

**Report to:** Cabinet

**Date of Meeting:** 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013

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

**Report of:** Head of Transformation Services & Head of Finance & ICT  
**Wards Affected:** All

**Is this a Key Decision?** Yes

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

**Exempt/Confidential** No

---

## **Executive Summary**

The report to 31<sup>st</sup> January Cabinet updated on the outcome of consultation on options previously approved for consultation, recommending what should now be included in the final two year Budget Plan and identified further new budget options and assumptions for consideration and consultation.

This report updates on the outcome of consultation on a number of options previously approved for consultation and presents the outcomes of the consultation with residents on an increase in the Council Tax. No new options are presented in this report.

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

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

		<b>Annexes</b>
Part 1	Background	
Part 2	Consultation and Engagement	
Part 3	Options previously approved for Consultation	A
Part 4	Risk	
Part 5	Next Steps & Conclusion	

## **Recommendations**

**Cabinet is recommended to**

### **Part 1 Background**

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

## Part 2 Consultation & Engagement

- b) note and take account of the feedback on Consultation and Engagement in part 2 when taking decisions on the recommendations to Council including the outcomes of the consultation with residents on Council Tax.

## Part 3 Options previously approved for consultation

### Public Sector Equality Duty

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

## Annex A

- d) consider the options in Annex A and have due regard to the information contained, consider these options and recommend their approval to Council and authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately pending final decisions of Council including the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notification, if appropriate to achieve change.

## Part 4 Risk

- e) note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in the Annex of this report in making its recommendations to Council

and

- f) agree the outcome of 31<sup>st</sup> January Cabinet and budget options in this report be incorporated into the budget to be recommended to Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services) on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2013 and Council on February 28<sup>th</sup> 2013.

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

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

## Reasons for the recommendations

The recommendations in this report, if approved, will bring the Council closer to agreeing the 2013/14 budget and a two year budget plan.

## FD2093 What will it cost and how will it be financed?

### (A) Revenue Costs

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

### (B) Capital Costs

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

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

### Implications:

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

#### Legal LD1409

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

#### Human Resources

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

#### Equality

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

**Impact on Service Delivery:**

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

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

- A questionnaire available on the Councils website, in libraries, One Stop Shops and Town Halls on setting a balanced budget
- Over 50 meetings and workshops with the public, voluntary, community and faith networks as part of the consultation on the Sefton Strategic Needs Assessment
- A telephone survey on setting a balanced budget
- The use of You Choose the budget simulator via the website
- Bespoke consultations such as libraries, public conveniences and burials and cremations.
- Older People Expert Stakeholder Panel
- Consultation on increasing the Council Tax via an e-form on the Councils website, a hard copy questionnaire in Town Halls and One Stop Shops and an impartial telephone survey.

Regular and ongoing consultations have taken place with Directors, employees and Trade Unions. Further information is contained in the annex of this report.

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

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

**Implementation Date for the Decision**

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

**Contact Officers:**

Margaret Rawding, Head of Corporate Finance & ICT

Tel: 0151 934 4082

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

Jan McMahon, Head of Transformation Services

Tel: 0151 934 4431

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

**Background Papers are available at**

<http://sb1msgov1:9070/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13417&path=13193>

- Feedback reports on the consultation and engagement on Council Tax
- Feedback following consultation on the proposal 'Cleaving - cease provision of free plastic sacks excluding those premises which are currently identified as 'difficult to access' (D1.24)

## **Part 1 Background**

- 1.1 The report to 31<sup>st</sup> January Cabinet updated on the outcome of consultation on options previously approved for consultation, recommending what should now be included in the final two year Budget Plan and identified further new budget options and assumptions for consideration and consultation.
- 1.2 This report updates on the outcome of consultation on other options previously approved for consultation.
- 1.3 Cabinet is asked to note that figures in the annex are working assumptions of options to be considered and the figures should not be seen as predetermining any decisions. **Some of these options remain subject to consultation, engagement and Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) assessment, and any figures indicated are being used to facilitate outline budgetary forecasting only.**

