

**Report to:** Cabinet  
Council

**Date of Meetings:** 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013

**Subject:** Two year Financial Plan and Revenue Budget 2013 /14

Report of: Head of Corporate Finance & ICT

**Wards Affected:** All

**Is this a Key Decision?** Yes

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

**Exempt/Confidential** No

---

## **Executive Summary**

The Council must legally set a balanced budget, one that is robust and sustainable. This report

- Updates on the final Local Government Settlement and confirms the budget gap of £50.8m over the next two years.
- Requests Cabinet approval for the final outstanding options, detailed within the report.
- Updates on the options and requests consideration of what should now be included in the final two year Budget Plan
- Illustrates how the two year Budget Plan can be balanced within available resources assuming the options identified can be approved and implemented

Since the last Cabinet Report on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013, the budget options and plan have been considered in detail at the Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Corporate Services) on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2013. Any issues arising from this meeting will be reported verbally at the meeting.

This report presents a 2 year budget plan, which enables a budget for 2013/14 to be approved and identifies those policy changes required to deliver a sustainable and robust two year budget plan. Due to the mixture of efficiencies and significant policy changes some of these options cannot and will not be realised within a 12 month period and will contribute to the 2014/15 budget as illustrated in this report. This will require the implementation of major change programmes and appropriate capacity will need to be dedicated to ensure deliverability. Given the scale of the budget reductions any slippage or underachievement will have implications for the financial management of the Council and as such robust management and monitoring arrangements must continue to be operated.

**Cabinet is Recommended: -**

1. To note the updated Library Review information provided in the report at paragraph 3.2 and make an appropriate recommendation to Council.
2. To note the final outcome of consultation for D1.32 Public Conveniences - and commend to Council for approval, the increase in the charges for pay to use facilities and where feasible introduce a charge for use at all public convenience facilities.
3. To commend the recommendations of the Street Lighting review to Council for approval and implementation as outlined in the budget option form in Annex A
4. To consider the draft two year budget plan (2013/14 and 2014/15) which now incorporates Cabinet's decisions in 1-3 above and make appropriate recommendations to Council.

**Council is recommended:**

1. Approve the two year budget plan and associated policy changes;
2. To note and take account of the detail within the Public Sector Equality Duty analysis reports or statements, the consultation feedback and the mitigating actions within each option in taking their decisions and authorise Officers to prepare for the immediate implementation of the policy changes for both years.
3. To create a new one-off £1m Community Transition Fund to facilitate where possible the transfer of certain services to become community run, and self sustaining.
4. To create a new one-off capital priorities fund of £1m to invest in Council priorities including town centres, youth employment and local economy
5. As required by the Localism Act 2011 (Section 38-41) to approve the proposed amendments to the Pay Policy as set out in paragraph 3.4 and for the pay policy to be published.

**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	*See below		
2	Jobs and Prosperity			
3	Environmental Sustainability			
4	Health and Well-Being			
5	Children and Young People			
6	Creating Safe Communities			
7	Creating Inclusive Communities			
8	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening Local Democracy			

\* The totality of the saving options will have a significant impact on our communities. It is not possible to give a global impact assessment in the table above. However, where appropriate, the impact of the saving options (Annex A) includes details of the impact of that decision.

## **FD 2144**

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

The Government's announcement of the final Revenue Settlement for 2013/14 and provisional figures for 2014/15 has resulted in a small reduction of £0.002m in grant compared to the provisional settlement announced on 19 December 2013. The Council's budget gap for 2013/14 and 2014/15, therefore remains at £50.8m.

### **(B) Capital Cost**

The report recommends that £1m of earmarked reserves will be used to establish a Capital Fund to assist the regeneration of town centres across the Borough, youth employment and local economies.

The Government has not made any changes to the previous announcement that Councils will not be allowed to capitalise the costs of equal pay settlements. They have agreed that authorities can use receipts from asset sales to meet such costs.

With regard to capitalisation directions for redundancy costs, no announcement has yet been made.

### **Implications:**

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

#### **Legal LD 1460**

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

- a. Each option has had the statutory basis for the service considered and details are included in the individual reports.
- b. The outcome of each individual consultation and equality impact assessment has been included in the reports.
- c. In addition mitigating factors have been included in the individual option reports.
- d. Generic risks including legal risks have been reported to Members previously and are re-iterated in part 5 of this report.
- e. The rationale for inclusion of this information, is to ensure that Members have all relevant information available, and that the information can be weighed up carefully when making each and all of the decisions.

#### **Human Resources**

The options 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


2. Equality Implications identified and mitigated

--

3. Equality Implication identified and risk remains

\* The status of the equality impact for the saving options are at varying levels of information as detailed in Annex A that includes details of the impact of the decision.

**Impact on Service Delivery:**

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

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

There have been extensive public engagement and consultation exercises throughout this process (see links under paragraph 2.2) regarding Developing the budget and Council Tax

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

Further information is contained in Annex A of this report.

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

All currently feasible / viable options have been put forward for consideration. A number of non viable budget options have been dismissed by Members.

**Implementation Date for the Decision**

Officers are authorised to implement all decisions within this report immediately following Council on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013.

**Contact Officer:**

Margaret Rawding, Head of Corporate Finance & ICT

Tel: 0151 934 4082

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

## Background Papers:

- Feedback from Closure of all public conveniences across the Borough (D1.32)  
<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1413&ID=1413&RPID=6997949&sch=doc&cat=13423&path=13421%2c13423>
- Updated Proposed Fees & Charges Booklet for 2013/14
- <http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1414&ID=1414&RPID=6997974&sch=doc&cat=13423&path=13421%2c13423>

## Other relevant budget documentation:

- Non-Domestic Rates and Revenue Support Grant for 2013-14 and Related Matters. (Previously published 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 Cabinet)
- <http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1415&ID=1415&RPID=6998051&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>
- Developing the Budget Consultation Report. (Previously published 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 Cabinet)
- <http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1418&ID=1418&RPID=6998237&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>
- Feedback reports on the consultation and engagement on Council Tax. (Previously published 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013 Cabinet)  
<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1417&ID=1417&RPID=6998154&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>  
<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1416&ID=1416&RPID=6998127&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>
- Feedback to Landscape Services Junior Sports Pitch Charges Consultation. (F1.2) (Previously published 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 Cabinet)
- <http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1419&ID=1419&RPID=6998272&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>
- Feedback to Landscape Services Cemeteries and Crematoria Consultation. (F1.4) (Previously published 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 Cabinet)
- <http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1420&ID=1420&RPID=6998307&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>
- Feedback from Cleansing – cease provision of free plastic sacks excluding those premises which are currently identified as ‘difficult to access’ (D1.24). (Previously published 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013 Cabinet)
- <http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1421&ID=1421&RPID=6998328&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>
- 
- Feedback on Consultation for Street Lighting Review (Previously published 13<sup>th</sup> December 2013 Cabinet)
- <http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1422&ID=1422&RPID=6998357&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>
- 
- Pay Policy  
<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1423&ID=1423&RPID=6998374&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>

## **Part 1: Final Revenue Settlement Announcement 2013/14**

- 1.1 On 19 December 2012, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government announced the Provisional Revenue Settlement for 2013/14 and indicative figures for 2014/15. The implication of this announcement for Sefton was a further £7.1m increase in the level of savings required for the next two years; i.e. from £43.7m to £50.8m.
- 1.2 Following a short consultation period, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government published details of the final Local Government Finance Settlement for 2013/14, with provisional figures for 2014/15 on 4 February 2013. In his written statement Brandon Lewis said:

*'We received almost 200 written responses from local authorities, fire and rescue authorities, formal and informal groupings of authorities and others during the consultation. In addition Ministers met delegations from representative bodies including the Local Government Association and London councils as well as a large number of individual local authorities'.*

*'Having considered the views of all those who have commented on the provisional settlement, I have decided broadly to confirm the proposals for the settlement for 2013-14 as announced in December, after making some minor technical changes following representations made during consultation'.*

### 1.3 Implications of the Final settlement for Sefton

#### 1.3.1 Start-Up Funding Assessment

The Start-Up Funding Assessment replaces Revenue Support Grant and Pooled Business Rate allocations. A further adjustment is incorporated to allow for the introduction of Local Business Rates retention scheme. There was a very small reduction in the Start Up Funding as a result of an adjustment to the Council Tax Support Funding data. The impact of this adjustment is a reduction in grant of £0.002m in both 2013/14 and 2014/15. In effect the two-year budget gap of £50.8m remains unchanged.

#### 1.3.2 Other Grant Notifications

A number of grant notifications received (e.g. NHS Support for Social Care and the Public Health transfer monies) have been built into the proposed budget for 2013/14 and 2014/15.

The following grant notifications, shown in the table below, received by the Council have not as yet been assumed in the budget. The terms and conditions of these grants (and in some cases the value) have yet to be clarified. The use of these grants will be subject to consideration once their utilisation has been clarified; this will be reported to a future Cabinet meeting: -

	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	
Community Right to Bid	8	8
Community Right to Challenge	8	8
Local Reform and Community Voices	267	275
Adoption Reform Grant	604	Not yet announced
Crime and Disorder Grant	*393	*393

**Purposes of above grants are described below: -**

**Community Right to Bid / Challenge** – To offset Council administration costs arising from the need to support community organisations who wish to bid to purchase assets of community value, or wish to challenge where they could run existing Council services differently.

**Local Reform and Community Voices** – To fund the transfer of the Independent Complaints (and Mental Health) Advocacy Services to local authorities. Also included is additional funding for Healthwatch and for Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards in Hospitals.

**Adoption Reform Grant** – This is split into two elements; ring-fenced (£210k) and non ring-fenced (394k). The first element is to provide support for local authorities to address structural problems with adopter recruitment, particularly the uneconomic fee that local authorities are charged by other authorities. The non-ring-fenced element is available to local authorities to support adoption reform.

**Crime and Disorder Grant** – The Police and Crime Commissioner wants to continue to support existing drugs, crime and community safety initiatives by distributing this funding to Community Safety Partnerships. Details of plans as to how the funding is spent, and how this fits in with the PCC's Police and Crime Plan, will be required. Outcomes of spending and performance will be monitored. \*The allocations are still to be finalised.

#### 1.4 **2012/13 Projected Revenue Outturn**

- 1.4.1 In September 2012, Cabinet agreed to allocate £3.169m of one off resources to support the likely shortfall in 2012/13 budgeted savings. The latest projected outturn (reported to Cabinet on 14 February 2013), shows the likely shortfall has reduced to £1.669m. If this were to be the case, this could enable £1.5m of earmarked reserves to be freed up, and therefore be available to support the establishment of the £1m Community Transition Fund and to contribute to the funding of the part year effect of the savings for 2013/14.
- 1.4.2 The 2012/13 savings which will not be achieved going forward will be funded from the Medium Term Financial Plan. Budgets have been prepared on this basis.
- 1.4.3 Recent settlement of outstanding legal claims at a figure below the provision made allows the Council to utilise £1m to resource the one off Capital Priorities Fund.

## **Part 2 Consultation & Engagement Overview**

- 2.1 An initial package of potential budget options was approved by Cabinet, 13<sup>th</sup> September 2012, to commence consultation and engagement.
- 2.2 Formal consultation on setting a balanced budget commenced on the 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012 and closed on the 7<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The purpose of the consultation was to seek the views of the public on a set of principles to assist the Council in the development of policies in relation to service areas. In addition to this in January 2013 Council consulted residents on their views on an indicative increase in Council Tax. Both of these consultations were reported to 14<sup>th</sup> February Cabinet –full details are available in other relevant budget documentation, see links below.

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1416&ID=1416&RPID=6963784&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1418&ID=1418&RPID=6963786&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1417&ID=1417&RPID=6963878&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>

- 2.3 The options shown in Annex A are all options recommended by Cabinet for Council approval. The options in this annex reflect matters which are at various stages of public and employee consultation and/or implementation. The status of each option is set out clearly in the Annex. In respect of the options officers are authorised to consult as appropriate.

## **Part 3 Options for consideration and approval**

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

- a) 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.
- b) The options are at various stages of consultation/implementation as outlined in Annex A and some are considered complete for Council approval and a number of the options 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. Council 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.
- c) Reducing budgets and activities is a difficult task, and one that the Council has to balance with the needs of the community. It is clear from 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

## **3.2 Service Options**

### **Libraries**

3.2.1 A report on the Library consultation was presented at 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013 Cabinet, when it was agreed that consideration of the report be deferred to the meeting of the Cabinet on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013 to enable Members to fully consider:

- (a) the consultation responses and the analysis thereof;
- (b) the Public Sector Equality Duty Analysis Report;
- (c) the representations made by petitioners; and
- (d) the information given by officers at this meeting in response to questions from Members.

The full report and minutes can be accessed through this link

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/mgAi.aspx?ID=24250#mgDocuments>

3.2.2 A number of questions and comments were raised by Members and petitioners at Cabinet and responses to some of those questions are detailed within the Minutes of the meeting. The following additional information in relation to a number of those questions and comments is provided for Members consideration.

- Dedicated car parking for disabled people is available on site at Crosby (Civic Hall), Formby, Meadows and Netherton libraries. Nearby on-street car parking for disabled people is available in the vicinity of Bootle and College Road libraries.
- In addition to the public transport information provided at the 14<sup>th</sup> February Cabinet meeting in respect of links to the Atkinson Library, there are direct buses from:
  - Aintree Library to Bootle, Meadows and Netherton Libraries
  - College Road Library to Bootle and Crosby Libraries
  - Litherland and Orrell Libraries to Bootle, Crosby and Netherton Libraries

*(Further information about frequency and time taken to travel are available through this link)*

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sched=doc&cat=13402&path=13193,13333>

- The only relevant restrictive covenant on Library buildings relates to Litherland Library where any use of the buildings for a purpose other than for the benefit of the public would require the approval of the Earl of Sefton's Estate.

