

**Appendix A**  
**Consultation Category B – Options for Change**

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>2015/16 £000</b>	<b>2016/17 £000</b>	<b>2017/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving £000</b>
B01	Adult and Health	Adult Social Care and Health	Review of Intermediate Care services	-	800	800	<b>1,600</b>
B02	Adult and Health	Adult Social Care and Health	Handy Persons Preventative Adaptation Service	100	-	-	<b>100</b>
B03	Adult and Health	Adult Social Care and Health	Short Term Prevention Services	-	200	-	<b>200</b>
B04	Adult and Health	Adult Social Care and Health	To create a single integrated safeguarding support service for the council	-	70	-	<b>70</b>
B05	Children's and Culture	Children's and Young People	Early Years - Service and contractual efficiencies	200	300	-	<b>500</b>
B06	Children's and Culture	Children's and Young People	Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Home to School Transport	200	300	500	<b>1,000</b>
B07	Children's and Culture	Children's and Young People	Targeted Support and Youth Justice Cost Reductions	500	-	-	<b>500</b>
B08	Children's and Culture	Children's and Young People	Children and Young People's Sports and Arts - Service redesign including arm's length operation	-	200	150	<b>350</b>
B09	Children's and Culture	Children's and Young People	Integrated Family Support Model	-	-	1,000	<b>1,000</b>
B10	Children's and Culture	Culture	Arts Development Service - Staffing Reduction	-	149	-	<b>149</b>
B11	Children's and Culture	Culture	Sports Development - Reduction of revenue funding	-	-	108	<b>108</b>

Ref.	Portfolio	Committee	Title	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	Total Saving £000
B12	Children's and Culture	Culture	Rufford Abbey Country Park - Improve customer offer and reduce revenue costs	-	-	303	<b>303</b>
B13	Places and Resources	Transport & Highways	Establishing an alternative service delivery model for the whole of the Highways Division	-	300	750	<b>1,050</b>
B14	Places and Resources	Transport & Highways	Publicity and Transport Infrastructure	10	20	20	<b>50</b>
B15	Places and Resources	Transport & Highways	Passenger Transport Facilities Charge	15	23	25	<b>63</b>
B16	Places and Resources	Environment & Sustainability	Introduction of charges for the acceptance of non- Household Waste at recycling centres.	150	-	-	<b>150</b>
		<b>Total</b>		<b>1,175</b>	<b>2,362</b>	<b>3,656</b>	<b>7,193</b>

		Option Ref	B01
1. Service Area	Intermediate Care		
2. Option Title	Review of Intermediate Care services		
3. Summary of Option			
<p>This proposal is to review, redesign and deliver Intermediate Care services which prevent or delay people needing long term care home placements, thereby delivering savings of £1.6m.</p> <p>Intermediate Care services are primarily provided to older people who have temporary or longer term physical disabilities or who are frail and who would benefit from a period of rehabilitation following an illness. The services are currently provided by the Council and by NHS organisations. Through delivery of these services, the Council ensures that people receive the appropriate levels of health and social care services which mean they can be safely discharged from hospital following surgery or a period of illness. The services seek to help people to recover and regain their independence. These services can often delay or prevent people's need for long term residential or nursing care.</p> <p>There are emerging joint social care and health projects within the three Clinical Commissioning Group areas of planning (south, mid and north Nottinghamshire), which are seeking to define future integrated service models for Intermediate Care (IC), Reablement and other hospital discharge services.</p> <p>It is proposed that within these models Nottinghamshire County Council maintains the following principles when defining future services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prioritise funding for IC and Reablement services which can evidence avoidance of or delay in the need for social care packages, including residential care</li><li>• Target service to those who would benefit most from it</li><li>• Focus on avoiding care home admission and hospital admission where possible, as well as hospital discharge</li><li>• Significantly reduce the number of admissions into long term care directly from hospital</li></ul> <p>The aim is to design a new, integrated service model, which will assure partners that the savings can be delivered from further reductions in residential care and intensive support packages.</p>			
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option			

Intermediate Care and Reablement are not statutory services however they are regarded as an evidence-based preventative service. There are a number of national and local research projects and evaluations which have generally shown the positive outcomes of Intermediate Care and Reablement Services in terms of older people (and cost savings for both health and social care services) e.g. 'Half-way Home', produced by Department of Health in 2011, and National Audit of Intermediate Care 2013.

