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** There will be no public toilet provision in Sefton.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** - If residents and visitors require the use of a toilet when away from their home they will need to access such provision via private sector facilities such as

shops, restaurants, fast food establishments, public houses and entertainment facilities. Visitors could be signposted to alternative private sector facilities via posters and notices on existing facilities. However, discussions with other such operators have not yet taken place and there may be some resistance from such operators that the Council is promoting 'free to use' facilities in their premises.

**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. For this service the Council receives £20k per year. These toilets are attached to existing Council facilities. Alternative arrangements may need to be made by Arriva should access to these separate facilities be compromised by the closure of the public convenience facility to which it is attached.

**Council** – The five 'Danfo' units are subject to prudential borrowing and therefore costs of £78k per year would still be incurred until 2016. 'Mothballing' (NNDR/other) costs would also still be incurred. It may be possible to 'sell' all of the current toilet facilities but at the time of writing this proposal, this avenue has not been pursued. It is therefore not known at this stage whether there would be any interest from the private sector and/or if this would achieve one-off capital receipts.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

Proposed Timeline Implement in April 2013.

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

**Legislation Considered:** Section 87 of the Public Health Act 1936, local authorities may provide sanitary conveniences [including lavatories] in proper and convenient locations; this is a discretionary power and not a duty.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions**– There is a risk that the lack of public toilet provision may have a detrimental effect upon visitor numbers to a variety of tourist destinations across the Borough.

It may be possible to sell all of the current facilities but any new owner may not wish to operate public convenience facilities in areas where they are be unable to generate a return upon their investment. This may therefore result in the future closure of some of the 'older' facilities. It is unclear at this stage whether any interest would be generated if these facilities could be purchased for an alternative use.

<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £92,000	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> <b>Investment Required:</b>	£52,000 None	Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b> None	<b>Staff at Risk:</b>	None	
<b>Other Resources used:</b>			

**Service Description: Cleansing Service - Rapid Response**

The Rapid Response Teams are responsible for responding to Requests for Service in relation to fly-tipping removal, graffiti removal, siting of litter bins, oil spillages, collection of dead animals from the highway and responding to clean ups following road traffic accidents. Any tree branches that are fallen are also collected, as is fallen debris from vehicles. The Rapid Response Team also thoroughly clean subways on a rolling programme. All cenotaphs are currently cleaned prior to Remembrance Sunday.

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

It is proposed to review the operation of the Rapid Response function in response to the wider Cleansing Services Review to produce further economies of scale as per the detail below. This can only take place once the full impact of the planned reduction of 15 cleansing staff in April 2013 is assessed. Therefore, this proposal will be designed to take effect from September 2013 (Quarter 3)

**Rationale for service change proposal –** This reduction will result in a saving of £25,000 from September 2013 to March 2014, rising to £50,000 for the period 2014/15.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** The review will affect the time available to respond to requests for graffiti removal. The current response times are 48 hours for offensive graffiti and 28 days for non-offensive graffiti. The anticipated response times will be significantly higher following the review and would increase to 72 hours for offensive graffiti, with non-offensive graffiti being removed within a 2 month period.

Response to road traffic accidents and oil spillages are dealt with as a priority. At the current time, crews are pulled from graffiti duty to respond to other more pressing incidents, as they arise, so increasing the time it takes for graffiti to be removed. Dependant upon the amount of accidents/incidents in any given period, there may be further impacts upon time available to remove graffiti within the time period above.

There is also a significant possibility of increased fly tipping due to the extra time required to respond to fly tipping incidents. The crews currently check the fly tipping 'hot spots' on a weekly basis, removing any items that have been dumped. Additional pressures upon the Rapid Response teams resulting from the deletion of 15 operative posts may lead to a reduction in response times to a fortnightly/three weekly cycle.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** By decreasing the ability to respond and provide services within shorter periods of time, areas may appear more unkempt where graffiti/fly tipping is not removed quickly.

**Partners –** removal of graffiti by the Probation Service's "Pay Back" scheme will not be affected by this proposal.

**Council –** Complaints to Elected Members may increase and there will be a significant delay in responding to lower priority incidents. There will also be a detrimental environmental affect due to a perceived lowering of standards.