### **3.2.3 Street Lighting and Public Conveniences**

Further information relating to Street Lighting and Public Conveniences options is detailed within the individual budget option documents (Annex A) The Consultation and Engagement report for Street Lighting was submitted to 13<sup>th</sup> December Cabinet. The Consultation and Engagement for Public Conveniences is available as a background document

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1413&ID=1413&RPID=6963767&sched=doc&cat=13423&path=13421%2c13423>

and Consultation report for Street Lighting is available as other relevant budget documentation:

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1422&ID=1422&RPID=6982415&sched=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>

## **3.3 Fees and Charges 2013/14**

3.3.1 The Cabinet report on 31st January included proposed fees and charges for 2013/14, some of which were predicated on savings options being approved by Council. This report identifies a number of further fees and charge proposals (the detail is shown in a Background Document to this report). The changes made to fees and charges since the report to 31 January Cabinet are in the following areas:

- a) Youth Sports pitches;
- b) Learning and Development
- c) Car Parking Review
- d) Public Convenience Review

### **Council Tax**

3.3.2 The financial plan assumes Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2013/14 would achieve £1.1m and is payable in both years. In 2014/15 it is assumed that Council Tax will increase to the maximum allowed without a referendum which would achieve income of £1.4m in 2014/15. The financial plan has been prepared on this basis. Members are asked to note that the Government has indicated that the regulations relating to Council Tax Referendum limits are to be reconsidered during 2013, and this may affect the 2014/15 referendum threshold shown here. This assumption will be kept under review in the light of any changes in Government policy.

### **3.4 Implementation**

3.4.1 The two year financial plan as presented in this report is based on the earliest feasible implementation phasing. This phasing requires one off resources in 2013/14 to deliver a balanced budget of £236.809m. It is therefore critical that officers commence implementation of all policy changes with immediate effect to avoid unaffordable slippage. The use of one-off resources to balance the budget is considered further in paragraph 5.2.

3.4.2 The options shown in Annex A are options recommended by Cabinet for Council approval. The options in this annex reflect matters which are at various stages of public and employee consultation and/or implementation. In respect of the options officers are authorised to consult and implement as appropriate which includes the sending to the Government Departments' notifications as required (HR1). Officers are already authorised to consult with Trade Unions under section 188 ensuring that appropriate notification is sent under the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

3.4.3 Where options have consequences for employees this is set out in the options document where possible. Any implementation of the options, is subject, as necessary, to consultation with Trade Unions and employees as part of the recognised processes and as ever this can have a range of outcomes including dismissal and re-deployment for example.

3.4.4 Council will recall that it approved the framework for and a pay policy for the first time last year. This document can be found within the other relevant Budget documents (see link below) Council is required by the legislation to specifically resolve before 31st March in any given year a new pay policy. In light of the established framework for the year 2013/14 only some minor amendments are proposed. These amendments are to include the fact that Chief Officer pay is to be considered in light of the current and on going Hay Review. It is proposed to amend the pay policy so as to reflect the now agreed

amendments to terms and conditions of employment (staff salary increments are frozen for a further 2 years until 2015/16 and the imposition of unpaid leave up to a maximum of 4 days). Furthermore it is anticipated that there will be two transfers of staff into the Council in the forthcoming year namely the public health staff and staff from the Capita contract. Members are therefore asked to approve these amendments and for the Council's pay policy be amended and published in the usual way.

<http://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/moderngov/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1423&ID=1423&RPID=6982417&sch=doc&cat=13424&path=13421%2c13424>

#### **Part 4 Two Year Revenue Budget Plan (2013/14 and 2014/15)**

- 4.1 Council on 22nd November approved saving options of £15.549m. Compared to the overall budget gap of £50.8m, this left £35.251m of further savings to be identified and approved by Council, in order for a balanced budget to be achieved. The additional budget saving options, recommended by Cabinet since November enable a balance budget to be achieved. **Annex A** lists all proposed savings (to meet the £50.8m gap over the two financial years 2013/14 and 2014/15. Including those previously agreed at 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 Council. The end column of the Annex identifies the current status of the saving (e.g. approved by Council in November, consultation completed, consultation process ongoing etc). Members are requested to give careful consideration of this Annex before making final decisions.
- 4.2 However, if proposals are rejected, or amended downwards by Council, this will result in a shortfall in the savings target. Council will therefore need to identify and agree alternative savings/funding mechanisms in order for a balanced budget to be approved.
- 4.3 The analysis of the proposed budget for 2013/14 and 2014/15 (assuming the approval of the saving options identified in this report), is set out in the 2013/14 Council Tax Recommendation report (elsewhere on today's agenda). It should be noted however, that whilst the budget is balanced over the two financial years, there is expected to be a shortfall in balancing the budget for 2013/14, which is recovered in the 2014/15 plan. This is due to the significant amount of preparation / implementation work required on a significant number of saving options. The logistics of this work cannot be over-emphasised. As a result, the need for approximately £0.84m of any available one-off resources will be required to balance the budget.  
.
- 4.4 The implementation of savings over the next two years will inevitably impact on local residents and communities. As a means of enabling local people to adjust to some of the impact of the changes, it is proposed that two funds, of £1m each, be established: -
  - i) A revenue based Community Transition Fund aimed at creating capacity to reduce the reliance on Council resources and services. It is proposed that this fund will be created as identified in paragraph 1.4 above and
  - ii) A Capital Priorities Fund aimed at assisting the development of town centres across the Borough, youth employment and local economy (see paragraph 1.4).
- 4.5 A further report on the detail on the use of these reserves will be brought to a future Cabinet meeting.

#### **Part 5 Robustness and Risk**

- 5.1 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 in some circumstances it may be very difficult 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.
- 5.2 This report identifies the need to utilise £2.84m of reserves in order to balance the budget and create the above Transition Funds. This will reduce the capacity of the Council to cover any shortfall in the achievement of the proposed two year saving options, or to meet unforeseen future financial demands on the authority.
- 5.3 All options contained in the annexes of this report have been risk assessed by the relevant senior officers with mitigating actions identified where possible. These risks have been assessed and will be managed in the light of new financial forecasts. Council is asked to note and take account of the risks and mitigating actions outlined in making its decisions.
- 5.4 Officers continue to monitor risks and issues, escalating significant risks and issues to Cabinet as appropriate.
- 5.5 The Head of Finance and ICT's statutory report on the proposed budget is included elsewhere on today's agenda. This comments on the overall financial position of the Council and the robustness of the budget proposals over the next two years.

## **Part 6 Conclusion**

- 6.1 This report represents the final stage in an extremely challenging financial planning process. It identifies how the Council can achieve its required savings of £50.8m over the next two years. This combined savings will have a significant impact on Sefton communities and the Council and follow on from £64m savings identified in the previous two years.
- 6.2 The savings are required as a result of a significant real terms reduction in Government funding coupled with a growing elderly population. They represent the Council's contribution to the Government's austerity measures.
- 6.3 The Council has a legal responsibility to approve a balanced budget and the options within this report enable this requirement to be met. The options are presented after extensive consultation and engagement. Annex A sets out the status for each option. The Council will continue to work with communities and partners to reshape the Council, to concentrate on agreed priorities and to make the very best use of the available resources.
- 6.4 Whilst the majority of this report focuses on savings, there are proposals to create two very important investment funds. Firstly a fund that supports the building of community capacity and resilience to facilitate greater involvement in local service delivery. This will be a major focus for the Council over the next two years and beyond. It is recognised that this will take time and facilitation across all partners but some dialogue has already started in areas such as libraries, football facilities, parks and economy. The Council is

looking to establish a Community Resilience Transition Fund which will support this development. Secondly a capital priorities fund which will enable capital investment in key priority areas. Further reports will be presented on the operation of this fund assuming the budget is approved.

- 6.5 This report represents a major milestone in the budget setting process with Council being requested to set the final budget and two year plan. However this is only the beginning of a significant change programme to ensure that the policy changes and savings are implemented and achieved. Cabinet will receive regular reports throughout the year, monitoring progress towards the achievement of the savings and identifying corrective action should a shortfall be identified.

## Annex A- Budget Savings Summary 2013/14 and 2014/15

Ref	Service Area	Option				Status
			TOTAL	TOTAL	OVERALL TOTAL	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	

### Strategic Management

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT						
	Senior Management	Restructure	150	0	150	Cabinet on 13th September 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4	Subscriptions	Local Government Association membership	-45	0	-45	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4	Subscriptions	North West Employers membership	-25	0	-25	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

### Corporate Commissioning

CORPORATE COMMISSIONING AND NEIGHBOURHOODS						
C11.2		Improved procurement of council wide communications activity	25	75	100	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E3.1		Integration of Communications	95	45	140	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012 (£0.100m) / Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval (D1.21 £0.040m)
E3.2		Review of Civic Support	60	0	60	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E3.3		Cessation of Room Bookings Service (linked to review of Civic Support)	20	0	20	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012

F4.1		Area Committee Budgets	100	0	100	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
F4.3		Double rating - reduction in line with Council grounds maintenance contracts	33	0	33	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.27		Corporate Commissioning & Neighbourhood Coordination (CCNC) Service - rationalise service	140	60	200	Cabinet on 14th February 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 3.6, includes previous option D1.29		Double Rating - cessation (2014/15)	30	150	180	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval  Officers are continuing to work with Parish Councils should significant issues arise Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.
Para 4.3		Democratic Services - Stop servicing all non-member meetings and those non-standing committees without decision-making powers(officer meetings, taxi drivers annual meeting, area partnerships, etc)	38	13	51	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.10		Budget re-alignment - members allowances as agreed by July 2012 Council	147	0	147	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3		Area Committees - Reduce from 7 to 3	15	5	20	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3	Neighbourhoods (SEE ALSO Economy)	Withdraw financial support from Southport's Christmas Lights and Christmas Trees across the Borough	10	0	10	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

## Corporate Services

<b>CORPORATE SERVICES</b>						
C12.1		Learning and Development	80	50	130	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012 (£0.080m) / Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval (£0.050m)
C12.2		Increased housing benefit grant from reduced error rates	250	250	500	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C12.3		Reduced external audit, recoverable VAT fees & improved cash management pension costs	500	800	1,300	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C12.4		Printing and publications	20	0	20	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E4.1		Learning and Development	75	75	150	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E4.2		Review of Corporate Support Services	248	114	362	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E4.3		Review of risk management inc externally commissioned services	80	0	80	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.11		Risk Management (Insurance)	25	25	50	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.12		Procurement. ICT and financial support	25	25	50	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval



**Built Environment**

<b>PLANNING</b>						
C1.1	Building Control	Vacancy and mini restructure	20	0	20	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C1.2	Land Searches	Right size budget land searches income	35	0	35	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C1.3	Planning DC	Commissioned technical advice	28	0	28	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C1.4	Planning DC	Pre-application advice – charge	6	0	6	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C1.5	Planning DC	Increase planning application fee	50	0	50	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C1.6	Planning DC	Consultancy	12	0	12	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012

<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>						
C2.1	Environmental Health	Reduced services and supplies	55	0	55	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C2.2	Environmental Health	Reduced Eco Centre Costs	15	0	15	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C2.3	Licensing (taxi etc)	Licensing reserve (one off)	240	-240	0	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.20	Environment	Trading Standards - staff restructuring	30	20	50	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.30	Built Environment	Pest Control - introduction of a charge	20	10	30	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

---

<b>INVESTMENT PROGRAMME</b>						
C3.3	Contracted Services	Defer re-instatement of highway management funding for a further two years	800	0	800	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012 (for 2013/2014) / Cabinet on 14th February 2013 Recommended Option for Approval (for 2014/2015)
C3.4	Network Management	Highway development control income target	40	0	40	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
Para 3.4	Parking	Strategic Review of Car Parking	0	300	300	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
	Street Lighting	Review of lighting options	15	49	64	To be considered by Cabinet on 28th February 2012
C3.2	Home Improvements	Housing Improvement Agency service brought in house	37	0	37	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3	Investment and Infrastructure	Investment & Infrastructure - Increase income from Network Management	38	12	50	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
C3.1	Infrastructure	Re-integration, re-commission and restructuring of services - Built Environment	0	500	500	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM</b>						
C4.1	Economic Development and Tourism – Cost of Service	Economic Development Redesign	0	67	67	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.8	Economy	To relocate staff from The Investment Centre, to Magdalen House	36	12	48	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval

D1.9	Economy	Budget re-alignment of salaries to be funded from grants, contracts and reserves	0	116	116	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.25	Economy	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.	51	0	51	Cabinet on 14th February 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3	Economy	Southport Theatre Complex (Tender or In-house management)	0	100	100	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3	Economy (SEE ALSO Neighbourhoods)	Withdraw financial support from Southport's Christmas Lights and Christmas Trees across the Borough	20	0	20	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

### Street Scene

<b>LANDSCAPE SERVICES</b>						
C5.1	Grounds Maintenance including Grass Cutting	Contractors indexation/eff. discounts FYE	50	50	100	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C5.2	Parks including Nursery and net of frontline)	Fernery/aviary shop	10	0	10	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C5.3	Cemeteries and Crematoria	Restructure staffing on Cemeteries and Crematoria	15	0	15	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C5.4	Parks (including nursery and net of frontline)	Further changes to Parks Management and standards in parks	50	50	100	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012

F1.2	Grounds Maintenance including Grass Cutting	Recharging grounds maintenance/utility costs for adult football/sports users/bowlers	85	0	85	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
F1.4	Cemeteries and Crematoria	Increase burial and cremation charges	400	0	400	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
F1.5	Parks and Greenspaces	Increase Fees - allotments	0	40	40	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.5	Street Scene	Landscape -Co-ordination of voluntary work in parks (transition)	0	175	175	Considered by Cabinet 31st January 2013 Recommended for approval

<b>DIRECT SERVICES</b>						
C6.1	Commercial Waste and Skips	Commercial waste increased income	100	0	100	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C6.2	Public Conveniences	Public conveniences reviewed for efficiency savings	20	20	40	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C6.3	School Crossings	Review crossing service and transport costs	40	0	40	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C6.4	Catering	Other catering activity (income target)	100	0	100	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C6.5	Vehicle Management and maintenance	MOT testing (income target)	50	0	50	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C6.6	Security Force	Careline Service / Security Force (income target)	125	75	200	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C6.7	Recycling	Rephase cardboard recycling to August 2014	1,000	-600	400	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C6.8	Recycling	Right size recycling budget following new contract	200	0	200	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012

E1.1	Cleansing	Review of Cleansing Services	100	200	300	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
F2.1	Street Cleansing	Bulky Items Collection Service - Restructure Crews and introduce charge for bulky items	150	60	210	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.19	Street Scene	Building Cleaning - change frequency of office cleaning	50	50	100	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.24	Street Scene	Cleansing - Cease provision of free Plastic Sacks, excluding premises with difficult access	60	0	60	Cabinet on 14th February 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.32	Street Scene	Public Conveniences increase charges	40	0	40	Cabinet on 14th February 2013 and to be considered by Cabinet on 28 <sup>th</sup> February 2013
D1.33	Street Scene	Cleansing Service - Re-organisation of workload and work patterns	25	25	50	Cabinet on 14th February 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4	Street Scene	Cleansing - Charge for Green Waste collections - A 2014/15 / 2015/16 proposal for an opt-in charge	0	1,000	1,000	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

**People**

<b>LEARNING AND SUPPORT</b>						
C7.1		Complementary Education Improved use of technology (EOTAS)	100	0	100	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C7.2		Pupil Attendance – teaching element	65	0	65	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C7.3		Pupil attendance and welfare – school absence prevention and action	60	0	60	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C7.4		Speech and Language Therapy	95	0	95	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C7.5		School Improvement Team	50	0	50	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012

E2.2		Admissions efficiencies	40	0	40	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E2.3		Educational Psychology Team Restructure	50	0	50	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.3		Statutory Provision Budget Re-alignment	9	0	9	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.4		Budget re-alignment Welfare and Pupil Attendance - Teaching elements to Dedicated Schools Grant	25	0	25	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.5		School Admission, Appeals and Student Support - Reduction in administration costs (supplies and services)	19	0	19	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.6		Connexions - Budget re-alignment	60	0	60	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.18		Reduce School Targeted Intervention	0	260	260	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3		To effect a further saving from the retained element of the Connexions Grant	0	400	400	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

<b>CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE</b>						
E2.1		Review of the commissioning of all residential care beds	400	600	1,000	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.7		Social Care Commissioned Services - travel efficiencies	0	100	100	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval

D1.17		Social Care - Central Management Costs and Support Costs - restructure / realign	100	0	100	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3		Review pathway of support for children with additional needs to increase effectiveness and efficiency	0	400	400	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval  Officers are continuing to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed and should significant issues arise Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.