## **Part 2 Consultation & Engagement**

- 2.1 An initial package of potential budget options was approved by Cabinet, 13th September 2012, to commence consultation and engagement on setting a balanced budget.
- 2.2 Formal consultation on setting a balanced budget commenced on the 15th October 2012 and closed on the 7th January 2013. The purpose of the consultation was to seek the views of the public on a set of principles to assist the Council in the development of policies in relation to service areas.
- 2.3 Members will recall that the findings of the consultation and engagement were reported in full to Members at the meeting of Cabinet on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013. In summary respondents were in broad agreement with the principles that the Council should endeavour to prioritise services for the most vulnerable, that the Council should deliver value for money through efficiency and the buying of services before reducing or ceasing services.
- 2.4 **Feedback on the consultation on Council Tax**
  - 2.4.1 In January 2013 the Council consulted residents to gauge their views on an indicative increase in the Council Tax of an average of £1.50 per household per week. This average increase would raise an additional income of £6 million every year, thereby reducing the amount of savings to be made. The consultation consisted of an on-line e-form questionnaire, an impartial telephone survey, hard copy questionnaires in Town Halls and One Stop Shops and press releases. The on-line consultation ran from the 15<sup>th</sup> January to the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013. The telephone survey, in order to reach a thousand residents, ran from 15<sup>th</sup> January to the 4<sup>th</sup> February 2013.
  - 2.4.2 The consultation sought to gauge the opinion of local residents on their willingness to pay an average increase of £1.50 per week. If people were not willing to pay an average of £1.50, would they be prepared to pay another amount? In order to be assured that only local residents took part in the consultation the questionnaire included a mandatory box for the full postcode, all non Sefton post codes have been removed from the data base, and the telephone survey included only Sefton based residents

2.4.3 The results of the consultation are as follows:

- **e-form and Questionnaire Feedback**

#### 2.4.4 Headline Outcomes

##### **On-line Form and Questionnaire Feedback**

In total 1216 people responded to the on-line consultation; 1209 were from Sefton postcodes and six were from postcodes outside of the borough and these have been removed from the data. These results are not weighted therefore represent the actual feedback received.

- Of those who responded to the questionnaire 39% (466) said they would be prepared to pay an average increase of £1.50 per week in their Council Tax
- 61% (741) said they would not be willing to pay an average increase of £1.50 per week in their Council Tax
- of the total respondents 9% (107) said they would be prepared to pay another amount, which included amounts ranging from 20p up to an additional £5 per week.
- 14% (107) of those who said no to a £1.50 per week average increase did agree they would pay another amount, with the majority agreeing to pay either an additional 50p or a pound per week.

- **Telephone Survey Feedback**

2.4.5 In total 1002 residents took part in the survey. These results have been quota controlled and weighted to the local population on deprivation, age, work status, gender and disability and therefore are a representative sample.

- Of those who responded to the survey 63% (620) said they would be prepared to pay an increase of £1.50 per week in their Council Tax
- Of those who said no to the question 'Would you be prepared to pay an average increase of £1.50 per week in Council Tax?' 64% (245) said they would not be prepared to pay any increase in their Council Tax
- Of the 23% (92) who said they would be prepared to pay another amount responses ranged from less than 24p up to less than £1.49. 13% of respondents (10) said 25p, 37% (33) said 50p, 14% (8) said 75p, and 27% (25)

2.4.6 Full feedback reports on this consultation and engagement are attached as background documents.

2.4.7 Should Cabinet wish to proceed to make an increase in the Council Tax this would require a referendum. Cabinet is asked to note and take account of this feedback on taking their decisions on their recommendations to Council regarding Council Tax levels. It should be noted that the current plan assumes a Council Tax freeze for 2013/14.