<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/>	
Proposed Timeline Reduce service levels by September 2013	
<b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> There are no proposed changes which will affect or disadvantage any individual or specific group with protected characteristics. Any changes proposed will affect all residents equally across the Borough	
<b>Legislation Considered –</b> The requirements of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 have been considered in the development of this proposal	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> There is a risk that levels of cleanliness across the Borough will be noticeably poorer, especially in relation to graffiti removal. During the implementation phase of the previously agreed Cleansing Review in 2013/14, additional resource will be allocated via the ‘Rapid Response’ services to allow areas of concern to be dealt with. However, it is expected that service delivery patterns will be established and area support mechanisms identified by September 2013, allowing for a further reorganisation and reduction in cleansing frequencies for graffiti removal, thereby providing an additional saving.	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £150,000  <b>Staffing:</b> 6  <b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £ 25,000 Part Year (from Q3) <b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £ 25,000 Full Year <b>Staff at Risk:</b> None affected

## HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE

Current maintenance strategies have been predicated on the basis that the full temporary saving of £1.2 million is returned for 2014/15. If £800,000 is further deferred then it will put at risk the maintenance strategy which is at present focusing upon short term repairs to mitigate potential liability, subject to return of the £1.2m into maintenance budgets. A further deferment will see the condition of highways, railings, bollards and street furniture decline, potentially lead to increased claims for injury / damage as a result and lead to increased insurance costs due to an increase in the number of successful claims against the Council.

## Annex I – Vulnerable People

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
D1.35	Section 117 After Care funding – The Council will pursue, with our Health colleagues, the identification of service users who receive 117 funding and request reviews to see if they still require this provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree the approach</li> <li>• note that consultation will take place as part of ongoing care package reviews which will be conducted by Health colleagues</li> <li>• consider and take account of the impact assessment</li> <li>• note that reviews will be undertaken of all people with a section 117 to ensure the needs still fall within the Council's eligibility criteria</li> </ul>
D1.36	NHS continuing healthcare - prioritise and undertake reviews of service users currently in nursing care to ensure that they are supported appropriately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree the approach</li> <li>• note that consultation will take place as part of ongoing care package reviews which will be conducted by Health colleagues</li> </ul>
D1.37	Use of Assistive Technology (equipment that enables service users (vulnerable people) to remain in their own homes with minimal outside support for e.g. Lifeline pendants that are connected to the Careline service.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree the approach</li> <li>• note that consultation will take place as part of ongoing care package reviews</li> </ul>
D1.38	<p>Increase charges for a range of services, these are an increase of charges to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of disposable income (currently 80%) - Currently Service users will contribute 80% of their disposable income toward their care or service costs and this option will mean a change in Council policy so that 100% of disposable income is considered in the financial assessment process.</li> <li>• Reduce disability related expenditure (DRE) which presently stands at £16.00 per user per week to £11.00 per week. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> <li>• Couples - disregard income buffer when assessing care needs. This option will mean a change in Council policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider the changes in policy</li> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> <li>• defer the achievement of £75k relating to the previously approved option E2.8 (Area Finance)</li> </ul>
D1.39	Further remodel current day care and associated transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree the commencement of consultation and engagement process with partners and service users</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will in part take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> </ul>
D1.40	Recover surplus, unspent Direct Payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider and note the process for recovery</li> <li>• consider the option to cease the first year one off workplace insurance payment of £150</li> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of the assessment and review process</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> </ul>
D1.41	Respite - reduction from a range up to a maximum of 2 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider and recommend the change in policy to Council</li> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> <li>• recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £1.9m</li> </ul>
D1.42	Revise Re-ablement model - To obtain new funding available from Health of £900,000, one year only, to enable more users to go through a re-ablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short & long term care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider and recommend the change in approach to Council</li> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> <li>• recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £1.2m</li> </ul>
D1.43	Housing Related Support incremental reductions in housing related funding have reduced the requirement for commissioning/ contractual functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider and recommend the change in policy to Council</li> <li>• note that consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</li> <li>• note that the Council will continue to meet assessed need</li> <li>• recommend to Council the approval of a budget reduction of £500k</li> </ul>