This option proposes that Reablement services are considered as part of the wider definition of Intermediate Care. The National Audit of Intermediate Care (2013) identifies the following four categories of Intermediate Care services:

- i) Crisis Response Service (predominately staffed by health professionals);
- ii) Home Based Intermediate Care Service (predominately staffed by health professionals with some Local Authority (LA) funded paid carers)
- iii) Bed-based Intermediate Care Service (predominately staffed by health professionals with some LA funded paid carers)
- iv) Reablement Service (predominately LA funded social care professionals)

The National Audit of Intermediate Care (2013 report) also highlighted the opportunity for Reablement services to become more integrated with the whole Intermediate Care system. In particular, diversity of provision was identified as a key theme, which identified concerns about fragmentation of services, potentially unclear routes in and out of services and lack of economies of scale.

Due to the way in which services have developed over time, Intermediate Care funding is currently disproportionately allocated across localities. Reviewing the budgets would provide the opportunity to ensure the resources are allocated more equitably across the county.

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

The aim of the new integrated Intermediate Care services will be to support people to quickly regain their independence following a health crisis whenever possible.

Promoting people's independence and maintaining people living in their own homes through community based intermediate care services will reduce the need for residential placements, and high cost care packages.

A bed based intermediate care service could be used as a hub around which a more integrated Reablement service could be developed. This would offer both home based Reablement in the community as well as the option of an accommodation based service for those requiring it.

The review of these services will enable the Council to deliver a more flexible and responsive service. It will provide an opportunity to reconfigure staffing and operating models so that it is able to deliver 7 day working or longer hours.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**GROSS  
£000

3,716

NET  
£000

3,521

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	800	800	1,600
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>1,600</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

45.4%

**7. Estimated Implementation Costs****WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	52	0	0	52

- 1FTE Project Manager @ Band D

**8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions****WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

0.0

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
0.0	0.0	0.0

0.0

No additional social care staff reductions are planned, above those already agreed in former savings proposals.

**9. Anticipated Impact****ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES****(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)**

- It is anticipated that the service will become more flexible and responsive, including through extending the hours of service
- The aim of the service is to support people's recovery and to help them regain their independence following a period of illness or a stay in hospital. The services can often delay or prevent people's need for long term residential or nursing care.

**ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS**

- The review of the Intermediate Care services is being undertaken in partnership

with Clinical Commissioning Groups. This should help avoid duplication and overlap thereby making the services more efficient.

#### **ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

- Clearer pathways to more joined up services - less duplication

### **10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment**

Older People are the main users of this service, and would be most affected by a reduced service.

<b>WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)</b>
--

Y
---

### **11. Risks and Mitigating Actions**

**Risk:** The remodelled service and plan is not able to deliver the required £1.6m savings.

**Mitigating Action:** Detailed modelling and forecasting will be undertaken over the next 6 months together with Clinical Commissioning Groups to identify any risk/s and to put in place measures to minimise risk.

**Risk:**

The public and wider stakeholders will perceive the funding reductions negatively.

**Mitigating Action:** Clear communications with the public and wider stakeholders on the efficiencies being delivered and the ability to divert people away from long term residential care.

**Risk:**

Further reductions to residential care placements are not achieved and therefore the required level of savings is not achieved.

**Mitigating Action:** Review of funding to current intermediate care services if reductions cannot be made to long term care budgets.

## **PROPOSED CHANGES FOLLOWING BUDGET CONSULTATION**

### Summary of Changes to Proposal

#### **Revised proposal following consultation**

After considering consultation feedback it is proposed to amend the original Option for Change to allow for a longer transition and implementation period which will mitigate against some of the risk of destabilising services which support hospital discharges.

CCGs have registered concern that the withdrawing of the adult social care contribution to IC services, without having the time to fully consider alternatives, could be detrimental to the overall aspirations held by health and social care of integrated care closer to home. The CCGs are concerned that the planned reductions will impact on hospital discharge arrangements and could result in an increase in hospital delays.

This amended proposal recommends that:

The £1.6m saving is realised over 2 years rather than 1 year; this would mean that £800,000 would be released in 2016/17 and a further £800,000 in 2017/18.