<b>EARLY INTERVENTION AND PREVENTION</b>						
C8.1		Reduce Connexions post in YOS	24	0	24	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C8.2		Delete sessional worker posts	54	0	54	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C8.3		Delete parenting co-ordinator post	43	0	43	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C8.4		Data support for the Children Centre Management System	28	0	28	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C8.5		Re-organisation of disabled children database workload	20	0	20	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E2.4		EIP Service restructure	140	192	332	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.1		Integrated Youth Support (Targeted Youth Support & Strengthening Families Team) & Reduce YOS Budget Re-alignment	92	0	92	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.2		Offset Substance Misuse work from DAT Public Health budget -re-alignment	124	0	124	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval

D1.16		Healthy Schools - Transfer function of co-ordination and consultant roles to schools	35	25	60	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.23		Aiming High - Review of Integrated Short Breaks - Budget realignment	55	0	55	Cabinet on 14th February 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

<b>ADULT SOCIAL CARE</b>						
C9.1		Drug Service Single point of assessment	224	0	224	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C9.2		Adult Social Care Budget Re-alignment	120	0	120	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E2.6		Central Support	0	350	350	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E2.7		Reduced social workers	135	135	270	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.14		Assessment & Care Management Teams - Reconfigure teams / skill mix	0	208	208	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.15		Reconfiguration of the Supporting People commissioning team.	125	61	186	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
F1.6		Community Meals- Migrating users to alternative providers.	138	62	200	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval



New Option (Options F3.2, D1.39 and D1.41 should now be considered as one option and updated information is described in section (ii) of annex D.)		Day care and respite provision	1,200	4,790	5,990	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval  Officers are continuing to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed and should significant issues arise Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.
D1.35		Section 117 After Care Funding	0	200	200	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.36		NHS Continuing Health Care Funding	0	400	400	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.37		Assistive Technology - Increase use of equipment to ensure users are able to remain in their homes with minimal outside support	0	200	200	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.38		Social Care- Subsidies- Increase client contributions for a range of non-residential services	244	320	564	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.40		Recover surplus / unspent direct payment funds at regular and earlier intervals and cease the first year one-off workplace insurance payment	752	0	752	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

D1.42		Revise Re-enablement model. Investment of one-off payment of £900,000 from Health will enable more users to go through a re-enablement process, thereby reducing levels of admission to short & long term care	0	1,200	1,200	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
D1.43		Further incremental reductions in housing related support	0	500	500	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval  Officers are continuing to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed and should significant issues arise Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.

<b>PUBLIC HEALTH</b>						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

D1.13		Integration Efficiencies	600	537	1,137	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3		Public Health Substance Mis-Use - Reduce service specification	0	500	500	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3		Public Health integration	0	100	100	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval

<b>HEALTH AND WELLBEING</b>						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

C10.1		Leisure operations –Improved Membership retention	200	0	200	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C10.2		Eze Fitness contract – terminate	55	18	73	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C10.3		Leisure operations – increase in income	150	0	150	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012

C10.4		Reduce supplies and services budget	23	0	23	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
C10.5		Reduce revenue growth for utility charges	200	0	200	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
E2.5		Review all management arrangements	320	-125	195	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
D1.22		Crosby Civic Hall - pilot external arrangements, with option of closure if unsuccessful	46	0	46	Cabinet on 13th December 2012 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4.3		Management fee reduction - Formby Pool Contract	50	0	50	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Cabinet Report		Libraries - Review of Service	150	250	400	Cabinet on 14th February 2013, further information requested for 28 <sup>th</sup> February Cabinet, to be considered at Cabinet (28 <sup>th</sup> February 2013)
Para 4.5		Local History and Volunteers (transition)	0	40	40	Considered by Cabinet 31st January 2013  Officers are continuing to work with and listen to service users. Equality implications are currently being assessed and should significant issues arise Council Officers will advise Members accordingly.

### **Authority Wide Savings / Financing Options**

Para 3.5 includes F3.1, F3.3, F4.2 & D1.28	Commissioning	Review of Commissioning - reducing funding support to community groups	679	261	940	Considered by Cabinet 31st January 2013 and 14 <sup>th</sup> February 2013 Cabinet. Recommended option for approval.
C12.5		Cash limit general non-pay budgets in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 (retains £0.5m excessive inflation provision in each year and retains inflation for specific contracts)	3,218	3,250	6,468	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
Para 4		NHS Support for Social Care	1,488	260	1,748	Option Approved by Cabinet 31st January 2013
Para 3.3	Terms & Conditions	Freezing increments for 2 years	1,500	1,500	3,000	Agreed by Cabinet on 31st January 2013. Proposed amendments to the Pay Policy as set out in 3.4 and for the pay policy to be published. Council.
Para 4.3	Council	Council Tax -100% on empty properties from month 2	0	400	400	Cabinet on 31st January 2013 Recommended Option for Approval
Para 4	Business Rates	Small Business Rates Relief - S31 Grant	1,171	0	1,171	Option Approved by Cabinet 31st January 2013
Para 4	Levies		1,180	0	1,180	Option Approved by Cabinet 31st January 2013
Para 4	Levies	To get total 2 year reduction to £4m	0	2,189	2,189	Option Approved by Cabinet 31st January 2013
Para 4	Transport Authority	Recharge	631	0	631	Option Approved by Cabinet 31st January 2013
Para 4	Disabled Facilities Grants	Capitalisation	0	1,000	1,000	Option Approved by Cabinet 31st January 2013
Para 4	Council Tax	Council Tax Freeze Grant	1,180	0	1,180	To be included in Framework Budget to be recommended to Budget Council.

Para 4	Council Tax	Council Tax Increase	0	1,408	1,408	To be included in Framework Budget to be recommended to Budget Council.
--------	-------------	----------------------	---	-------	-------	---

**Integration**

I1.1	Commissioning, Business Intelligence and data		125	125	250	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
I1.2	Learning & development, Training, Professional Training and CPD		250	250	500	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
I1.3	Financial Assessments		0	250	250	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012
I1.4	Customer Access Points		0	250	250	Option Approved by Council - 22nd November 2012

		<b>Use of One-Off Resources to Support the Budget</b>	843	-843	0	To be included in Framework Budget to be recommended to Budget Council.
--	--	---	-----	------	---	---

**25,000    25,800    50,800**

<p><b>Service Description: Communications (Integration of Communications Staff)</b> 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.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to continue with consultation with a view to implementing the following change</b> – That the agreed reduction of the number of staff working under the new integrated service could achieve further savings of around £40k in 2014/15 given the agreed structure and absence of pay protection after that period.</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – 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.</p> <p>The structure has been drawn up to reflect a reduction in staffing costs and initial figures show that the additional £40k could be achieved in 2014/15 without further staff reductions. This structure has been shared with the unions and the communications staff involved in the process and any potential for VR/VER or changes to working practices is being explored ahead of compulsory redundancies. The true achievable savings will not be confirmed until the structure is populated.</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – Reduced capacity to market and advertise some council services – although potential mitigation through new working methods and tighter co-ordination and prioritisation of activity.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change</b> – <b>Service Users</b> – Potential reduction in the amount of information available about council services. <b>Partners</b> – Potential reduction in the amount of information available about Council services. Potential loss of co-promotion/management of joint projects. <b>Council</b> – Potential reduction in the amount of information available about council services, potential impact on income streams because of reduced marketing activity.</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> –</p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Proposed Timeline:</b> 6 months Consultation is ongoing in accordance with HR procedures. Implementation: (April 1, 2013)</p> <p>Updates on the integration process have been ongoing with staff and there have been several meetings with service-managers and direct face-to-face updates on the process with the staff concerned. Several updates have been provided at the regular union update meetings and individual union and employee issues have been responded to. Frequent email updates have also been sent to staff and any queries responded to. The job descriptions have been finalised and circulated and assimilations, where appropriate, have been completed. Interviews are being arranged for the remaining posts. Detailed discussions with HR colleagues have taken place and they are supporting the process.</p>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</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.</p>
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Statutory guidance on public/legal notices etc. The 2011 Government Guidelines for Local Authority Publicity.</p>
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – Loss of information streams for residents, partners etc – mitigated by looking at delivering communications 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</p>

generators would be a prioritised area of activity within the new arrangements. The £40k is in addition to the £100k already approved by November 2012 Council; however it will not put further staff at risk. The true achievable savings will not be confirmed until the structure is populated and therefore the £40k is an estimate.

	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £ 40,000 Full / Part Year</p> <p><b>Potential Staff at Risk: TBC</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal</p> <p>Net posts 0 but posts may need to be changed from treatment officers to enforcement officers in order to address failure to treat amongst those unwilling to pay.</p>
--	---

**Service Description: Double Rating (This is a combined option F4.3 and D1.29)**

**F4.3** To reduce funding to Town Council/Parishes in 2013/14 for double rating in line with council grounds maintenance contracts.

**D1.29** To further reduce double rating allocations to Parish/Town Councils by £30,000 in 2013/14, and for double rating allocations to be removed completely in 2014/15.

**Categorisation:**

Double rating allocations are made to four Parish/Town Councils within Sefton East Area Parishes area to in order to support their responsibility for maintaining parks and/or open spaces for land owned by them, or leased from Sefton MBC. These ex-gratia payments commenced in 1976/77 and were based upon acreage.

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

**F4.3-** In 2013/14 to implement the reduction in double rating by £33,000.

**D1.29**

- (1) In 2013/14, to reduce double rating allocations to Parish/Town councils by £30,000
- (2) In 2014/15, to completely remove double rating allocations from Parish/Town Councils.

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

In terms of proposal D1.29 (1) above, the proposed reduction is in line with reductions within the council's landscape service. In terms of proposal (2) the worsened council budgetary position, as a consequence of the recent Local Government Settlement, has meant a further review of services against key criteria. Double rating allocations to Parish/Town Councils fall within a non-statutory service, and have therefore been identified as a potential saving option.

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

It will become increasingly difficult for Parish/Town Councils currently in receipt of double rating, to maintain parks and/or open spaces either owned by them, or leased from Sefton MBC. Service standards and maintenance for parks and open spaces will require review, and are likely to be reduced in order to reflect what resources are available to the Parish/Town Council.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Service users may become less satisfied with the quality of parks, open spaces and sporting/recreational facilities.

**Partners –** N/a

**Council –** The potential to “hand back” the leases could be a complex proposition which breaks down into three basic scenarios for both the Council and the Parish Councils;

1. At the natural expiry of the lease term, the Parish can decide not to renew the lease so the land and property reverts to the Council. At this point the Council will seek to ensure that the land/buildings have been returned in repair as required under the lease. If not the Council would make a claim for dilapidations and usually this manifests into a financial settlement payable to the Council. However each lease would need to be checked and assessed separately. It then falls to the landlord to manage and maintain the land/building.
2. Break Options – sometimes leases contain break options which permit a service of notice to terminate the lease before the natural expiry date. There are usually conditions that need to be met before the break is effective, but these would be specified in the lease document. If the break is successfully executed, the lease will terminate on the relevant break date. As per 1 there might be a dilapidations issue to resolve and the Council has to manage/maintain the



land/building.

3. Early Surrender – the Parish can seek to negotiate the early termination of the lease, but acquiescence to this would be at the sole discretion of the Council and on terms satisfactory to the Council. The Council would not normally accept an early surrender if it meant taking on additional financial liabilities or releasing the tenant from onerous liabilities which it would then have to meet. If the Council were to consider this course of action a receiving department would have to be found that had the management capacity and financial wherewithal to take on the relevant repairing and maintenance liabilities of the land/buildings.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

Proposed Timeline Consultation and Engagement is currently on going as part of the process Implementation: April 2013 and April 2014

**Public Sector Equality Duty –** A Full Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken should Members agree that the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when the final decision is made.

**Legislation Considered –** Double rating allocations are non-statutory.

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –** There is no legal requirement for the council to provide double rating allocations. Please see impact of Service Change Section for further detail.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
£229,000 + £33,000

**Staffing:** N/a

**Other Resources used:** -

**Saving 2013/14 (#):** £63k

**Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):** £150k

**Staff at Risk:** Potential number unknown, but likely to include staff with responsibility for grounds maintenance within Parish/Town Council.