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

- 3.1 **Annex A** contains a number of options which were previously approved for consultation and are now presented for further consideration. Cabinet is asked to consider the change proposals in Annex A.
- 3.2 These options have been updated in light of the consultation and are now presented for consideration and to make the appropriate recommendation to Council. Should further related opportunities and or significant issues arise with respect to these options between now and next Cabinet, officers will advise Members accordingly. Having due regard for the information contained in Annex A Cabinet is asked to consider these proposals and recommend their approval to Council and authorise Officers to prepare for implementation immediately, pending final decisions of Council including the issue of relevant statutory and contractual notifications, if appropriate to achieve change.
- 3.3 F4.2 Review – Voluntary Community & Faith (VCF). In accordance with previous approvals by Cabinet, a number of organisations have been given notice of a potential reduction in funding. Details of these changes are listed below:

Organisation	Value of Saving/Reduction	Reason
Sefton CVS – Infrastructure Support	£50,000 – 2013/14	Service efficiencies
Benefiting Older Persons Fund	£50,000 – 2013/14	Small grants pot that funds one off activities.

This saving of £100,000 will contribute towards the budget reduction of £0.940m phased over the two year period. Lead officers have been in discussions with each of the organisations impacted to secure reductions in funding and or the decommissioning of activities. This will continue with clear engagement mechanisms being put in place through partnership arrangements. The Quality Assurance group has reviewed these proposals and recognises that commissioning arrangements will ensure that PSED will be considered as part of the decommissioning and recommissioning process.

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

- 3.4.1 Members are aware that as the Council continues to put actions into place to set a sustainable budget plan for 2013/14 and 2014/15 there is a need to be clear and precise about our processes to ensure that duties under the Equality Act 2010 are met. The Council constantly builds in to its thinking the equality implications to changes in services and mitigating risk as appropriately as possible. This research and subsequent findings are put before Members in the form of quality assurance statements or reports to ensure that Members make decisions in an open minded balanced way showing due regard to the impact of the recommendations being presented in compliance with the Equality Act 2010.
- 3.4.2 The options outlined in Annex A have been and continue to be subject to appropriate consultation, engagement and PSED analysis as part of the process of assessing impact in order to have due regard to the Council's obligations under the Equality Act

2010. Where appropriate a PSED analysis report and/or statement is provided which identifies any potential impact on those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions to be taken should any risks remain. Cabinet is requested to note and take account of the detail within the PSED analysis reports or statements, the consultation feedback and the mitigating actions within each option in taking their decisions on the recommendations to Council.

- 3.4.3 Reducing budgets and activities is a difficult task, and one that the Council has to balance with the needs of the community. It is clear from the Sefton Strategic Needs Assessment and feedback from our local population, that the people of Sefton recognise that some members of our community need more support and services than others. In reviewing the recommendations within the reports presented, Members need to endeavour to keep this in view and balance the needs of the few with the needs of the general population whilst showing due regard to all statutory duties.
- 3.5 Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures and this will include regular HR monitoring reports to the Cabinet Member Corporate Services.
- 3.6 Cabinet is asked to identify any further information required, if any, for consideration at 28<sup>th</sup> February Council.

#### **Part 4 Risk**

- 4.1 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 in the Council's budget of the level required by Government cannot be achieved in a risk free environment. There will be significant risk associated with the budget options, which will be mitigated where possible. It must be recognised that it is no longer possible to mitigate all aspects of risk. In those circumstances steps will be taken to ensure they are identified and managed within the limited resources available.
- 4.2 All options contained in the annex of this report have been risk assessed by the relevant senior officers with mitigating actions identified where possible. These risks have been assessed and will be managed in the light of new financial forecasts. Cabinet is asked to note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in making its recommendations to Council.
- 4.3 Officers continue to monitor risks and issues, escalating significant risks and issues to Cabinet as appropriate.