<p><b>Service Description: Section 117 Funding</b>  Everyone with mental health needs is entitled to a community care assessment to establish what services they might need. However, section 117 goes much further than this and imposes a duty on health and social services to provide aftercare services to certain patients who have been detained under the Act.</p> <p>Health Services are required to fund the nursing element of care associated with diagnosed mental illness and Social Care are required to fund social care and community needs for example domiciliary care or support.</p>		
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> To work with Health colleagues to undertake reviews of (currently) 240 service users who are subject to Section 117 aftercare funding.</p>		
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> At present service users who are subject to Section 117 aftercare do not have a financial assessment if they are in receipt of care following a Court ruling. This means that once a service user qualifies for Section 117 funding, the funding is rarely reduced or removed. This option will introduce a methodology for process to review each case on an individual basis.</p>		
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The Council will pursue, with our Health colleagues, the identification of service users who receive 117 funding and request reviews to see if they still require this provision.</p>		
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> Possible financial impact to the service user if reduced. However a full review would dictate the appropriateness of the continued funding e.g. mental health assessment advocates. Some service users may be impacted by the accumulative affect of the removal of subsidies and this option.</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> Increased assessments and reviews carried out by partners in Merseycare Mental Health Trust.</p> <p><b>Council –</b> Assessments and reviews carried out by staff seconded to Merseycare</p>		
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews undertaken by Health colleagues.</p> <p>Partner – Initial discussions have taken place with Merseycare and will continue in January.</p>		
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> See <i>Equality Analysis Report below</i></p>		
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> Section 117 of the Mental Health Act 1983 - obliges councils and the NHS to provide aftercare services, including a care home place if that is needed, for people who have been discharged from hospital having been detained for treatment under the Mental Health Act 1983.</p>		
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Service users may present legal challenge if funding withdrawn. This is mitigated by following policy and procedures for re-assessment</p>		
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b></p> <p><b>Staffing:</b></p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £200,000</p> <p><b>Investment Required:</b> £ Nil</p> <p><b>Staff at Risk:</b> Nil</p>	<p>Full Year</p>

# Equality Analysis Report

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

What is Section 117?

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

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

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

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

## Discharge of section 117 aftercare

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

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

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

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

### **Ramifications of Proposal:**

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

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

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

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

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

### **Consultation.**

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

Partners to decide time frame.

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

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

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

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

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

<p><b>Service Description: NHS Continuing Health Care Funding</b>  NHS continuing healthcare is a package of continuing care provided outside hospital, arranged and funded solely by the NHS, for people with ongoing healthcare needs.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to</b> prioritise and undertake reviews of service users currently in nursing care to ensure that they are supported appropriately.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – To be eligible for NHS continuing healthcare, the main or primary need for care must relate to the service users health.</p> <p>For example, people who are eligible are likely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• have a complex medical condition that requires a lot of care and support</li> <li>• need highly specialised nursing support</li> </ul> <p>Someone nearing the end of their life is also likely to be eligible if they have a condition that is rapidly getting worse and may be terminal.</p> <p>Eligibility for NHS continuing healthcare does not depend on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a specific health condition, illness or diagnosis</li> <li>• who provides the care, or</li> <li>• where the care is provided</li> </ul> <p>If the service user has a disability, or is diagnosed with a long-term illness or condition, this doesn't necessarily mean that they will be eligible for NHS continuing healthcare.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – It is forecast that some of these reviews will mean a number of LA funded cases will meet the eligibility criteria for CHC.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change</b> –</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> – The impact on service users will be minimal, health professionals are required to undertake such reviews now and in doing so would seek to provide the most appropriate care where someone is eligible for care they are not required to make a contribution.</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Increased costs for Health</p> <p><b>Council</b> – None</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> – consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews</p> <p>Partner – Initial discussions with Health took place in November and indications are of a positive nature. Further meetings to discuss methodology and process will continue through December and January.</p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment</b> – Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – NHS Continuing Healthcare responsibilities 2007.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – The Council and Health may not have the capacity to review CHC cases.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b></p> <p><b>Staffing:</b></p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15</b>            <b>£400,000</b></p> <p><b>Investment Required:</b> £ Nil</p> <p><b>Staff at Risk:</b> Nil</p>

## **Service Description Assistive Technology**

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

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

Review all services where assistive technology can be utilised as an alternative  
This may result in increased use of assistive technology for example

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

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

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

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

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

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

- better targeted timing and sizing of care packages and support



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

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Some service users and care support staff will require additional and further training in the use of various solutions.