<b>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	
<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. Parish and Town Councils strategic liaison will be reduced. <b>Council</b> –Financial saving.	
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> –	
Type Inform	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Page
	<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	
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – The Quality Assurance Group recognises that in relation to “Cease specialist equalities support” this is the end of a project. There will be no impact to service users as management responsibilities have been distributed between the existing management team and therefore no impact assessment is required. The Quality Assurance group recognises there are no equality implications.	
<b>Legislation Considered</b> – Crime and Disorder Act 1996 Equality Act 2010	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – 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> £140,000
	<b>Saving 2014/15</b> £60,000
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: Savings achieved through</b>
<b>Other Resources used: -</b>	<b>VER/VR and voluntary reduced hours</b>

<p><b>Service Description: Democratic Services</b> Reduce governance structure of the Council and frequency of meetings and restructure democratic services to meet reduced structure. NB This option is also linked to the option relating to a reduction in the number of Area Committees.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> Stop servicing all non-member meetings and those non-standing committees without decision-making powers(officer meetings, taxi drivers annual meeting, area partnerships, etc) Reduce frequency of meetings for example Cabinet 14 to 10, Area Committees each meeting from 5/6 meetings per year to 4, Licensing and Regulatory Committee (6 meetings to 4 ) This option will also consider current Overview and Scrutiny arrangements</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> The option will facilitate a leaner decision making process. It will also reflect the Council's reduced resources, release capacity so as to facilitate the changing role of the Council in the future.</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The number of formal decision-making meetings will significantly reduce.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> None</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> None</p> <p><b>Council –</b> There will be less formal decision making meetings and therefore agendas for remaining meetings may increase in business.</p> <p>The responsibility for meetings no longer serviced by democratic services would need to be transferred to service departments.</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Page <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline The revised calendar of meetings can be implemented for the start of the 2013/14 Municipal Year and the resultant restructure implemented for June 2013.</p> <p>Implementation: The calendar of meetings for Cabinet is a matter for the Leader of the Council to determine. The calendar of meetings is a matter for full Council to determine. Changes to the Constitution would be required to implement the new structure and this would also be a matter for the full Council.</p> <p>Staff briefings have taken place on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2013 and Trade Unions have been fully engaged.</p>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that there will be no change to the community. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> Local Government Act 1972, Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Localism Act 2011</p>
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b></p>

There is a risk that the remaining Cabinet meetings may contain a large number of items and there is an increased risk of urgent decisions being required outside of the Cabinet timetable.

There is also a risk that a reduced timetable may mean that additional meetings are called which would reduce the savings that are made. The Constitution currently allows for any 5 Members to call on the Mayor to arrange a special Council meeting and any two Members can call a special Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting. Consideration may need to be given to this.

As resource would be focussed on meeting the Council's statutory requirements,  
As Democratic Service staff also assist with elections during peak times, arrangements would need to be made with other Council departments to release staff during those peak periods.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
£386,750

**Staffing: 10.09FTE (across Democratic Services as a whole)**

**Other Resources used:**

**Saving 2013/14: £38,000**  
**Saving 2014/15 £13,000**  
**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 1.5 fte**

**Staffing savings would be 1-FTE (£41k) if all of option taken, Additional savings in SRA allowances could be realised dependant on the outcome of the review of overview and scrutiny**

<p><b>Service Description: Reduce number of Area Committees</b> To reduce the number of Area Committees from 7 to 3</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> To reduce the number of Area Committees from 7 to 3</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> this will result in a reduction in the cost of democracy and maintain a balanced approach which recognises the geography of the borough and allow councillors and members of the public to access this forum.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The number of Area Committees across the Borough will be reduced by reconfiguring the area covered by each bearing in mind the legislative requirements set out below.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> There may be greater distances for service users to travel to attend their Area Committee</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> There may be greater distances for service users to travel to attend their Area Committee</p> <p><b>Council –</b> Agendas for meetings will cover a larger geographic area which may have conflicting priorities which could result in limited resources being more effectively targeted</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline This could be implemented for the start of the Municipal Year in May 2013.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change. Whilst there may be more travel involved for members of the public, if this presents particular problems, they still have the option of meeting/contacting with their local councillor to put their views forward. Where the change affects staff, officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered -</b> Local Government Act 2000, Part II, s18 (5) requires that where executive functions are delegated to Area Committees, each Area Committee covers no more than 2/5 of the Borough both in terms of area and population.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Venues could alternate to allow equal opportunity to access the meetings</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £386,750</p> <p><b>Staffing: 10.5</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14: £15,000</b></p> <p><b>Saving 2014/15: £5,000</b> Full Year</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 0.5</b></p>

<p><b>Service Description: Support for Christmas Tree Displays</b>  For a number of years Sefton MBC has installed and decorated 11 Christmas trees in 11 specified sites throughout the borough. The Council has also contributed and supported Christmas celebrations throughout the borough.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to continue consultation and engagement and implement the following change</b>  It is proposed to cease the councils support for the installation and decoration of 11 Christmas trees within the borough and to cease its financial contributions for Christmas celebrations throughout the borough.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b>  The cost of installing and decorating 11 Christmas trees within the borough is now at an unsustainable amount circa £19,000. The projected budget shortfall is £7,000 which equates to a % rise on the original budget held (£10,200). Economic Development and Tourism also hold an £8,000 Christmas light support fund along with a £12,000 Christmas lights budget for Southport. In previous years Bootle, Crosby and Maghull has also benefited from this funding, both of these funds will no longer be available due to budget reductions.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b>  The Council will no longer supply, install and maintain the 11 Christmas trees and provide financial support throughout the borough for Christmas celebrations.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Council –</b> If the proposal is accepted this may result in negative press against the council. Mitigations will need to be put into place to explain the decision to our residents and businesses.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Page <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline: Immediate on approval  Implementation: Immediate on approval</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> The QAG recognises that whilst community Christmas lights and trees are part of the cultural landscape, it also recognises that people, businesses and communities can put up their own decorations etc ( in line with public safety regulations) but the Council can no longer afford to fund this provision. This is now in line with other religious festivities.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b>  There are no statutory or legislative requirements on the Council to provide Christmas trees.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>  Communications will need to be put into place to explain the decision to our residents and businesses.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>  £30,200 (In year saving)</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>    <b>£30,000</b></p>

<b>Service Description: Risk management (insurance)</b>		
<b>Categorisation:</b> The Council will retender insurance covers in 2013. Based on the experience of a partial retendering in September 2012 the service is confident that a saving of £50,000 is achievable		
<b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> As above		
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Retendering the contract on an amended basis and to change the claims handling costs		
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Downsize the claims handling costs		
<b>Impact of Service Change -</b>		
<b>Service Users –</b> possible delay in processing claims		
<b>Partners –</b> none		
<b>Council –</b> process will require streamlining in areas of high claim levels to minimise additional workload		
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>		
Type Inform	Consult <input type="checkbox"/>	Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance Group is satisfied that this is a technical retendering process and as such has no equality implications.		
<b>Legislation Considered -</b>		
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>		
Risk assessment forms a key component of the tender evaluation process.		
<b>2012/13 Service Budget: £</b>	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>	£25,000 Part
<b>Staffing:</b>	Year	
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#): £</b>	25,000 Part
	Year	
	<b>Staff at Risk: 0</b>	

<b>Service Description: Finance , ICT and procurement</b> <b>Categorisation:</b> Further streamlining of processes The Finance and ICT teams are undertaking a further reconfiguration of processes for handling data and reporting.	
<b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> The changes in automation of these processes will reduce running costs and staffing time. The service believes that a saving of £50,000 full year effect is achievable.	
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> The current financial system requires system changes to be actioned by March 2014. In preparation for this some early changes can be made which will streamline the processes and systems within the Council.	
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Reduced software and operational costs	
<b>Impact of Service Change -</b> <b>Service Users –none</b> <b>Partners – none</b> <b>Council –</b> process will require streamlining in areas of high claim levels to minimise additional workload	
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type Inform      Consult <input type="checkbox"/> gage      Pa <input type="checkbox"/> ship <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> Quality Assurance Group has considered this proposal and recognises there are no equality implications.	
<b>Legislation Considered –</b> N/A	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Detailed process changes will be risk assessed by audit	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £      25,000
<b>Staffing:</b>	Part Year
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £ 25,000                      Part Year
	<b>Staff at Risk: 0</b>



<b>Service Description: Environment-Trading Standards</b>	
Improve integration of service delivery within Trading Standards and Licensing Section	
<b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> Restructure and reallocation of roles and responsibilities.	
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Opportunity for greater service efficiency	
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Change to licence application process and multi role enforcement duties for officers	
<b>Impact of Service Change –</b> <b>Service Users –</b> None <b>Partners –</b> None  <b>Council –</b> Internal operations, restructure, reallocation of duties and deployment of staff, reduction in established posts.	
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>  Type Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Consultation with staff at risk continued following HR processes. Trade Unions fully engaged.	
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to team structures and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.	
<b>Legislation Considered -</b> Licensing Act 2003, Trading Standards legislation	
<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.	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget: £</b>	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £ 30k Part Year
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £ 20k Full year
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<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

**Service Description: Pest Control**

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

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

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

Assume 4.5 pest control officers and 0.5 enforcement officers.

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

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

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

Type Inform  Consult (Internal)

**Pest Control Charging Feedback from Consultation**

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

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

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

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

	£0	£5	£10	£15	£20	£25	Stated	
Rats	11	1	2	1	3	3	£18 x1	
Mice	9	1	6	2	2	1		

Cockroaches	1							
Bedbugs								
Fleas	3	2	5	1	2	4		
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>57</b>

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

**Public Sector Equality Duty – See below**

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

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

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

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

**2012/13 Service Budget:**

£184,000

**Staffing: 5**

**Other Resources used:** UU

Sewer baiting contribution

**Saving 2013/14 (#):**

£ 20,000 Part Year

**Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):** £ 10,000 Full Year

**Staff at Risk: 0** 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.

**Equality Analysis Report**

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

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

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

**Ramifications of Proposal:**

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

If 'Yes' give details

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

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

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

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

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

**Consultation.**

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

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

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

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

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

1. Inform public
2. Identify process for income testing

Monitor take up and efficiency of service

<p><b>Service Description:</b> Deferment of return of highway management funding £800k for further 2 years</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b> No consultation required. The temporary reduction in budget has previously been through the consultation process</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> 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</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> This would require a continued restructure of the Highway Works Programme. Implementation of the current £800k reduction has delivered by: ceasing footway/carrageway reconstructions; ceasing carrageway "plane &amp; 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</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b> <b>Service Users –</b> 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. <b>Partners –</b> 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. <b>Council –</b> Significantly increased reputational risk - corporate complaints increased by 43% last year following a rise of 70% the previous year.</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/> Saving already implemented and would therefore continue</p>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> 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.</p>
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> Highways Act 1980</p>
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> 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 &amp; therefore increased highway risks and liability claims, potential increase in numbers of payouts &amp; insurance premium. Also increase to inspector work load and associated</p>

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 budget for one year	£800,000 Deferment of return of budget for one year under consideration	£0 reduction (return of 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

**2012/13 Service Budget:**  
£6428850

**Saving 2014/15 (#): £ 800,000**  
**Investment Required: 0**  
**Staff at Risk: Nil**

<b>Service Description: Street Lighting</b> Savings in energy due to selective switching off of street lights on A565 and A59 which will generate a saving of based on existing tariffs.		
<b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b> Substantial consultation has been undertaken with over 500 responses Selected alternate street lights on rural sections of A565 and A59 (excluding junctions) will be switched off between 20:00 hrs and 06:00 hrs. Signs will be erected at key locations to advise the highway user		
<b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Cost saving initiative pilot study to gauge impact and customer perception with a view to possible extension should conditions permit		
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b>  Alternate street lights will be turned off at selected times. Review impacts on the previously reduced night scouting scheme. (see consultation report for further information)		
<b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users –</b> To be reviewed following implementation  <b>Partners –</b> None  <b>Council –</b> Reduced spend on energy based on existing tariffs. Possible reputational risk		
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type (please specify) Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/>  Consultation completed and results reported to Cabinet		
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> See Equality Analysis Report below		
<b>Legislation Considered –</b> <i>Highways Act 1980.</i>		
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> <i>Potentials risks to be monitored and considered during initial period of implementation. Any mitigating actions becoming apparent will be reported through the political process.</i>		
<b>2012/13 Service Budget: £</b>	<b>Saving 2013/14: £ 15,000</b>	Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Additional Saving 2014/15: £49,000</b>	Full Year
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Investment Required: £ Offset</b>	
	<b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b>	
	<b>*Savings based on current tariffs subject to change</b>	

<b>Equality Analysis Report</b>	Reference: Street Lighting
<b>Details of proposal:</b>	
<b>Reduction in street lighting to save costs.</b>	
Sefton currently has 31,500 street lights, 1,100 illuminated bollards and 1,963 illuminated traffic signs. These account for 30% of the Councils 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.	

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.

The issue of street lighting can be an emotive issue as they are clearly linked to issues of safety and criminal deterrence.

### **Ramifications of Proposal:**

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': Yes

If 'Yes' give details

There will be a number of options continued to be explored looking at times and location where street lighting can be turned off or reduced.

Three proposals were put forward to the public:

- **Proposal 1: Replace existing bulbs with Light Emitting Diode (LED) lighting:**  
**83.82% (435)** "Strongly agree" or "Agree" with this proposal.
- **Proposal 2: Replace existing bulbs with energy efficient bulbs:**  
**69.17% (359)** "Strongly agree" or "Agree" with this proposal.
- **Proposal 3: 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.

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

Proposal 1 & 2 will not affect anyone in a disproportional manner as the lighting will remain – the type of equipment will differ.

Proposal 3 has drawn concerns from the public, and presents an emotive issue. In general there could be a disproportionate impact if the scheme starts to extend in to 'work and social time' should this to happen and where street lighting is reduced or diminished in locations such as schools this could adversely affect children and parents (predominantly female) travelling to and from school. This raises safety issues.

Disability: Lower street lighting will affect visually disabled people/pedestrians and people with mobility problems (dimly lit areas can cause trips/falls etc.)

Mitigation:



Careful consideration will be given to areas assessed for reduced lighting or early switch off as to ensure there will be minimum impact. Full account of local amenities will be given and disability access to such amenities.