#### **Part 5 Next Steps & Conclusion**

- 5.1 At its meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013, the Cabinet agreed a series of recommendations which, if accepted by Council, would produce a balance two year budget plan. A number of these options were working assumptions previously approved for consultation. This report details those options where consultation is considered complete and is therefore now presented for consideration. Approval of the recommendations will make the budget plan more robust. However it is recognised that consultation remains outstanding on a number of options previously approved and therefore work will continue prior to the Budget Council meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> February.



It must be stressed that this report does not contain any new options not previously considered by the Cabinet.

5.2 At its meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> February, the Cabinet will consider its final budget recommendation to Council of the same day. This will include:

- any further consultation outcomes
- the recommended phasing of the two year plan,
- any final recommendations to Council on budget options, Council Tax and outstanding reviews e.g. Libraries

## Annex A Options previously approved for consultation

<b>Ref</b>	<b><u>Option</u></b>	<b><u>Recommendations</u></b>
D1.23	Aiming High – Review of Integrated Short Breaks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note that this option can now be delivered through improved ways of working and more efficient procurement of supplies and services and will no longer require consultation</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £55k</li> </ul>
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>• agree to cease provision of free plastic sacks excluding those premises which are currently identified as ‘difficult to access’</li> <li>• to consider, and note and agree the contents of the consultation report</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £60k</li> </ul>
D1.32	Increase the charge for pay-to-use facilities and where feasible introduce a charge for use at all public convenience facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to consider increasing the charge for pay-to-use facilities and where feasible introduce a charge for use at all public convenience facilities,</li> <li>• consider a reduction in the current portfolio of facilities provided</li> <li>• to commit to the ongoing provision of facilities for the sole use of Arriva staff</li> <li>• to consider reducing the budget for repair, maintenance and vandalism on the understanding that should any significant work be necessary this may result in the closure of a facility due to a lack of funding.</li> <li>• to consider and note the brief overview from consultation and agree to a full report being presented to Council</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £40k based on the details stated above as an alternative to closure</li> </ul>
D1.33	Cleansing – reorganisation of the workload and work patterns of the Rapid Response Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• note the reduced standards of service that will occur should this budget reduction be agreed</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £75k</li> </ul>

D1.25	Re-finance the Mersey Forest subscription to make a saving on the revenue budget; accept voluntary reduction in working hours from two staff; and make further savings in supplies and services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to re-align costs and budgets in Economy &amp; Tourism</li> <li>• to note the voluntary reduction in hours</li> <li>• to consider, and note the consultation information</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £51k</li> </ul>
D1.27	Corporate Commissioning and Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service – rationalise service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to effect any change (subject to any required employee/ Trade Union consultation) as necessary through HR procedures that may involve VR/VER</li> <li>• to consider, note the contents of the consultation report</li> <li>• to consider, note the contents of the Impact Assessment</li> <li>• recommend to Council a budget planning assumed reduction of £200k</li> </ul>
D1.34	Further deferment in the re-instatement of Highway Management funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recommend to Council a budget reduction of £800k for the purposes of budget planning</li> </ul>

**D1.23 Service Description: Aiming High – Review of Integrated Short Breaks**

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 implement the following change option** –Through improved ways of working and more efficient procurement of supplies, the budget reduction will be achieved and services will not impacted on. This means that this option will no longer require consultation.

**Rationale for service change proposal** – To ensure better value for money

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** –  
Better and more efficient procurement

**Impact of Service Change** –

**Service Users** -. None

**Partners** – Commissioned activities will be reviewed

**Council** – None

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement** –

Type Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Inform

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to working practices and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change.