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –** consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments and reviews

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

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

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

- Care staff may not be onsite (depending on individual need), therefore not immediately available, however, support will still be readily accessible. The mitigation associated with this risk is described above i.e. service users will be given full training and quality assurance processes will be put in place.
- Potential to include new clauses in contracts regarding overnight emergencies.
- For many service users AT will be one element of their support package, which may also include regular visits by care staff and other workers
- Understanding the range of AT options available and communicating the benefits either to those who assess potential users of the service, or directly to the potential users and their families.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
**Staffing:**  
**Other Resources used:**

**Saving 2014/15 (#): £200,000** Year  
**Investment Required: £**  
**Staff at Risk: Nil**

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

**It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –** Increase client charges for a range of non-residential services as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

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

**Partners –None**

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External & Partners)  Engage

With consideration to the required consultation and system development it is recommended that the proposed changes be implemented part year, this allows for 12 weeks consultation, and for systems to be developed to calculate contributions and monitor proposed changes.

Suggested implementation approach:

- Further detailed analysis of client data.
- A 12 week period of public consultation regarding the proposal.
- Consultation analysis.
- Report to Cabinet and Council.
- Notification of proposed changes to charges to all clients.
- Implementation:
  - System configuration.
  - Financial re-assessments.
  - Manage enquiries, providing information, advice and guidance.
  - Manage appeals process.

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

**Legislation Considered –**

Health and Social Services and Social Security Adjudications Act 1993

Policy Guidance:

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

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –** Clients may refuse to pay increased charges and may cancel the services they receive and this may impact on their health and wellbeing. There is a potential risk to income generated as a result of the impact of Welfare Reform and the Council Tax Support Scheme that reduce the income of working age clients, as well as reduced income from clients who cancel services. The Welfare Rights team will ensure advice and assistance is offered to all clients.

Discretion may need to be considered on an individual basis where the proposed increase is significantly above the average. The Financial Visiting Officers will be responsible for managing all appeals and presenting cases where discretion should be considered, they will also retain responsibility for all new assessments and for re-assessments.

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

	<b>Part year saving 2013/14 : £444,000</b> <b>Full year saving 2014/15: £120,000</b> <b>Investment Required: £ Nil</b> <b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b>
--	---

**Service Description Day Care and associated specialist transport provision**

Day Care provides care for a person during the day. It is provided away from the person's home. The purpose of day care - as part of Community Care - is to help people remain living at home as an alternative to living in some form of residential or nursing home. Day care offers benefits both to the people who receive it and to any carers who look after them. New day opportunities will enable service users to re-learn skills they may have lost through illness or disability or to learn new skills they need to cope with changing circumstances.

The Council also provides a specialist transport service for day care users.

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

Further remodelling of current day services and opportunities which may result in the utilisation of an alternative approach to all day opportunities and associated transport. This may also mean the closure of a number of day centres.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** The Council is seeking to move service users towards greater independence by transforming day opportunities.

This option proposes that in the future day opportunities are shaped by how best to meet assessed needs and made more appropriate to people who use them. It is anticipated that demand for more traditional day services, which are often provided from a day centre, will reduce as a greater number of people choose from a wider range of activities and services.

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

- The use of alternative solutions to traditional day care facilities, that may include the closure of a number of day centres
- Evidence suggests that the numbers attending traditional day centres will fall. For all those who do not have complex needs the intention is to signpost them to alternative solutions e.g. Arts & Culture, Leisure Centres Voluntary, Community, Faith Sector activities.
- A change in transport and routes. Further details will emerge following the completion of an adult transport remodelling exercise.
- Depending on the alternative solution, current day care facilities/ estate will be reviewed regarding future use.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Alternative opportunities for current day care service users

**Partners –** Some Day care providers' offer will change. This function is mainly provided by Sefton New Directions

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

Sefton New Directions pilot (September Cabinet F3.2) has now ceased and in a period of evaluation. It is anticipated that the outcome of the pilot will be reported to Cabinet in January 2013

Targeted consultation with service users – To commence following Cabinet approval

Consultation with Transport staff - To commence following Cabinet approval

Consultation with SND – Commenced December 2012

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

**Legislation Considered** – National Assistance Act 1948, Local Authority Circular (93)10

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Increasing dependency of service users currently accessing day care – the Council will signpost service users to universal services which will enable more accessible and inclusive opportunities.

Risk to the operation of the Specialist Transport Unit – the Council would remodel this service accordingly.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
**£5.1m**

**Saving 2014/15 (#):** minimum of £1.4m

**Investment Required: £ Nil**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Current Direct Payments would be reassessed and potentially reduced throughout the year and the workplace insurance payments for new Direct Payments recipients will cease.