***The current proposal looks at switching off between 12 midnight and 6am. This should not affect school runs or community safety.***

**Consultation.**

**Full consultation has taken place with residents. See full report.**

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

Currently the suggestion is to pilot the reduction in lighting in rural areas with low density traffic between 12 midnight and 6am. As each pilot is created attention to how it affects people will be made and reported to senior officers/council.

The current proposal meets the public sector equality duties.

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

- 1. Continue to develop pilot**
- 2. Continue to establish the effects before reducing lighting.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

**Partners – NA**

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  nsult (Internal)  Engage

Partnership

Providers have been fully engaged in this process. TUPE provisions would need to be applied to

bring external staff in-house, and mobilise services.

**Public Sector Equality Duty-** The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change to team structures and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users except those in receipt of the non mandatory handyperson services. Service users will be able to source similar services through local tradesman and traditional nationally recognised companies. Officers will comply with procurement and HR policies and procedures. This will include regular monitoring reports to Corporate Services.

**Legislation Considered -**

Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 [for DFGs],  
 Transfer of Undertaking (Protection of Employment Regulations 2006 TUPE.  
 Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act, 1970

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

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

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

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

The Council will encounter contractual issues and risks associated with managing the agencies current nominated contractor list. Whilst there is no direct contractual link with the Council, additional demands for assistance and advice may be generated via clients of the service if things go wrong.

The risks are not significant but can incur considerable officer time in order to resolve.

DFGs and Minor Adaptations are mandatory services, However, if a service review led to the need for fewer staff due to efficiencies, then there may be a need for some redundancies during 2013-14.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Progress	The decision was taken by Cabinet on the 8 <sup>th</sup> of November. A meeting was held with Mears management on the 9 <sup>th</sup> of November, to explain the Councils position and way forward. Similar meeting was later held with CVS. Letters were served on both Mears and CVS on the 29 <sup>th</sup> of November, to formally notify them of our intention to internalise the Major Adaptations and Minor
----------	---

	<p>Adaptations services , and to cease the Handy person services.  There has been an ongoing dialogue and exchange of information with Mears, regarding staff TUPE since December, which is still ongoing.  Officers have been to visit and meet the Mears TUPE staff on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January. Plans are progressing to bring the staff and Adaptations services in house, with effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2013.  The Handy person services will cease from 28<sup>th</sup> of February 2013.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> External staff would TUPE in-house</p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b>  Accommodation, IT, telephones and central support services would be required. In-house Budget estimates include a 57% on-cost to reflect this.</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>    <b>£37,000</b>    (£39k capital)  <b>Investment Required:</b> <b>£0</b>            <b>Year?: n-a</b>  <b>Staff at Risk:</b> <b>0</b></p>	

**Service Description: Increase Highways Network Management Income**

Increased income target of £50K in Highways Network Management, phased as an additional £38k in 2013/14 and £12k in 2014/15

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

Network Management currently has an income target of £400k. This income is based on the following sources:

- Utility sample inspection
- Utility defect inspections
- Utility prolonged occupation of the highway
- Utility administrative errors
- Street Works Licenses
- Licensing of skips
- Licensing of scaffolding
- Licensing of hoardings
- Licensing of open air cafés
- Licensing of Cranes

Other than the utility sample inspections, all other sources of income are speculative, based on either requirements for licenses, or errors and poor performance by utility companies. Further strategies have either been approved by Cabinet or are in the process of development. These are currently:

- Licensing of builders materials (approved)
- Licensing of developers containers (under development)
- Licensing of advertising A-Boards (under development)

Achievement of the income target is based on staff availability and the increased target will be a further stretch on resources. The increase will not be achievable without additional resources being allocated to this task and an increased focus on the licensing activity.

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

The Council is empowered to levy charges and fines to works promoters (statutory undertakers) in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (as amended by Traffic Management Act 2004) and also to levy further charges for licensing in accordance with Highways Act 1980. These charges have not increased for two years.

Whilst these activities generate income for the Council to cover the costs of delivering the service, the underlying benefit is the Council's enhanced ability, through this initiative to comply with the statutory network management duty by maximising the availability of the highway network to users.

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

With some refocusing of resource, the additional initiatives detailed above will be implemented without detriment to other areas of service provision.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** More control of activities and increased charges will provide further incentives to work in an efficient manner to reduce individual costs so the service user will benefit from a more accessible highway network

**Partners – None**

**Council –** Income targets, whilst speculative, will be potentially more achievable with this

initiative in place.	
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>	
Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/>	
Partnership <input type="checkbox"/>	
Proposed Timeline: 1 <sup>st</sup> March 2013 for return of staff to allow for set up arrangements to be implemented Implementation: 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2013	
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance Group is satisfied that this is a tendering exercise to achieve a saving process and as such has no equality implications to this action.	
<b>Legislation Considered –</b> Highways Act 1980, New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (as amended by Traffic Management Act 2004)	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> The increased target is arbitrary and imposed rather than proposed. All income is speculative and officers use their best endeavours to achieve targets based on the fundamental network management duty to manage activity and maximise availability of the highway network. The income relies on the activity of utility companies, along with developers and other third parties who require licenses to operate on the highway. The income is monitored and reported through financial analysis systems on a monthly basis, however certain elements are somewhat seasonal so a consistent income stream is not achievable.	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>	<b>Additional Income 2013/14: £38,000</b> Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Additional Income 2014/15: £12,000</b> Full Year
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Staff at Risk: 0</b>

<p><b>Service Description: Re-integration, re-commission and restructuring of externalised services-Built Environment</b>  Restructure of Investment Programmes and Infrastructure Division and services following the termination of Capita Symonds contract and the reintegration/ re-commissioning of services from October 2013.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b>  Unless otherwise agreed the services within the Capita Symonds contract return in October 2013. The time then required for the restructuring/re-commissioning exercise and any statutory consultation and notice periods required suggest that it is unlikely that any significant saving could be achieved during the 2013/14 financial year. Implementation of saving would be 2014/15.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> Discussions on the basis for the reintegration of Capita Symonds’ staff into the Council and/or re-commissioning of services are still in their infancy, however an assessment of the likely workload in 2013/14 has indicated that an overall saving is likely to be in region of £500,000, but this could alter following detailed review.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> Discussions on the basis for the reintegration of Capita Symonds’ staff into the Council and/or re-commissioning of services are still in their infancy. Implications in relation to services and staff will be assessed should members agree the proposed option be taken forward.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users –</b> The Council will continue to meet statutory requirements, the re-commissioning of services will seek to ensure value for money is obtained. As the work commissioned is variable services users will be considered as part of any potential change  <b>Partners –</b> see above  <b>Council –</b> Reorganised team</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b>  Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) X Engage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline <i>complete Sept 2013</i> Implementation: <i>complete March 2014</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular team meetings have taken place with Sefton Council staff</li> <li>• Regular meetings have taken place with Capita senior management teams</li> <li>• Direct Consultation between Sefton Council staff and Capita staff has taken place in January 2013, with a view to implementation in October 2013.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to team structures and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will comply with procurement and HR policies and procedures. This will include regular monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> N/A</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Discussions on the basis for the reintegration of Capita Symonds’ staff into the Council and/or re-commissioning of services are still in their infancy, however an assessment of the likely workload in 2013/14 has indicated that an overall saving is likely to be in region of £500,000, but this could alter following detailed review.  Risk implications will be assessed should members agree the proposed option be taken forward. This will be reported when final recommendations are brought for a decision.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget: £</b>  <b>£ 1,919,000 (Capita Core Fee)</b>  <b>£ 613,000 (SMBC)</b>  <b>Staffing: 120 approx (Capita)</b>  <b>14 approx (SMBC)</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £500k Full Year</b></p> <p>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: not known at the present time as work ongoing to determine requirements is not yet complete. If 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: Relocation of Economic Development to Magdalen House</b>          To relocate 35 staff of the Council's Economic Development Service from The Investment Centre, Stanley Road, Bootle to Magdalen House, Trinity Road, Bootle, and make a saving of £48,000 in rent in 2013/14 and subsequent years.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change</b> No external consultation required. The proposal can be implemented from the start of the financial year 2013/14 (exact date tbc).</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> To reduce the running costs of the Council, and to reduce the level of accommodation leased from private landlords in line with the Council's Accommodation Strategy.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> There will be no change in service levels attributable to the relocation. There will be a higher level of occupation in Magdalen House which will increase the efficiency of the Council's property-related spend and services.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change</b>  <b>Service Users</b> – None, <b>Partners</b> – None  <b>Council</b> – Saving on rent (utility costs will be transferred to Magdalen House)</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b>          Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/>          Partnership <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>          Proposed Timeline Consultation with staff will commence immediately after the proposal is accepted          Implementation: Space planning and relocation planning to be completed late in financial year 2012/13, and move in early 2013/14.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change in location 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. Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> N/a</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> This proposal takes into account the implications of relocation for the viability of South Sefton Development Trust (the Council is an anchor tenant). The Trust now has a higher occupation rate for the Investment Centre than when the Economic Development team moved in (November 2008), so the financial risk to the Trust is believed to be manageable with the real possibility of a market re-let.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>          £110,000 (controllable revenue budget)   <b>Staffing: 89</b>   <b>Other Resources used:</b>          Revenue expenditure 12/13 = £2.34m          Capital expenditure 12/13 = £5.11m</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £36,000  <b>Saving 2014/15</b> £12,000 Full Year  <b>Staff at Risk:</b> 0           Costs of moving, fitting out and furniture will be met from within existing reserves in Economy &amp; Tourism           Dilapidation charges on TIC will be met corporately.</p>

## **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.

### **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

<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline: Immediate  Staff briefings have taken place with affected staff  1-1 meetings have taken place  Discussions have taken place with Mersey Forest on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2012, with email correspondence on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2012, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2013 and 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013</p> <p>Implementation: With immediate effect following approval.</p>			
<p><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</p>			
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> The Council has no statutory or legislative duty to provide these services.</p>			
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> Discussions have taken place with Mersey Forest and affected staff to minimise risks in implementation.</p>			
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £251k</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> 55 (excl. Tourism)</p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b> £2.2m (external funding)</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £ 51k</p> <p><b>Investment Required:</b> £0</p> <p><b>Staff at Risk:</b> 0</p>	<p>Full Year</p>	

<p><b>Service Description: Southport Theatre and Convention Centre (STCC)</b>  The Council own the recently (2008) refurbished STCC conference and theatre venue which is presently operated under a management agreement and lease arrangement by Ambassador Theatre Group. The agreement has come to term and an Invitation To Tender is live at this time (Feb 13) seeking to secure an operational partner for the next 10yrs.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b>  Securing of an operator for the STCC for a term of 10 yrs.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b>  Existing agreement has come to term.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b>  It is expected that the securing of a new operational arrangement will allow efficiencies to be captured that are reflected in a reduced cost to the Council with minimal impact on service delivery.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> Minimal  <b>Partners –</b> Minimal  <b>Council –</b> A revenue saving to the Council</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"/>  Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline ITT is live with expectation of completion by Summer 13 for commencement at beginning of 14/15 financial year.  Implementation: April 14</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b>  The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a technical change to specification/renegotiated contract and is satisfied that there is no notable expected change to service delivery for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered -</b>  There are no statutory or legislative requirements on the Council to provide a conference and theatre venue.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>  ITT is through an EU open tendered process and therefore market tested</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget: £</b></p> <p><b>Staffing: N/A</b></p> <p><b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#): £ 0</b>  <b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#): £ 100K Full Year</b>  <b>Staff at Risk: 0</b></p>

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

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

The 'paid-for' facilities include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	No of (adult) facilities  (n.b. this varies each season)	Approx. number of (adult) users (2012/13)  (n.b. this varies each season)	Current actual costs for providing facility (adults only)  (This is a <b>guide only</b> based on averages, each user group will be consulted about their specific charges, which vary depending on facilities used at each site)
			<b>See note 1</b>
Baseball	1	20	Total: £2k Grounds maintenance: £2,000 per diamond
Bowling greens:	17	1,000	Total: £82k (across the borough) Grounds maintenance: £4,200 average per green Utilities: average £600 per pavilion (where applicable)

Cricket wickets	1	40	Total: £1,800 (across the borough) Grounds maintenance: £1,800 Pavilion cleansing: (not applicable – provided by others) Utilities: (not applicable – provided by others)
Croquet lawns:	2 (9 courts)	100	n/a the club now maintain their own facilities
Football pitches	50	2,500	Total: £95k (across the borough) Grounds maintenance: £1,650 per pitch Pavilion cleansing: £1,550 per pavilion (where applicable) Utilities: average £1,250 per pavilion (where applicable)
Rugby pitches	2	35	Total: £2,000 at these facilities Grounds maintenance: £1,000 per pitch Pavilion cleansing: (not applicable – provided by others) Utilities: (not applicable – provided by others)

Note 1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note 2.

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

Note 3.

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

NB It may be that the leagues/ associations in question will wish to raise fees and charges to

users above and beyond those described above in order to continue generating their own income

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

There is no requirement for consultation on this option as public consultation took place as part of the 2012/13 budget setting process. At the Council meeting on 22nd November it was agreed to defer Option F1.2 (Grounds Maintenance – Recharging grounds maintenance / utility costs for adult football/sports users / bowlers) until the consultation process on Option F1.3 (Grounds Maintenance - Recharging grounds maintenance / utility costs for organised junior sports activities) is concluded and a report is submitted to the Council.

10 meetings have also been held with organisations such as New Victoria Cricket Club, Southport Croquet Club and Bootle Stadium Community Group. See full details within Equality Analysis Report below.

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

**Legislation Considered** – N/A

**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

Risk: Users may refuse to pay for grounds maintenance charges

Mitigating Action: Formal agreements to be put in place

Risk: Significant number of users may stop using the facilities

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

Risk: The managing agents who currently administer activities may fold

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

**2012/13 Service Budget:** £290k      **Saving 2013/14:** £ 85,000      Full Year

£290k

**Staffing:** n/a

**Other Resources used:**

**Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 0**

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

**Details of proposal:**

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

The 'paid-for' facilities include:

- Formal football pitches (adult and Junior)
- Cricket wickets
- Formal Rugby pitches (adult and Junior)

- Bowling greens
- Croquet lawns

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

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

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

### **Ramifications of Proposal:**

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Consultation**

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

#### *Sefton Sports Connect*

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

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



The options include:

- Lowering maintenance specifications
- Reducing utility costs
- Seeking external funding
- Rationalising / sharing facilities
- Self management / contribution to management etc.