**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** – None

2012/13 Service Budget: £1.2m

Saving 2013/14 (#): £55k

Investment Required: £ Nil

Staffing:

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

**D1.24 Service Description: Cleansing Services - Provision of Plastic Refuse Sacks**

Free clear plastic refuse sacks are currently provided twice a year to approx 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 implement the following change –**

It is proposed to cease provision of free sacks to approx 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 approx 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

Residents were consulted on the proposal to cease the provision of free plastic refuse sacks

and ask households to buy their own sacks from retailers. In return, any type of sack up to a standard 70 litre refuse sack, and any number of sacks per property, would be collected.

In addition to this, there would be an enhanced waste recycling service for households, who receive the weekly plastic sack refuse collection service as a result of grant funding obtained by Sefton Council.

Three options were proposed to residents receiving the service during the consultation:

- Option A – Keep the existing free of charge but limited sack service
- Option B – the Council makes available plastic refuse sacks, that can be purchased and collected by residents and continues to collect a limited quantity (2 per week) of only Council approved plastic sacks each week; or,
- Option C – households provide and use their own type of plastic sacks/bags and the Council agrees to collect all plastic sacks/bags of residual waste placed out for collection.

Consultation feedback was received from 57 of the 1,400 householders contacted, 53 online via eConsult, the council's consultation system, and four by email or letter.

The consultation shows that:

- Nearly two thirds of respondents were in favour of Option C, full report is attached as a background document.

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – 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, following 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 clear plastic sacks 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.

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

**D1.32 Service Description:                    Cleansing Services – Public Conveniences**

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 Str  
  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 external Contractors under existing arrangements.

Savings identified in previous years have reduced the overall cost of the service to £92k per annum. This includes a range of ‘fixed’ costs such as non-domestic rates, utility charges and ongoing repair and maintenance charges across all of the public conveniences.

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 consider the introduction of charging for the use of these facilities.

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

It is proposed to;

- Increase the charge for pay-to-use facilities and where feasible introduce a charge for use at all public convenience facilities
- To consider reducing the current portfolio of facilities provided
- To commit to the ongoing provision of facilities for the sole use of Arriva staff and
- To reduce the budget for repair, maintenance and vandalism on the understanding that should any significant work be necessary this may result in the closure of a facility due to a lack of funding.

All of the above would aim to generate a saving of £40k.

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

Following consultation it is now recommended that the income generated to offset the cost of providing these facilities is increased by raising or introducing a charge (where feasible) for using all public convenience facilities.

Where usage and therefore potential income is low consideration will be given to closing a facility in order to achieve the overall saving required. In addition the budget for repair and maintenance of these facilities may be reduced however this may result in closure of a facility should significant unplanned costs be incurred. The proposal also relies on the ongoing receipt of income from Arriva under an arrangement that provides their staff with exclusive use of specific facilities for an agreed fee.

There will still be a net cost to the Council of operating both the pay-to-use and any remaining free-to-use toilets however the overall cost of providing this service will be reduced by £40,000,

generating an annual saving for the Council.

Whilst this is less than the saving of £52k per year which would be generated from ceasing to provide public toilets there are potential (unquantifiable) environmental and economic benefits associated with continuing to provide such facilities.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** – The overall subsidy provided by the Council for the public convenience service will reduce.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** - If residents and visitors require the use of a toilet when away from their home they can access such provision via public sector facilities however this will be, in the majority of locations, at an increased cost. Visitors will still be able to make use of alternative private sector facilities should they choose to do so however the Council will not promote or direct the public to 'free to use' facilities in private premises.

**Partners** - Sefton Council currently has an agreement with Arriva to operate a toilet in Southport and a toilet in Crosby for the exclusive use of Arriva Drivers. These toilets are attached to existing Council facilities. Arriva have been consulted as a stakeholder and would prefer the current arrangement to remain in place. Therefore the Council would continue to receive a significant annual financial contribution towards the cost of operating these facilities which can be used to offset the overall subsidy provided by the Council.