The retained funding would be used to support IC services provided through three of NCC's Care & Support Centres whilst a model for integrated care is agreed and finalised with the CCGs. The centres are Leivers Court in the south, Bishops Court in Mid Notts and James Hince Court in Bassetlaw

The timeline will be aligned with that of the Extra Care scheme option; subsequently there will be 2 years for care and support centres to be used to support the development of the service model with health.

### UPDATED Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

3,716

NET  
£000

3,521

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	800	800	1,600
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>1,600</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

**45.4%**

## UPDATED Estimated Implementation Costs

### WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	52	0	0	52

1FTE Project Manager @ Band D

## UPDATED Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

### WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

### WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	0.0	0.0

0.0

No additional social care staff reductions are planned, above those already agreed in former savings proposals.





1. Service Area	ACSH – Strategic Commissioning
-----------------	--------------------------------

2. Option Title	Handy Persons Preventative Adaptation Service (HPAS)
-----------------	--

3. Summary of Option
----------------------

It is proposed that the Handy Persons Preventative Adaptation Service (HPAS) partnership is reviewed and redefined, including seeking a proportionate financial contribution from Clinical Commissioning Groups to support the highest area of growth for HPAS, which is referrals to support hospital discharges, specifically to fit key safes rapidly.

***Current Operating Model:***

The Handy Person Adaptation Service (HPAS) is a highly used and highly valued service which aims to help people live safely and independently in their own homes through arranging:

- essential minor adaptations, such as installing grab rails, second stair rails, and half-steps. Individuals are asked to pay a contribution of £15 towards trader fees for adaptation work. Up to £250 worth of adaptations can be supplied and fitted in a single job.
- small practical jobs, such as fixing and fitting curtain rails and window locks, putting up shelves and fixing trip hazards such as loose carpets. Individuals are asked to pay a contribution of £15 towards trader fees for handy person jobs. All materials need to be supplied for the job are paid for by the service user.

The work is carried out by professional traders from Nottinghamshire County Council's "[Buy with Confidence](#)" register. They have all been approved by Trading Standards.

The £456,900 funding for the scheme is currently divided between partners as follows:

Nottinghamshire County Council	78%
District / borough councils	22%

The number of handyperson jobs has declined substantially over the past four years, whereas the number of adaptations has increased. Last year a total of 414 handyperson jobs were undertaken (standard and hospital discharge), compared to 2,929 adaptations (1,234 of which were hospital discharge adaptations).

The Supra C500 key-safe unit is the only material not exempt under the HPAS scheme or already covered by a client contribution where the cost may possibly be recouped.

During 2013/14 a total of 1,085 key safe units were fitted (at a cost of £92,272). Of these, 736 resulted from hospital or self-referrals for fast installation to support hospital discharge (at a cost of £65,000). The key safes enable both community health and social care staff to access people's homes to provide support for people who have difficulties in getting to the door themselves and/or who may be at risk of falling.

This hospital discharge element of the service was added to the original scheme following a successful pilot project. The pilot was initially funded by temporary joint re-ablement funds; however, no long term funding was added to the service to take on the additional work. Demand for this part of the service is now growing rapidly as more people are supported to return home earlier from hospital.

Options, including increasing the contribution from service users in line with other similar local schemes or increasing the contribution to achieve full cost recovery have been explored but discounted, as they would deliver minimal additional savings.

#### 4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option

HPAS is a preventative service that people do not have to meet social care eligibility criteria to use. It is not a statutory service.

HPAS contributes to timely discharge from hospital through the provision of installation of key safes. It is of benefit to health partners as it is a low cost service that can assist in expediting safe discharges from hospital, HPAS is therefore a cost effective service.

#### 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

The aim is to continue to deliver the same volume of service by seeking funding from Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) for the elements that support hospital discharge. If funding cannot be secured, then this element of the service may be reduced.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

457

NET  
£000

357

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	100	0	0	100
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

**28.0%**

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

0.0

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	0.0	0.0

0.0

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

**(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)**

There should be no direct impact on service users or carers unless CCG partners are unable to contribute towards the key safe jobs, in which case, this element of service provision could not be maintained at its current level, which could impact on hospital discharges.

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

Potential impact on CCG partners if the capacity for the fitting of key safes to support hospital discharge is reduced. This element of the service was added to the original scheme following a successful pilot project; it was initially funded by temporary re-ablement funds. Agreement would be needed on the method of CCG split of contributions; however, if this was equally divided between the six CCGs a relatively small contribution of £16,600 p.a. each would be required.