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

*Further Discussions with Stakeholders*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Football:

- Southport and Formby Amateur Football League are considering different options, including pitch rationalisation and potential for future self management of buildings
- Crosby and District Football League are considering self management of Buckley Hill pavilion, reducing number of pitches and sites they play from
- Hesketh Casuals Football club are developing a model whereby volunteers undertake the extra over works relating to football provision
- The County Football Association, Sports England etc are offering to work pro-actively with

the Council and the leagues, clubs and teams, to try and manage the changes, using examples of best practice from other Local Authorities, with the aim of making the sport more sustainable and self-sufficient.

It has been reported that 6 teams / clubs have disbanded as a result of the increased charges in 2012/13.

#### Bowling:

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

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

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

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

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

#### Cricket:

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

#### Croquet

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

#### Multi sport:

- Bootle Stadium Community Sports Group/ Crosby Stuarts Football Club/ Trojans baseball club are developing a model and ongoing discussions about self management/ developing built facilities.

- If the proposed increased are agreed, all sports users groups will be informed of their proposed fee increase for 13/14 this will be followed by more detailed information is it becomes available (as utilities costs are clarified based on actual bills for 12/13)

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

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

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

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

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

**Service Description: Increase charges for burial and cremation service**

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

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

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

Current fees charged locally by similar burial and cremation authorities:

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

(The table includes some calculated or averaged charges)

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

**Council –** It is possible that service users may consider using other service providers which may affect the overall amount of income generated from this proposal.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult  Engage  Partnership

**Proposed Timeline:** April 2013

Consultation and engagement took place during October 2011-January 2012 on the changes to charges which were reported to Cabinet and Council in February 2012. At the Council meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November, it was agreed that further consultation on this proposal takes place from 6<sup>th</sup> December until 7<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

<b>Public Sector Equality Duty – See assessment below</b>			
<b>Legislation Considered - N/A</b>			
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> –There will be a risk that some customers may use services offered by neighbouring authorities. This has been allowed for in the income estimate.			
<b>2012/13 Service Budget: -</b> £0.94m	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b>	£400,000	Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b> 15	<b>Investment Required: £0</b>		
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk:</b> none		

<b>Equality Analysis Report</b>	
Reference: F1.4 Cremations and Burials	
<b>Details of proposal:</b>	
<p>To increase the charge for burials, cremations and associated services. The increase in charges would be above the rate of inflation and generate an additional income in the region of £400,000.</p> <p>The current charges for the main services are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cremation - £600</li> <li>○ Interment (1/ 2 coffins deep) - £600</li> <li>○ Interment (3/4 coffins deep) - £675 and £715 (respectively)</li> <li>○ Purchase of a grave (resident) - £750</li> </ul> <p>Currently Sefton's prices are in the upper quartile of those charged locally but are not the most expensive on Merseyside.</p> <p>The proposed increase could lead to charges which would equal the current most expensive on Merseyside.</p> <p>An Equality Analysis report was submitted to Cabinet in February 2012 in relation to previous cost increases for burial, cremations and associated services. This analysis report draws on previous findings and is commenting on the above proposal.</p>	
<b>Ramifications of Proposal:</b>	
<p>Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': Yes</p> <p>Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No</p> <p>The threshold will change as costs to all residents will increase if the proposal to increase the charges to clients of the Cemeteries and Crematoria service is accepted.</p>	
<b>Are there any protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected in comparison to others?</b>	
<p>Although there are concerns expressed by particular groups and faith groups coming from the consultation, there is no evidence of a disproportionate effect on any one protected characteristics above and beyond the others.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the concerns raised from the consultation relate to poverty and low income at the time of death - but this in itself is not definitively linked to having a particular protected characteristic.</p>	

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

### **Consultation**

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

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

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

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

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

The Area Dean of Bootle said that:

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

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

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

- Consideration should [also] be given to those least able to afford the higher costs (some of whom will be older citizens) who may then be much more likely to require services in the longer run which are more expensive to provide."

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

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

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

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

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

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

Notify communities & funeral providers of new pricing policy.

Letters to individual funeral directors

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

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

Monitor progress

**Service Description: Allotments 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:**

- 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)



- Between October and November 2012, site notices were posted at all sites to inform allotment holders of the proposed increase in charges.
- 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. Representations from the NSALG, whose concerns were set out in detail, were considered by Cabinet on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012 as these had been received shortly before the Cabinet meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012.
- As extensive consultation took place last year regarding allotment and sports user fee/charge 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.
- Four emails have been received: three from individual tenants at Sherwood Road, and Queensway Road allotments, Crosby; and Gardner Avenue, Bootle, complaining about the proposed increase, and one from Birkdale Irrigation Allotment Society asking for further information. A further letter has been received from a tenant at Queensway Allotments which states that this person believes that the change may be unlawful under the Allotment Act and requests that this be brought to Members attention.
- If agreed at the Council meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> February, letters will be sent to all allotment associations or tenants to inform them of the increase that will apply from April 2014 onwards.

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

**Public Sector Equality Duty – 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.

<p>The predicted increase in costs for all of the recreational activities concerned are significantly higher than the proposed increase in allotment rents.</p> <p>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. Should there be any implications which adversely affect the proportionality of this option then this will be brought to Members attention accordingly.</p>		
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –Risk:</b> Users may refuse to pay additional charges  Mitigating Action: Formal agreements to be put in place</p> <p>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 &amp; Banstead) [1982] 43P&amp;CR 336.</p> <p>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.</p>		
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> c £52,000  <b>Staffing:</b> n/a  <b>Other Resources used:</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15:</b> £ 40,000  <b>Investment Required:</b> £ 0  <b>Staff at Risk:</b> 0</p>	<p>Full Year</p>

<p><b>Equality Analysis Report</b>  Reference: F1.5 Allotments</p>
<p><b>Details of proposal</b>  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.</p>
<p><b>Ramifications of Proposal:</b></p> <p>Is there a consequence to ‘Threshold’: Yes  Is there a consequence to ‘Capacity’: No</p> <p>Cost of running an allotment will go up for the user. This will affect those who cannot afford to pay more.</p>
<p><b>Are there any protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected in comparison to others?</b></p>

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.

**Service Description: Building Cleaning – Change of frequency in office cleaning**

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.

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

The staff who work in the buildings and would be affected if this saving proposal is approved are aware of the impact this may have in relation to staffing levels and/or terms and conditions (hours of work) which would be subject to the actual method of achieving the saving following further discussion/negotiation.

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

**Legislation Considered -** Health & Safety at Work Act 1974

**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:** There is 83 staff that are all potentially affected by this saving proposal. 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 a reduction in the hours of some posts as opposed to redundancy

**\_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. Following consultation the most favoured option is for residents to provide their own 'bin bags' within the parameters stated by the Council, if this option is approved it is considered that there would be 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.

**2012/13 Service Budget:**

£60,000 (provision of plastic sacks)

**Staffing:** None

**Saving 2013/14 (#):**

£60,000

Full Year

**Investment Required:**

None

**Staff at Risk:**

None



**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 –**

- 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.

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

**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 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	

### Equality Analysis Report

Committee paper code: Annex

**Details of proposal:** The Council currently operates a number of public toilets across the Borough. It is proposed to:

- Increase charges for use
- Reduce the budget for repair
- Consider reducing the number of facilities.

### Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': yes

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': yes

In some instances there will be either an increase in charge or a charge applied where previously it was free.

It may be the case that some facilities will be closed over time, based on either: lack of use or the facility being beyond repair.

Mitigation:

Alongside 'public conveniences' there are also private provisions, whether in the form of other public buildings ( e.g. town halls) or other service providers, ( e.g. super stores with public facilities) where the public can access toilets.

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

Whilst some people may need public toilets more than others, especially pregnant women, people with medical conditions – which may include some people with disabilities.

The proposal will not have any impact on these more than others as the service is continuing. Where closure is concerned people within the area will be notified and there will be 'signposting' to the nearest convenience – this may include pointing towards other public buildings or private facilities such as super stores.

### **Consultation.**

The consultation on the proposals to **close all public toilets** ran in Sefton from 19<sup>th</sup> December 2012 until February 2013. The following provides an overview:

Concerns were raised over the needs of;

Older people

Disabled people

Families with young children

Tourism

Local business

Instead of closing all the facilities some respondents recommended:

1. Increasing charges
2. Use private facilities (stores/pubs/cafe etc)

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

Yes: The public toilet provisions will continue.

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

- Develop charging process
- Monitor outcomes
- Identify potential closures
- Identify network of 'private' facilities if public facilities due to close.

<p><b>Service Description:                    Cleansing Service</b></p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change –</b></p> <p>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)</p>
<p><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 £50,000 for the period 2014/15.</p>
<p><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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users –</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> removal of graffiti by the Probation Service’s “Pay Back” scheme will not be affected by this proposal.</p> <p><b>Council –</b> 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.</p>
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proposed Timeline Reduce service levels by September 2013</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> There are no proposed changes which will affect or disadvantage</p>

<p>any individual or specific group with protected characteristics. Any changes proposed will affect all residents equally across the Borough. In relation to any graffiti which is based on spreading 'hate crime' – this will be prioritised.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – The requirements of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 have been considered in the development of this proposal</p>	
<p><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.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £150,000</p> <p><b>Staffing:</b> 6</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £ 25,000 Part Year (from Q3)</p> <p><b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £ 25,,000 Full Year</p> <p><b>Staff at Risk:</b> 0</p>

<b>Service Description: School Admissions, Appeals and Student Support</b> Team provides management and administration of Sefton's school admissions service.	
<b>It is proposed to implement the following change</b> – Reduction in administration costs (supplies and services)	
<b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> –Further online application reducing costs	
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – Online application and printing of admission information	
<b>Impact of Service Change</b> – <b>Service Users</b> – None <b>Partners</b> – None <b>Council</b> – None	
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> – Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> X	
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – 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.	
<b>Legislation Considered</b> – School Standards and Framework Act 1998 School Admissions Code and School Admission Appeals Code Education Act 1996 – Education and Inspections Act 2006 -	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – NA	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £19,000 Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Staff at Risk:</b> 0
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	

**Service Description Schools Targeted Intervention and Improvement Team**

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 the LA School Standards And Effectiveness Advisers (SSEAs) and Ofsted in their evaluation of schools. The team ensures that the LA fulfils its statutory duties in relation to:

- KS1 and KS2 statutory assessment
- intervention in schools causing concern, including writing statements and action plans required by the DfE for failing schools; and
- acting as the Appropriate Body for Newly Qualified Teachers.

It is also a requirement that SSEAs meet with Ofsted inspectors during school inspections. The LA is responsible for designing, commissioning and brokering an appropriate support package for schools. 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, service level agreements with schools.

**Rationale for service change proposal –** This element of the service is non-statutory, although the team ensures that 11 statutory duties and two Ofsted requirements are met. Schools are able to build on the current successes of supporting less successful schools, although this is limited capacity for this at the moment.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** Reduced monitoring and challenge by SSEAs and reduced intensive support from the Intervention Officers in schools causing concern and those at risk of failing. 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 SSEAs and intervention officers

**Partners** – None

**Council** – None

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

23/01/13 –Informed staff of the proposed reduction to the budget

23/01/13 –Consultation with schools by meeting the Secretary of the Primary Head Teachers Association.

28/01/13 – informed the Sefton Learning Partnerships Group (HT leads of all of Sefton's schools' networks/clusters, where it was agreed that a representative group of HTs should meet with the LA to discuss SLAs.

Engagement will continue throughout the implementation period with for example:

- Continued discussions and engagement with all schools
- Meeting representative group of Head Teachers to plan for Service Level Agreements.

**Public Sector Equality Duty –** 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 –** DfE Statutory Duties: 57, 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 107, 160, 200, 201  
Education and Inspections Act 2006



**Risks & Mitigating Actions –**

- An increase in the number of schools judged inadequate or requiring improvement by Ofsted, which in turn would affect our national rankings (reputational risk) and could potentially trigger an Ofsted inspection of LA school improvement services (Ofsted announcement 16/01/13).
- Schools can, and do, change very quickly (e.g. significant changes in staffing, leadership, governors) and the risk could be that the LA cannot respond quickly enough to secure improvements.
- The loss of ‘intelligence’ about our schools: the LA would not know its schools well enough. LAs need to know how all of its schools are performing and this information is vital for interviews with inspectors during school inspections, which are required by Ofsted.
- Should the LA need to broker services, it would not be possible to have the same levels of accountability and quality assurance of external ‘advisers’, brokered in as required.
- If the service no longer supported Head teacher appointments, Governors would not have access to expertise and advice which is crucial to appointing the best senior leaders in our schools.
- The funding for this service will come via the Education Services Grant with effect from April 2013 and schools may feel that if the Council can not provide a service they will seek to become academies which mean that they will receive the grant directly. In this event there would be a direct reduction in Council funding of £116 per pupil (or £25k for each one form entry primary school which becomes an academy) – this will then impact on other Council services.