**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 if the facilities were closed. Rather than close all facilities this alternative proposal aims to reduce the overall level of subsidy provided by the Council for the provision of this service.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

The consultation on the proposal to close all public toilets in Sefton ran from 19<sup>th</sup> December 2012 until 1<sup>st</sup> February 2013. The following provides an overview of consultation on this saving option;

General themes arising from the consultation are the potential negative impacts for:

- Older people
- Disabled people
- Families with young children
- Tourism
- Local businesses

Some respondents indicated that:

- Increasing charges for the use of public conveniences may be preferred to the complete closure of all sites, especially where private sector facilities are not readily available.
- In some cases, where there are a larger number of private sector facilities available, a small number of people have said these would be preferred instead of public conveniences if cleanliness, physical access and free use can be guaranteed.
- Use of certain private sector facilities, such as public houses, has been identified as being unsuitable for older females and people with young children.

Detailed analysis of the consultation feedback is ongoing, and further information will be



provided in the 28 <sup>th</sup> February report to Council.		
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – Equality implications are currently being assessed in light of this on-going consultation and will be reported to Council on 28 <sup>th</sup> February 2013.		
.		
<b>Legislation Considered:</b> 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.		
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions–</b> There is a risk that increasing the price to use facilities and/or introducing at charge at other (currently free-to-use) facilities may deter or decrease usage which would affect income and the overall saving identified. However public opinion favoured the provision and availability of pay-to-use public conveniences rather than none at all. The availability of public toilets should not adversely affect visitor numbers to a variety of tourist destinations across the Borough.		
It may be possible to reduce the overall number of facilities in areas where usage is low and would produce low income. This may therefore result in the future closure of some of the ‘older’ facilities however any decisions of this nature would be considered by the Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment in relation to the overall costs of the service and performance in relation to the saving target of £40,000. It is unclear at this stage whether any interest would be generated if such facilities were to be offered for purchase for an alternative use.		
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £92,000	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £40,000	Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b> None	<b>Investment Required:</b> None	
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Staff at Risk:</b> None	

<b>D1.33 Service Description: Cleansing Service</b> The Rapid Response Teams are responsible for responding to Requests for Service in relation to fly-tipping removal, graffiti removal, oil spillages, and 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.
<b>It is proposed to continue with consultation on/implement the following change –</b> 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 services posts in April 2013 is assessed. Therefore, this proposal will be designed to take effect from September 2013 (Quarter 3)
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> This reduction will result in a saving of £25,000 from September 2013 to March 2014, rising to an additional £50,000 for the period 2014/15.
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> 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 56 days for non-offensive graffiti. At this stage it is envisaged that offensive graffiti should still be able to be removed within current timescales. 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.
Certain functions currently undertaken via the Rapid Response Teams will be transferred to

the newly formed night time operation, such as certain subway underpass cleansing regimes and fly tipping monitoring. This will allow for the planned reduction in the amount of resource directed to the Rapid Response Service.

**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 may well be a delay in responding to lower priority incidents. There will also be a detrimental environmental affect due to a perceived lowering of standards.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

Proposed Timeline Reduce service levels by September 2013  
 There are currently three Rapid Response Teams operating across the Borough with a total of six staff. This proposal will reduce the service by one team. There are no staffing implications as the two affected operatives will be utilised elsewhere within the service following the removal of fifteen posts from the as part of a separate savings proposal. All staff are aware of the proposal and unions have been consulted accordingly.

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – 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

**Legislation Considered** – The requirements of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 have been considered in the development of this proposal

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – 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>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £ 25,000 Part Year (from Q3)
<b>Staffing:</b> 6	<b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £ 50,000 Full Year <b>Staff at Risk:</b> None affected

**D1.25 Service Description: Economy & Tourism**

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

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 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

- £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.
- The combined salary cost for this service of £206k

It is proposed that for 13/14, a saving of £51,000 is made by Re-financing the Mersey Forest subscription to make a saving on the revenue budget; accept voluntary reduction in working hours from two staff; and make further savings in supplies and services.

These financial changes require internal consultation only.