There are some other handy person schemes available in some areas of the county but they do not meet the quick time-scales required for hospital discharges. These services may incur increased demand.

**ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

N/A

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics. If health partners agree to contribute towards the cost of key-safe jobs, this proposal should not directly impact on service users or carers. However, if they do not, and this element of service is reduced, it would impact on clients of the key-safe service, which are mostly people aged 70 and over.

An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed in the event that there is no contribution from the health partners.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)**

Y

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

There is a risk that health partners will not be able to contribute towards the cost of keysafe jobs.

However, CCGs are highly supportive of all schemes which support people to be discharged from safely from hospital and which prevent unnecessary delays. Discussions have already been held with health partners about jointly investing in services which have a positive impact on people and which prevent delays in hospital discharges.



		Option Ref	B03
1. Service Area	Strategic Commissioning – services for younger and older adults		
2. Option Title	Short Term Prevention Services		
3. Summary of Option			
The County Council will invest in a short term prevention service for both younger and older adults. The aim of the service is to avoid people needing social care where possible, or stop existing social care needs increasing.			
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option			
A review of the evidence base for different preventative interventions informed the current 2014-17 programme of savings. Services that show good outcomes for reducing the need for social care are already planned to re-focus on three key areas of Older People, Mental Health and Vulnerable Adults. This also redefines investment in services that will deliver the new Care Act prevention duties and priorities.			
It is proposed that:			
<div>1. Social Care and Public Health jointly commission targeted, short term prevention support for both older and younger adults as one exercise and use this approach to help support a saving of £200,000.</div> <div>2. The service will focus on the requirements of the Care Act and developing a sustainable service that is effective in preventing people requiring social care, or reducing the intensity of their needs.</div>			
Work undertaken with the Institute of Public Care last year has developed a set of indicators of when older people are likely to most require and benefit from the service. For example, someone who is aged eighty plus, with multiple long term conditions, living alone following the death of a spouse. This will be used to pro-actively target people most likely to benefit from the service. Work will also be undertaken to establish indicators for younger adults.			
<b>Proposed Combined Older and Vulnerable Adult Prevention Support Service</b>			
The following demographic information and the new Care Act duty to identify and prevent future demand for social care services and also prevention services have been used to inform this proposal.			
<u>Evidence Base:</u>			
The IPC identified the following characteristics as indicators of likely future need for residential care (5 characteristics) or escalating social care needs (3) for older people.			

Long term conditions	Life Events	Social Characteristics
COPD(Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease) Stroke Diabetes Asthma Dementia Incontinence Learning disability Visual impairment Depression Limited mobility	Fall Death of spouse or friend Family move away Financial difficulty Sudden illness	Inappropriate or inaccessible housing Lives alone Limited social engagement Rural Over 85 Female Carer with own health problems Carer elderly

The targeted prevention support element of the service would be available only to people with at least two of the characteristics set out above (i.e. just short of escalating social care needs) and would, through the provision of very short term support (up to 6 weeks) aim to support people to continue to self-manage their independence.

Based on this, a combined early intervention and prevention support service has been designed. This combines Public Health resources (linked to Community Outreach Advisors) with social care budgets to commission one service that will deliver brief interventions to a broader population of targeted preventative support, as well as outreach work. The combined service will reduce duplication in service commissioning and delivery and create a more flexible and responsive service.

The brief intervention element of the service (Public Health funded) will initially offer up to two visits to address issues raised. The response will predominantly involve signposting to a range of organisations and services, including Department of Work and Pensions (DWP), energy advice services, Falls prevention team, Handy Persons Preventative Adaptations Service (HPAS), befriending services etc.

The outreach element will deliver the Care Act requirement to pro-actively identify people with prevention needs. A First Contact checklist will be completed for all contacts at this stage and where needs are more complex and people meet the criteria for a prevention support service, the service user will move to the next tier of service. At this point a more detailed assessment will consider needs in five core areas:

- Improving Health & Well-being
- Promoting Independence
- Social Connection
- Safe and Suitable Accommodation
- Improving Economic Well-being

It would be a principle of the service that, where services exist elsewhere that could deliver individual outcomes sought; people should be signposted to that service. The same work will now be completed in respect of the target population of vulnerable adults

and the interventions that will be most effective in addressing their risks to independence, in order to inform the new service.