Mitigated by schools support network and brokerage service for schools as necessary

	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £260,000</b>      Year</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: up to 5</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>
--	--

<p><b>Service Description Connexions</b>  The Merseyside Authorities have a contractual arrangement with the Greater Merseyside Connexions Service to provide information, advice and guidance to young people through schools and other engagement mechanisms, particularly for vulnerable groups. The contract ceases on the 31st March 2014.</p>									
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –</b> To effect a further saving from the retained element of the Connexions Grant.</p>									
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b> To redefine the service provided in terms of information, advice and guidance to young people in context of required legislation.</p>									
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> The current contract with Merseyside Connexions Partnership ceases in March 2014</p> <p>Focus to be kept on the defined vulnerable groups rather than the broader definition of those vulnerable of becoming Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET).</p>									
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b>  <b>Service Users</b> - None directly as this is flexible enhanced activity funding  <b>Partners</b> – Potential staff losses for Connexions  <b>Council</b> – None</p>									
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 25%;">Type Inform</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 25%;">Consult (External)</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 25%;">Consult (Internal)</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 25%;">Engage</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>		Type Inform	Consult (External)	Consult (Internal)	Engage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Type Inform	Consult (External)	Consult (Internal)	Engage						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance Group is satisfied that this is a recommissioning retendering process and equality implications will be built into the service specification.</p>									
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> 2008 Education and Skills Act. Apprenticeship, Skills and Learning Act 2009.</p>									
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b>  Potential lack of progression of certain vulnerable groups, without focused support, in to Education, Employment or Training (EET).</p> <p>Potential not to be able to effectively track those at NEET to focus intervention.</p>									
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b>  £1.2m</p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £400,000</b>  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 0</b></p>								

**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 implement 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 where 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 in 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

<p>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. This includes a meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013</p> <p>Standard Council procedures will be observed in the instances where the Council are required to inform the public</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – 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 2010</p> <p>Officers continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Ofsted Inspection of child protection including early help provision.</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – 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.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £ 12,272, 600 ( placements only)</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14: £400k</b> <b>Additional Saving 2014/15: £600k</b> <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: 18</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal</p>

<b>Children's Social Care Commissioned Services</b> A range of services commissioned to provide and/or to support vulnerable children.	
<b>It is proposed to implement the following change</b> –To review the way the Council commissions travel (vehicle hire, leasing and taxis), Special Guardianship Order payments and residents orders.	
<b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> –It is anticipated that savings are achievable through efficiencies and re-commissioning.	
<b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – Business as usual re-commissioning	
<b>Impact of Service Change –</b> <b>Service Users</b> – None <b>Partners</b> – None <b>Council</b> – None	
<b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change of sourcing arrangements 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.	
<b>Legislation Considered</b> – Children's Act 1989	
<b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – None	
<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> £273,000 <b>Staffing:</b> <b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> <b>£100,000</b> Full Year <b>Staff at Risk:0</b>

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

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

<p><b>Service Description Healthy Schools</b>  This function ensures the on-going improvement, development and promotion of physical and emotional health by providing accessible and relevant information and equipping pupils with the understanding, skills and attitudes to make informed decisions about their health.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change option</b> – Transfer the function of co-ordination and consultant roles to schools</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – This is not a statutory function and because of successful initiative launches and monitoring this is now embedded within schools to take forward without coordination by the Council</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – Co-ordination, monitoring and promotion of healthy schools and Personal, Social and Health Education agenda in accordance with national policies. Schools will be expected to provide this service themselves.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users</b> none schools will be expected to provide this function to pupils  <b>Partners</b> – None  <b>Council</b> – None</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A series of staff consultations have been held, on the following dates: 30/11/2012, 04/12/2012, 06/12/2012, and also 22/01/2013.  The Trade Unions have been engaged throughout the process.</p> <p>A meeting with primary head teachers has taken place on 29/01/2013, and a meeting with secondary head teachers to inform is scheduled for March 2013.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to staffing and process and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. Officers will continue to comply with HR policies and procedures. This will include regular HR monitoring reports to Corporate Services.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – None</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – Schools may not carry forward the Healthy Schools agenda. Public Health may continue to provide some support through a re-negotiated service level agreement for school health services</p>	
<p>2012/13 Service Budget: £60,200</p> <p>Staffing: 2</p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14:: £35,100 Year</b>  <b>Saving 2014/15 £25,100</b>  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: up to 2</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>



<p><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.</p>	
<p><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</p>	
<p><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).</p>	
<p><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.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><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.</p> <p><b>Partners –</b> Change will require updating of process and contact information</p> <p><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</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Meetings with staff commenced in October 2012. Two workshops have been held to explore new structures and processes. Issues regarding reconfiguration are discussed with staff at regular Leadership meetings and regular reconfigurations meetings continue to take place with Team Managers and Care Management staff.</p> <p>Meetings with staff - 9/10/12, 10/10/12, 6/11/12, 7/12/12, 20/12/12, 8/1/13</p> <p>Workshops - 25/10/12 &amp; 11/12/12</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is an organisational change and is satisfied that the changes to service delivery seek to improve processes for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change. Officers will comply with HR policies and procedures.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b> None</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> If staffing reductions are outweighed by increasing demographic pressures, resource will be prioritised for those people with greatest and most complex need.</p> <p>The employee mix in the proposed care management model will ensure that there is a core specialist group to deal with sensitive cases.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	
	<p><b>Saving 2014/15 (#): £208,000</b> Year</p> <p><b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: Up to 10</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this option</p>

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

**Service Description Community Meals- Migrating users to alternate providers**

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.

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

**Rationale for service change proposal –** There has been a fall in demand for the service in recent years and it is anticipated that this trend will continue. Sefton saw a 21% reduction in the number of clients having meals delivered between the end of year 2009/10 and end of year 2011/12 figures. Nationally there was an average fall of 45.5% in the number of clients having meals delivered between over the same period.

The majority of Local Authorities have moved away from a direct meals service and towards arrangements with external providers for the supply of hot and re-heatable meals.

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

The 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>
Net Saving	-£200,000

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

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

In January 2013 a questionnaire was sent out to 433 current service users regarding the provision of Community Meals also known as Meals on Wheels. The questionnaire included both service users and also family members who were involved with requesting these services on behalf of relatives. The closing date was 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013 and the offer of telephone contact was suggested to those unable to complete the form.

Responses received as at 12<sup>th</sup> February are 143 (33%) and the respondents varied in age with the average age being 80+, although some service users are younger and there are also people over 100.

The questionnaire posed a number of questions around how many meals the service user ordered and whether they were hot or frozen and also whether they had access to a microwave or freezer. Respondents were also asked if they bought ready meals from other sources and if so where. Good value for money and dietary requirements were also queried as well as whether assistance with daily living was required and if so who offered this assistance. The final question was over what the service user considered a fair price.

From the responses received to date 20 people no longer require the service (14%) and from those that do they usually have on average 4 meals a week from the service. 33 respondents (23%) buy ready meals from other retail outlets on none delivery days or for other meals such as the evening meals. Retail outlets include Marks & Spencer's, Tesco, Wiltshire Farm foods, Morrison's, Iceland. Many people, however, rely on assistance from family, friends and neighbours with some family members expressing concern if hot meals were not provided due to lack of mobility of the service user or the inability to prepare meals due to mental health issues.

All except 2 (1%) felt the meals were good value for money although the variety of the meals and whether the option of not having a pudding for a reduced cost was queried. Those that had dietary requirements in the main said they were catered for and these included low sugar, low fat and soft food for a client with cancer.

Dialogue will continue with those who did not participate in the consultation to ensure that they are advised of the changes to the service delivery and options available for them.

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

**Legislation Considered** – 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 (#): £138,000**

**Saving 2014/15 £62,00**

**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

## Equality Analysis Report Community Meals.

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

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

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

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

### Ramifications of Proposal:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

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

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

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

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

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

Any withdrawal of service will affect these groups disproportionately. Council has only the duty to 'signpost' to meal on wheels type services (unless the recipient is assessed under FACS as a need) Alternate operators would provide a service, but officers need to ensure that the current recipients fully understand what is happening and can access the new service. Officers need to allow for people's age and levels of understand when putting the new proposals forward to recipients.

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

Ethnicity	Proportion
White - British	99.7%
White - Irish	0.3%
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. Contact Centre and Social Care processes and website processes will be updated
3. Monitor performance and feedback.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Further evidence to assist in considering this option is the feedback from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment consultation. This demonstrated that it is clear that access to universal services and

enabling self care is a key element to improving the health and wellbeing of our community especially those with learning and physical disabilities. This consultation has also confirmed that independent travel is valued and greater access to independent travel training would be welcomed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

x



Type Inform	x Consult (External)	Consult (Internal)	Engage
<p>The pilot consultation feedback indicated that the use of alternative venues is preferable to the current day care and respite models and that there is the potential to make alternative use of community and Council assets to improve outcomes and reduce longer term financial impact on the Council. The Council now intends to build on this approach to improve short break planning, shift the balance towards preventative support, independent travel where suitable and to personalise support to improve outcomes both for carers and those with assessed care needs so developing a sustainable model for short term breaks.</p>			
<p>This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,</li> <li>• To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.</li> <li>• Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.</li> <li>• To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.</li> </ul> <p>To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required</p> <p>Officers will continue with Consultation and engagement processes as part of the implementation process with service users, families, carers, employees and trade unions.</p>			
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</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> – National Assistance Act 1948, Local Authority Circular (93)10  There is no statutory duty to provide care in a day centre.  Case law is helpful in this regard in that it emphasises that the Authority should conduct assessments of current future service users to help determine provision to meet those assessed needs.</p>			
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> –</p> <p>Any material change to a person's care package should follow a reassessment or review and revised care/support plans which should be confirmed in writing.</p> <p>Increasing dependency of service users currently accessing day care – the Council will signpost service users to universal services which will enable more accessible and inclusive opportunities. Analysis from pilot has shown this to be a preferable solution.</p> <p>Risk to the operation of the Specialist Transport Unit – the Council would remodel this service  Challenge from service users and carers, mitigated by individual assessments and reviews</p>			
<p><b>Saving 2013/14 = £1.2m</b>  <b>Saving 2014/15 = £4.79m</b>  <b>Indicative Number of Staff at Risk: tbc (transport)</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal</p>			

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Ramifications of Proposal:**

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

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

continue to receive support.

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

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

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

**Consultation.** Officers have put in place plans to undertake reviews of care packages with each service user to ensure compliance with all statutory duties.

**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></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 continued through December and will continue over the coming months.</p> <p>This option was within the expert stakeholder panel agenda and was one of the topics of discussion. The first of a number of expert stakeholder panels took place on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013. This panel was specifically created to consult and engage with a wide variety of groups, forums and individuals involved in, or with an interest in, adult social care. Amongst other tasks this group is charged with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,</li> <li>• To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.</li> <li>• Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.</li> <li>• To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.</li> <li>• To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance Group (QAG) in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change in the funding source; the policy and activity of supporting people with assessed need has not changed.</p>

**Legislation Considered** – NHA Act 2006 and The NHS Continuing Healthcare  
(Responsibilities) Directions 2009

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

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

<p><b>Service Description Assistive Technology</b> 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.</p>
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change option</b> – Review all services where assistive technology can be utilised as an alternative. This may result in increased use of assistive technology for example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.)</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• sensors to prevent floods from overflowing baths</li> <li>• smoke and carbon monoxide detectors</li> <li>• falls detectors, e.g. worn on a belt</li> <li>• epilepsy sensors on the mattress or chair to detect an episode</li> <li>• video phones</li> <li>• computer-based communication aids such as Type Talk</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>What the Department of Health Use of Resources guide (DH 2009b) says on assistive technology</b></p> <p>“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.”</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better targeted timing and sizing of care packages and support</li> <li>• greater choice of care and support options</li> <li>• reduction in residential placements</li> <li>• crisis avoidance, meaning fewer A&amp;E and hospital admissions</li> </ul>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change – Service Users</b> – Some service users and care support staff will require additional and further training in the use of various solutions.</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Potential changes and reductions to the current contracts for night care</p> <p><b>Council</b> – 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</p>

scenarios from a number of different suppliers. It is expected that any such investment required in new technologies will be undertaken on an 'invest to save' basis, with the income generated from the delivery of new services generating sufficient surpluses to cover the cost of purchase.

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

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

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

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

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

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** –

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Council	% Charge against disposable income
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

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

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

A further meeting of the stakeholder panel took place on 13th February 2013. These meetings are ongoing on a monthly basis.

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

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

**Legislation Considered** – Health and Social Services and Social Security Adjudications Act 1993 Policy Guidance:

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

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

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

	<p><b>Part year saving 2013/14 : £244,000</b>  <b>Full year saving 2014/15: £320,000</b>  <b>Investment Required: £ Nil</b>  <b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b></p>
--	--

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

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

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

- Fostering engagement in the programme within their own service area,
- To encourage local ownership of the programme by informing their networks of the programme's aims, objectives and progress.
- Where possible, to facilitate the engagement of appropriate community groups and interested lay leaders.

- To review and evaluate the programme delivery and make recommendations, for future action, for consideration by the Steering Group.
- To actively participate in e-network activities as and when required.

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

**Legislation Considered** – Health and Social 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>
--	--

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

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

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

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

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

- maximise independence
- minimise whole life cost of care.

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

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

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

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

**Impact of Service Change –**

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

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

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

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

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

- Commissioning of new service will commence upon Council approval

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

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

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

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

**Legislation Considered** – Community Care (Delayed Discharges, etc) Act (Qualifying Services)(England) Regulations 2003  
Best Practice Guidance - Intermediate Care - Halfway House: updated guidance for the NHS and local authorities, 2009

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** –

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

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

The utilisation of such new technologies also allows for the development of new opportunities and clients groups, and the adoption of a more commercial approach to these new markets. This may include clients in a wider geographical area outside of the 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 2014/15 (#): £1,200,000</b>
<b>Staffing:</b>	<b>Investment Required: £ Nil</b>
<b>Other Resources used:</b>	<b>Staff at Risk: Nil</b>

**Service Description Housing Related Support (Commissioning Budget)**

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.

**It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –** A further reduction of the budget for housing related support services

**Rationale for service change proposal –** Incremental reductions in housing related funding have reduced the requirement for commissioning/contractual functions.

**The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –** In the main, the housing related support services are commissioned discretionary services intended to meet low level support needs.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users –** Reduction or cessation of housing related support services

**Partners –** reduction in funding to service providers.

**Council –** A small number of services are commissioned within the Council, reductions to funding for those services could have human resource implications.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

Type Inform  Consult (External)  Consult (Internal)  Engage

Extensive consultation has previously taken place

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

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

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

The Consultation and Engagement processes will continue as this option progresses to implementation.

**Public Sector Equality Duty –** The Council's Quality Assurance Group (QAG) recognises that the homelessness and housing policies are being reviewed and once reviewed these will set out fresh funding priorities. QAG is satisfied that the new policies will meet the Equality Act 2010 and that the commissioning process will contain details in relation to service user and their diverse needs.