### Rationale for service change proposal

1. Mersey Forest provides a valuable service to the borough, and as a partnership between the city region local authorities is the most cost effective way of delivering pan-Merseyside projects. It is financed 80% from grants and contracts, with the balance recharged to the local authorities. By recovering the subscription cost from alternative sources, it is possible to offer up an £18k saving, while retaining intact the five year Partnership Agreement which ends 2015.
2. Saving of £27k by accepting voluntary reduction of working hours by 2 Business Investment Officers
3. Saving of £6k from economies in supplies and services.

A £51k reduction in funding will protect for 13/14:

- 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 for staff who meet the business case. Specifically, the Environmental Regeneration Manager will lead on a £10m+ regeneration investment into south Sefton associated with port expansion and the 2 part-time Business Investment Officers will help lever in £1.2m of grant associated with InvestSefton's Mersey Business Support project.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce** –Reduced capacity in Business Support Project, but compatible with delivery of contracted outputs.

### Impact of Service Change

**Service Users** – None identified

**Partners** – None identified

**Council** – financial saving

### Communications, Consultations & Engagement –

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

Proposed Timeline: Immediate

Staff briefings have taken place with affected staff

1-1 meetings have taken place

Discussions have taken place with Mersey Forest Implementation: With immediate effect following approval.			
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> The Quality Assurance Group recognises this as a renegotiation of a service contract, whilst it may have implications on environmental management issues, these are not connected to the PSED			
<b>Legislation Considered</b> The Council has no statutory or legislative duty to provide these services.			
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> Discussions have taken place with Mersey Forest and affected staff to minimise risks in implementation.			
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £251k  <b>Staffing:</b> 55 (excl. Tourism)  <b>Other Resources used:</b> £2.2m (external funding)	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> <b>Investment Required:</b> £0 <b>Staff at Risk:</b> 0	£ 51k	Full Year

<b>D1.27 Service Description: Reduction in Corporate Commissioning and Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service</b>
<b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> To rationalise service delivery and reduce costs by £200,000, taking into account the outcomes of the domestic violence review.
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> To reduce costs
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b>  Direct management support to the service will be reduced through VER/VR and voluntary reduced hours.  Specialist equalities support will cease, unless there is a need for expert support which would be assessed on a case by case basis  Operating costs for neighbourhood activities will be reduced  Strategic support for neighbourhood activities relating to Parish/Town Councils and town/village centres will be reduced
<b>Impact of Service Change –</b> There will be consequences on service delivery and support for Councillors, residents and communities.  <b>Service Users –</b> A reduction in support for Parish and Town Councillors. <b>Partners –</b> Parish and Town Councils strategic liaison will be reduced. The integration of the Vulnerable Victim Advocate Team within a specialist DV VCF organisation would need agreement from the relevant VCF partner. These discussions are ongoing. <b>Council –</b> Financial saving.
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>  Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Partnership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Service meetings have taken place with all staff to ask for views on savings options. Unions have been consulted about the option.  
 Parish and Town Councils have been consulted and informed the reconfiguration of the reduced support that they would receive  
 Discussions are ongoing with the specialist VCF organisation who may provide DV services on behalf of the Council This doesn't affect the delivery of the savings option.

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – The Quality Assurance Group recognises that in relation to “Cease specialist equalities support” this is the end of a project and Reduction in Overall Management Support is an organisational change and such do not require an impact assessment. Equality implications for DV are currently being assessed in light of this on-going consultation with the specialist VCF organisation and will be reported to Council on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013.

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

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – Consultation has taken place with staff and partners to minimise risks of implementation.

<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £1.1m	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £200,000	Full Year
<b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: Savings achieved through VER/VR and voluntary reduced hours</b>		

**D1.34 Service Description:**

Deferment of return of highway management funding £800k for further 12 months to 2015/16.