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

**Equality Impact Assessment –** Equality implications will be assessed should

Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision

**Legislation Considered** – Health and Social Care Act 2001  
Dept. of Health Best Practice Guidance on Direct Payments, 2009.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – Service Users are assessed according to their individual needs. Direct payments should be sufficient to enable the recipient to lawfully secure a service of a standard that the Council considers appropriate to fulfil the need of the service to which the payment relates. In estimating the reasonable costs of securing the support required, the Council should include associated costs that are necessarily incurred in securing that provision.

	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#): £752,000</b> Year
	<b>Investment Required: £ Nil</b>
	<b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b>



<p><b>Service Description Respite Provision for Adults</b>  Respite care is the provision of short-term, temporary relief to those who are caring for family members who might otherwise require permanent placement in a facility outside the home. Respite care provides planned short-term and time-limited breaks for families and other unpaid care givers of adults in order to support and maintain the primary care giving relationship.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –</b>  Respite offer to be reduced from a range up to a maximum of two weeks per year from the current allowance. The proposed changes will maximise the use of available respite days according to actual usage.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> The Council currently provides residential respite and crisis services for vulnerable adults. An analysis of short breaks has revealed that not all allocated respite care is utilised.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Reduction of length of respite stays for service users. Respite offer will be reduced to a maximum of two weeks per year. This will also involve re-commissioning of current block contracting arrangements and with a potential alternative approach.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> Approximately 500 service users have accessed respite to date this year. There will be a reduced number of respite days available that will reflect assessed need and usage rates.</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> Care providers will need to review their provision and new provision will be commissioned. This will impact on partners such as Sefton New Directions (cumulative impact associated with other options) and Parkhaven.</p> <p><b>Council –</b> None</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b>None</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>  Challenge from service users and carers, mitigated by individual assessments and reviews</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>  <b>£3.8m</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14/15 (#):</b> minimum of £1,900,000  <b>Investment Required:</b> £ Nil  <b>Staff at Risk:</b> Nil</p>

**Service Description: Re-ablement**

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

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

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

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

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

- maximise independence
- minimise whole life cost of care.

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

**Council** – A number of studies have shown impressive results, both in personal and financial terms, following the increased use of assistive technologies in enabling people to stay in their homes for longer by being more self-sufficient. A wide range of interventions are currently being developed and assessed within the Council's Careline Services and will be ready for deployment by 2013/14. Further details of all of these proposed new services and solutions will be presented prior to their implementation by April 2013.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement** – consultation about this approach will take place as part of ongoing care package assessments

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

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

**Legislation Considered –**

Community Care (Delayed Discharges, etc) Act (Qualifying Services)(England) Regulations 2003

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

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

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

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

The utilisation of such new technologies also allows for the development of new opportunities and clients groups, and the adoption of a more commercial approach to these new markets. This may include clients in a wider geographical area outside of the Borough, as well as opportunities to work with new and alternative service suppliers on a regional and even national basis.

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

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

<p><b>Service Description Housing Related Support (Commissioning Budget)</b>  Housing Related Support (previously Supporting People) was a Government run programme that funded services to help older people and others to live independently at home. Local Councils had responsibility for identifying what the local needs were, for funding the services to meet those needs, and making sure that the services were effective and of good quality. They had contracts with the organisations providing the services which specify the type of service to be provided. This once ring-fenced budget has now been integrated within the council's base budget and forms part of the Adults Community Care budget.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option – A</b> further reduction of the budget for housing related support services</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Incremental reductions in housing related funding have reduced the requirement for commissioning/contractual functions.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> In the main, the housing related support services are commissioned discretionary services intended to meet low level support needs.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> Reduction or cessation of housing related support services  <b>Partners –</b> reduction in funding to service providers.  <b>Council –</b> A small number of services are commissioned within the Council, reductions to funding for those services could have human resource implications.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Extensive consultation has previously taken place</p>	
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment –</b> Equality implications will be assessed should Members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> None</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>There is a potential that a reduction in funding for housing related support services will lead to negative impacts for the vulnerable people supported by the services, including those with protected characteristics of age, disability, gender and those in receipt of care packages for assessed care needs. Any impact will be mitigated as far as possible within care management practices.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £4.7m</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b> Partner organisations commissioned to deliver current activity</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14</b> Nil  <b>Saving 2014/15</b> £500,000 Year  <b>Investment Required:</b> £ Nil  <b>Staff at Risk:</b> Nil</p>