Opportunities for more integrated commissioning are being explored. The involvement of the District Councils in this work is also being sought. Contact is being pursued with the CCG areas in the county for similar discussion.

The intention is to have new services in place by late summer 2015.

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

### Service level outcomes:

The high level outcomes sought from the new service will be based on the core objective of reducing demand for social care services and include:

- identifying people at risk of becoming eligible for social care services before a crisis emerges
- addressing key issues that evidence shows contribute to the escalation of social care needs
- supporting people over a short period of time to continue to self-manage.

### Service user outcomes:

At an individual level, the needs of service users will vary. Outcome measures will be developed to measure impact of the service on individual service users, across five support areas:

#### **Improved health and wellbeing:**

This might be achieved by referring people to health services, supporting access to health management information or falls preventing exercise, offering healthy lifestyle advice or advising on improved home security.

#### **Promoting Independence:**

This might be achieved by the development of new skills or finding new ways to manage daily tasks. Where possible, informal support solutions might be found from within communities.

#### **Social Connection:**

This might be achieved by supporting people to engage in their local community, build stronger networks of family and friends or through referral to befriending services.

#### **Safe and suitable accommodation:**

This might be achieved through referrals for adaptations or equipment, support to carry out repairs or housing options advice.

#### **Improved economic well-being:**

This might be achieved through support or referrals on benefits advice or money and debt management.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

11,622

NET  
£000

10,023

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	200	0	200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

2.0%

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

0.0

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

2015/16 2016/17 2017/18

0.0 0.0 0.0

0.0

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

**(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)**

The services are not yet in place; therefore a reduction to the budget can be made without loss of existing services.

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

There are opportunities with partners to develop aligned or integrated services. The combining of services for both older and younger adults provides a better fit with ways that services for people with long term conditions are structured.

### ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There is an impact for Public Health as this will be a jointly commissioned service.



## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

This proposal will impact on people with the protected characteristics of age and disability. The aim, however, is to provide an improved, more effective service. The ability of the provider to offer an appropriate service across these groups will be monitored, in order to minimise any potential negative impacts.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED?**

**Y**

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

1. Risk that too great a reduction in prevention investment would result in higher expenditure in the longer term as people come to the door sooner and/or in crisis. The services will be targeted to enable more appropriate and timely support services.
2. There are many service providers currently working with either older people or vulnerable adults. This change will require the market to respond appropriately. This can be managed through market events and partnership/consortium bids.
3. Integration considerations add complexity to delivery and therefore a risk to the timescale delivery. Clear links with interdependent projects will minimise this risk.



		Option Ref	B04
1. Service Area	Safeguarding Adults		
2. Option Title	To create a single integrated safeguarding support service for the council		
3. Summary of Option			
<p>There are currently two separate boards overseeing the arrangements to safeguard the county's adults and children from abuse and neglect. This proposal begins to explore how these boards can work more closely together to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiencies.</p> <p>Early discussions with partners would help to develop and shape this proposal for more collaborative working.</p> <p>By combining some of the functions and working collectively on common issues it may be possible to avoid duplication of effort and create a single support service for the county for all safeguarding matters</p> <p>Funding streams for the respective safeguarding boards are multi agency and no discussion has yet been had with partners jointly funding these arrangements. To ensure fair and sufficient contribution to overall safeguarding arrangements in the county, funding commitments to the service will need to be agreed with partners.</p>			
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option			
<p>A more integrated approach to safeguarding adults and children's boards has been achieved in other places.</p> <p>With the introduction of the Care Act, both the Adults and Children's boards will have a statutory function and this provides a good opportunity to consider the possibility of streamlining resources and combining functions and budgets.</p> <p>There may be a reduction in the amount of independent chair time required by having one chair who could represent a joint agenda.</p> <p>Reconfiguring management and officer structures could create efficiencies through economies of scale.</p> <p>There may be opportunities for the amalgamation of some safeguarding functions and streamlining some approaches; for example some sub groups of both safeguarding boards may be combined creating efficiencies, avoiding duplication and further supporting the one council approach. Training could be commissioned and delivered to help staff safeguard children and adults. Currently there is separate</p>			

training to safeguard children and to safeguard adults, and also separate domestic violence training - all overseen by different boards with individual governance arrangements.