**It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change** – No consultation required. The temporary reduction in budget has previously been through the consultation process

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

The Council is under a statutory duty (sections 41 and 58 of Highways Act 1980) to ensure a safe highway network. Cessation is not a realistic option as it would likely result in damage to life and limb leading to claims against the authority and potential corporate manslaughter charges.

Extension of this temporary reduction does carry the risk of short and long-term implications in terms of deteriorating condition of the highways and related infrastructure, with increased risk of accident and injury on the highway.

In addition, there is a further risk that failure to repair in a timely manner can result in far greater expenditure to achieve the same outcome later as the infrastructure may have deteriorated to the extent that more significant works (and funding) are required. Disruption to use of the highway network has an associated detrimental economic impact.

Hence the proposal to defer reinstatement of the budget will help towards the savings targets on a temporary basis but the number of risks mean this would only be for a manageable for a short period and would require a corresponding subsequent significant reinvestment in the highway network infrastructure

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

This would require a continued restructure of the Highway Works Programme. Implementation of the current £800k reduction has delivered by: ceasing footway/carriageway reconstructions; ceasing carriageway "plane & inlay" resurfacing; removing landscaping/flowerbeds on roundabouts; and reductions to arboriculture database and maintenance.

Previous re-profiling of the reduced budget will be continued, with more emphasis placed on reactive minor repairs and less substantial slurry sealing, surface dressing and micro asphalt treatments. Such an approach will help to maintain the integrity of the highway network on a short term basis but is not a long term option.

More substantial proactive maintenance and replacement works will therefore not be undertaken and more emphasis will be given to more costly and less effective reactive works

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Disruption to use of the highway network and deterioration of the highways network would affect movement of individuals, private business and other service delivery (e.g. refuse collection, community services, emergency services, public transport etc.) with associated detrimental economic impact.

**Partners –** These are works contracts, reduction of the budget would impact upon contractors and would have some implications for level of design and supervision work undertaken by Capita Symonds.

**Council –** Significantly increased reputational risk - corporate complaints increased by 43% last year following a rise of 70% the previous year.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

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

Saving already implemented and would therefore continue

**Equality Impact Assessment –**

Previously undertaken when budget initially reduced it was identified that any obstruction or difficulty in relation to disability access would be prioritised within the financial constraints.

**Legislation Considered –** Highways Act 1980

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –** This temporary reduction does carry the risk of short and long-term implications in terms of deteriorating condition of the highways and related infrastructure, with increased risk of accident and injury on the highway.

The budget is currently insufficient, continued non investment would put a significant strain on the demand budget & therefore increased highway risks and liability claims, potential increase in numbers of payouts & insurance premium. Also increase to inspector work load and associated accuracy risks.

The reduced budget means we have to target small reactive works as opposed to the more financially efficient proactive repairs. There will continue to be a deterioration of the highways and infrastructure. Failure to maintain in a timely manner increases the need for more substantial future funding to return network to a manageable state of repair.

Disruption to use of the highway network has an associated detrimental economic impact and a reputation impact. The reputational risk is significant with corporate complaints in this area increasing since the reduction in budget was agreed.

This continued temporary reduction will result in more significant maintenance costs in future years as more significant investment will be required to re-establish a suitable highway condition.

Previous Budget reductions as table below:

Budget Analysis	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Previous Permanent Reduction 1	£200,000	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
Previous Permanent Reduction 2		£50,000	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
Previous Temporary Reduction 1	£800,000	£800,000	£800,000 Deferment of return of	£800,000 Deferment of return of	£0 reduction (return of

			budget for one year	budget for one year under consideration	budget)
Previous Temporary Reduction 2		£400,000	£400,000	£400,000	£0 reduction (return of budget)
Total	£1,000,000	£1,450,000	£1,450,000	£1,450,000 or £650,000	£250,000
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £6428850		<b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £ 800,000</b>			
<b>Staffing:</b>		<b>Investment Required: 0</b>			
		<b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b>			