**Legislation Considered –** None

<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 <b>Staffing:</b> N/A <b>Other Resources used:</b> Partner organisations commissioned to deliver current activity</p>	<p><b>Saving 2014/15</b> £500,000 <b>Year Investment Required:</b> £ Nil <b>Staff at Risk:</b> Nil</p>
<p><b>Service Description:</b> <b>Public Health Integration and Further Efficiencies</b> From April 2013, the Council will be responsible for public health services, currently managed by Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) and for improving the health of the people in Sefton.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to implement the following change</b> –The integration of Public Health within the Council, will identify an initial range of business efficiencies (e.g. releasing of vacancies, training programmes, commissioned services and infrastructure). Estimates from these integration related efficiencies, new ways of working and reviews indicate a potential saving of £1.137m. The Public Health Transition plan and status will be presented at January’s Cabinet. Further reports will identify the prioritisation of Public Health specific grant activities.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal</b> – Integration presents an opportunity to realise business efficiencies in both the corporate support and commissioning areas of the Council and Public Health.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce</b> – Reduction and/or cessation of various corporate activities that can be integrated and are duplicated such as infrastructure, commissioned services and marketing programmes. Much of this involves a budget re-alignment.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change</b> –</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> – Services may be delivered in a different way</p> <p><b>Partners</b> – Some activities will be commissioned differently</p> <p><b>Council</b> – Integration of Public Health functions</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement</b> – Type Inform      Consult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/> Partners <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Staff are engaged and informed according to HR procedures.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b> – 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.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered</b> – Health and Social Care Act 2012</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions</b> – Capacity to integrate and maintain outcomes. Prioritisation and effective joint working will mitigate against this risk.</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> £600k <b>Saving 2014/15:</b> £537K <b>Staff at Risk:</b> 0</p>



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

**Service Description: Crosby Civic Hall****It is proposed to 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

**Public Sector Equality Duty** – 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: 0**

<p><b>Service Description: Sport &amp; Recreation (Leisure Activity Review) – Formby Pool</b> In discussions with Formby Pool Trust and Formby Land Trust to vary the existing 40 year contract, and identify savings for the Council.</p>	
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on/implement the following change –</b> Discussions have been on going with FLT and FPT to vary the contract to benefit both parties and allow for a reduction in annual subsidy from the Council.</p>	
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b>This is part of the Leisure Activity Review. The varying of the contract can be achieved with the permission of all parties, the Council, FLT and FPT. Both partners are sympathetic to the Council’s current position and would like to assist, but not at the detriment of their operation.</p>	
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b> FLT and FPT are prepared to accept a reduction (17%) in the Council’s agreed subsidy if the Council will agree to vary two aspects of the Contract. 1. That FPT be allowed to charge users at a rate 20% above the charges set by the Council. The current limit is 10%. The Council would benefit from this as an income share agreement would be put in place that grants the Council a percentage of additional income generated above a set target. Discussions on the level of this target are ongoing. 2. That the lease of operation for FPT is extended by a further 20 year term. Both The Council and FLT are pleased with the performance of FPT as the Centre Operator. The current lease has 4 years remaining, and an additional 20 would give FPT a 24 year lease period, which in business planning terms would allow them to develop a long term business strategy and potentially improve their credit rating for future investment into the facility.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b> <b>Service Users –</b> Maintain and improve the service operated by the current leaseholder. <b>Partners –</b> Greater certainty, improved flexibility and long term business stability. <b>Council –</b> Reduction in subsidy and income share from revenue generated above an agreed target.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b> Type Inform <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult <input type="checkbox"/> Page <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b> The Quality Assurance group in looking at this proposal recognises that it is a change to commissioning arrangements and is satisfied that there is no change to service delivery for service users. As a consequence there will be no equality implication to this change.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered - N/A</b></p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b> Concessions will still be applied in line with the Council’s offer via the Active Choices card (leisure passport scheme)</p>	
	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> <b>£ 50,000</b></p>

<p><b>Service Description</b>  <b>Health &amp; Wellbeing – Libraries – Local History Service</b></p>
<p><b>It is proposed to commence consultation on the following change option –</b>  To consider the transfer of the operation and delivery of the Local History Service for Sefton to the Voluntary Sector (Sefton CVS).</p>
<p><b>Rationale for service change proposal –</b></p> <p>The Local History Service is based at Crosby library. It provides a specialist unit for people researching local and family history service, and for more detailed specialist enquiries. Although based at Crosby it is a borough wide service providing specialist support and advice for all the libraries in Sefton. It houses the historical archives of Sefton Council. The annual number of local history enquiries = 12,500.</p> <p>It is considered that the service may be able to be delivered by the Voluntary sector given the spread of local history groups across the borough.</p>
<p><b>The following activity will change, stop or significantly reduce –</b></p> <p>If achievable the service would be provided by the voluntary sector as oppose to the Council. The service may continue to be delivered from Crosby Library initially, but likely with reduced hours. There will be a loss of specialist knowledge from the Council's professional staff.</p> <p>Every council has a statutory duty to maintain its historic records. Sefton Council is one of the few authorities without an Archive Service or any archivists. It therefore falls to the Local History service to fulfil this statutory role. The Local Government Act 1972 (s.224) requires local authorities to 'make proper arrangements with respect to any documents that belong to or are in the custody of the council of any of their officers' but does not oblige them to provide archive services.</p>
<p><b>Impact of Service Change –</b></p> <p><b>Service Users</b> - The Local History Service is a highly valued, well used and a very localised service. The impacts are likely to be:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant reduction in the ability to provide access to information to members of the public</li> <li>• Loss of specialist knowledge, which is expected by the public</li> <li>• Reduced service provision of historic archives</li> </ul> <p><b>Partners</b> – A likely reduction in partnership working/reduction in services to all departments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential negative impacts particularly on Children's Services and schools as local history forms part of the national curriculum, if the voluntary sector cannot support schools.</li> <li>• Potential negative impact particularly on the Planning Department who require local historical information for development and conservation work.</li> <li>• Reduced service provision of departmental historic archives.</li> <li>• A potential reduced ability to provide council information to the public.</li> <li>• Overall delays in service to other council departments and loss of specialist knowledge.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Council –</b></p> <p>The Local History section fulfils the council’s statutory responsibilities towards the council’s historic documents as laid down in the Local Government Act 1972.</p>	
<p><b>Communications, Consultations &amp; Engagement –</b></p> <p>Type Inform <input type="checkbox"/> Consult (External) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consult (Internal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engage <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Consultation and Engagement processes will continue as this option progresses to implementation.</p>	
<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty –</b></p> <p>The transfer of responsibility for PSED will transfer with the service. When proposal is being considered Council will ensure duties will be clearly identified in the proposal.</p>	
<p><b>Legislation Considered –</b></p> <p>The Local Government Act 1972 (s.224)</p>	
<p><b>Risks &amp; Mitigating Actions –</b></p> <p>The risks are the reduced level of service as outlined above. There will be protest from local history service groups who have already seen the service reduced significantly.</p> <p>There is a risk of not being able to fulfil the Council’s statutory obligation.</p> <p>There is a risk of a lack of specialist knowledge.</p> <p>Mitigating actions will be to work closely with Sefton CVS and local history groups/ societies, and investigate if/how they can deliver the service.</p>	
<p><b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b></p> <p><b>£44,000</b></p> <p><b>Staffing: 4</b></p>	<p><b>Saving 2013/14 : Nil</b></p> <p><b>Additional Saving 2014/15 : £40,000</b></p> <p><b>Investment Required: £ TBC</b></p> <p><b>Staff at Risk: 4</b> note that where changes and/or savings cannot be achieved through deletion of vacant posts, VR or VER then there may be a need for compulsory redundancies arising from this proposal</p>

**Service Description: VCF Grants provided by the Council (F3.1, F3.3, F4.2, D1.28 Combined)**

Grants to Voluntary, Community and Faith sector organisations related to option proposal Early Intervention and Prevention (£283,000), Adult Social Care (£295,575) and Corporate Commissioning Neighbourhood Coordination (£100,000) in financial year 13/14. A further £261,425 will be realised in financial year 14/15 through the completion of the Councils VCF Thematic option review.

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

The following table shows the impacts upon the affected organisations. Primarily the reasons are a refocus upon service delivery, service efficiencies, reducing duplication and value for money.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Value of Saving/Reduction</b>	<b>Reason for Reduction</b>
Homestart Southport & Formby	£48,886	Early Intervention Service is being redesigned to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focus on targeted work, not universal</li> <li>• reduce duplication</li> <li>• provide robust evidence of impact on reducing risks of harm to our most vulnerable groups of children</li> </ul>
Homestart West Lancashire	£26,480	
May Logan Healthy Living Centre	£40,850	
Sefton Play Council	£40,000	
Queen's Road Neighbourhood Centre	£73,150	
Additional Savings 2013/14	£53,634	Service Efficiencies
Sefton Carers Centre - Hospital Link worker project	£64,550	Duplication with other services
Addaction Alcohol service	£6,525	Retender of service
Merseyside Partners	£7,000	Reduced need and value for money
Achieving People CVS	£37,500	Duplication with other providers
Additional Savings 2013/14	£180,000	Service Efficiencies
Benefiting Older Peoples Fund	£50,000	Focus on targeted work
Sefton CVS	£50,000	Service Efficiencies
Additional Savings 2014/15	£261,425	
<b>Total Savings 2013/14 and 2014/15</b>	<b>£940,000</b>	

**Rationale for service change proposal –**

To explore efficiencies from a range of providers in the VCF sector by analysing outcomes against the on-going prioritisation programme of the council.

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

Primarily the reasons are a refocus upon service delivery, service efficiencies, reducing duplication and value for money.

**Impact of Service Change –**

**Service Users** – There will be a reduction in available services to service users.

**Partners** – Potential reductions in grant funding may impact upon the VCF organisations ability to continue to provide services.

**Council** – Potential reductions to the VCF sector may impact upon the Council’s continued good working relationship.

**Communications, Consultations & Engagement –**

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

Extensive consultation has already taken place with the VCF sector regarding the Council’s budget position. There has been a coordinated approach ensuring that organisations were contacted by one named officer. This approach has enabled individual meetings to take place with all of the affected organisations. These discussions have included the impact on the organisations, the impact on service users and the mitigations required to ensure these are minimised. There will be on-going coordinated consultations with organisations under the VCF thematic review over the coming months where a prioritisation process will be undertaken against the councils priorities.

The Consultation and Engagement processes will continue as this option progresses to implementation.

**Public Sector Equality Duty –** Equality Impact Assessment below

**Legislation Considered** – There is no specific legislation in relation to this proposal

**Risks & Mitigating Actions** – 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. There is a risk the Council could be challenged against reducing resources in the sector. This may be managed by ensuring any proposals to reduce funding have considered equality impacts. There is potential for a disintegration of the Council’s relationship with the VCF sector – this can be avoided by appropriate engagement about service changes and communication of decisions

<b>2012/13 Service Budget:</b> circa £3.8 million	<b>Saving 2013/14 (#):</b> £679k Full Year
<b>Staffing:</b> N/a	<b>Additional Saving 2014/15 (#):</b> £261k Full Year
<b>Other Resources used:</b> -	<b>Additional Saving 2015/16 (#):</b> £ Full / Part Year
	<b>Investment Required:</b> £ <b>Year?:</b>
	<b>Staff at Risk:</b> N/a

**Equality Analysis Report**  
VCF Review

**Details of proposal:**  
The following organisations will have their funding removed/reduced in 2013/14:

Organisation	Value of Saving/Reduction
Homestart Southport & Formby	£48,886
Homestart West Lancashire	£26,480
May Logan Healthy Living Centre	£40,850
Sefton Play Council	£40,000
Queen’s Road Neighbourhood Centre	£73,150



Sefton Carers Centre - Hospital Link worker project	£64,550
Addaction Alcohol service	£6,525
Merseyside Partners	£7,000
Achieving People CVS	£37,500
Sefton CVS	£50,000

### **Ramifications of Proposal:**

#### Homestart Southport & Formby/Homestart West Lancashire/May Logan Healthy Living Centre/Sefton Play Council/Queens Road Neighbourhood Centre

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': YES

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': YES

The Early Intervention Service is being redesigned to focus on targeted work, not universal provision.

#### Sefton Carers Centre – Hospital Link Worker Project

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': NO

There are sufficient Social work staff and Community care practitioners working in both acute hospitals who can carry out carers assessments and have the knowledge and skills to sign post carers to the centre, or to benefit advisers for an income maximisation check.

#### Addaction Alcohol Service

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': NO

This is a service joint funded by Public Health and is being re-tendered in September 2013. Funding is being reduced but will support the service until retendering takes place.

#### Merseyside Partners in Policy Making

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': NO

This organisation provides training courses for people with learning disabilities and their carers. These courses will in future be spot purchased as necessary with a lower level of core funding provided.

#### Achieving People CVS

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': NO

If 'Yes' give details

Outcomes for this project have been low. Support for people who may have accessed this service is available from the Sefton at Work project and from disability support services at Jobcentre Plus.

#### Sefton CVS

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': NO

Savings will be achieved through efficiencies identified through consultation with the organisation.

#### Benefiting Older People Fund

Give details:

Is there a consequence to 'Threshold': NO

Is there a consequence to 'Capacity': No

If 'Yes' give details

The Benefiting Older Persons Fund does not provide a statutory service. It provides one off grants.

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

#### **AGE**

Families with young children may be affected by the reduction in Homestart funding in some areas as resources are targeted towards areas in greater need.

#### **DISABILITY**

People with disabilities and their carers may be affected by reductions in funding to Merseyside Partners in Policy Making and Achieving People.

#### **Consultation**

Extensive consultation has already taken place with the VCF sector regarding the Council's budget position. There has been a coordinated approach ensuring that organisations were contacted by one named officer. This approach has enabled individual meetings to take place with all of the affected organisations. These discussions have included the impact on the organisations, the impact on service users and the mitigations required to ensure these are minimised.

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

YES

Although the reduction or removal of funding to the organisations listed may have the effect of reducing the services available there are a number of mitigating factors:

- i. There are other organisations offering similar services.
- ii. Services will continue to be provided but on a spot purchased basis
- iii. Services were subject to low take-up or low outcomes

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

The organisations concerned will be given appropriate notice of the cessation/reduction of their

funding for 2013/14

Further consultation will take place with the organisations concerned regarding their role in the services provided by the Council and other partners in those areas.

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