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

The Council will have joined up multi-agency safeguarding arrangements for children and adults, meaning the statutory functions of the two safeguarding boards will be fulfilled in a more effective way.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

Gross

569

Net

319

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	70	0	70
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

21.9%

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

This is still to be identified. To achieve the savings it is estimated there will be a reduction of 3 to 4 staff.

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

8.0

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	0.0	0.0

0.0

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### **ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**

**(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)**

Implemented successfully, service users and communities would see a positive impact on service delivery.

### **ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS**

Partners would need to be fully engaged and in full agreement regarding any change to current arrangements.

Partners would see a demonstrably more joined up approach to safeguarding.

### **ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

Adult Services and Children and Young People's Services would need to be equally committed to this approach. By adopting a joined up approach shared agendas should be easier to achieve, for both the Council and partner agencies. For example, the 'think family' approach and transitions between Children's and Adult Services.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)**

N

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

### **Risk:1**

Inequitable attention is given to either the Children's or Adults agenda in relation to safeguarding work and subsequent activities may reduce, potentially leaving one group at greater risk.

### **Mitigating actions:**

Retention/appointment of staff and independent chairs from both services so that neither service is dominated by one agency/agenda.

Creation of new structures with clear terms of reference that are fit for purpose. Attention given to the management structure of any new arrangements to ensure they adequately reflect the work that needs to be undertaken.

### **Risk 2**

The impact of the Care Act in relation to safeguarding adults' boards may not be fully understood and embedded.

**Mitigating actions**

The Care Act does not preclude integration of support to safeguarding boards or the joining of safeguarding boards' activity. Careful scrutiny will need to be given to any realignment to ensure compliance with the new legislation. By undertaking the work in 2017/18 this will mean the Care Act will have had time to bed down and be better understood and implemented.

**Risk 3**

There is a risk that service delivery levels would be affected by staffing changes.

**Mitigating Actions**

Careful and detailed planning and agreements over the next two years to scope out what could be achieved via integration with clear programmes for the work to be undertaken. Staff training will also be provided.

**Risk 4**

Uncertainty about how the arrangements would be viewed by partners and regulators and potential withdrawal of multi-agency funding.

**Mitigating Actions**

Early dialogue with partners to secure agreement and input to shape and refine the outline proposals.



		Option Ref	B05
1. Service Area	Early Years		
2. Option Title	Service and contractual efficiencies		
3. Summary of Option			
<p>This option will deliver further efficiencies from work to support early years provision and through commissioned children’s centre services.</p> <p><b>Children’s Centre Services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Further development of integrated early childhood services: An established work stream will seek to redesign early childhood services together with partners including Public Health commissioning for health visitors and school nurses.</li><li>• The Service will review and revise its core children’s centre offer by targeting the delivery of children’s centre services to families with children aged 0 – 5 years, with a specific focus on promoting good levels of child development for 0 – 3 year olds.</li><li>• Both of these measures will contribute to staffing efficiencies.</li><li>• In addition, by scrutinising the commissioned contract with Nottinghamshire Children Family Partnership (NCFP), further efficiencies will be identified (such as pension and resources costs).</li></ul> <p><b>Early Years Services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Service will redesign the support provided to the Early Years sector through the Early Years Specialist Teacher team, with a view to developing a support model requiring reduced staffing, based around the development of Early Years Practitioner roles and multi-skilled teams.</li><li>• The Service will develop a sold service to the early years sector for workforce development and support to improve quality. An Early Years quality brand will be developed with alignment and integration of early childhood services to promote quality provision and sold services</li></ul>			
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option			
<p>This option builds upon the Service’s current business case and retains the proposed levels of clustered children’s centres with a redesign of the provision of services. This will help reduce further impact on families and communities and continue to support the development of an integrated Council early help offer.</p> <p>The reshaping of the Service’s support arrangements for the Early Years sector reflects changing national policy in this areas (the 2, 3 and 4 year old early education offer) and changing regulatory/inspection requirements.</p>			

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

Children's centre services will continue to deliver high quality early childhood services, but will focus more on children and families who need support the most. Children's centre services will be better integrated with broader universal services such as health visiting, and will be promoted to the public under a single Early Childhood Services brand, to improve awareness and service uptake.

Support to the Early Years sector will continue to promote and develop high quality provision in settings for 2, 3 & 4 year olds.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

17,224

NET  
£000

16,681

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	200	300	0	500
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

3.0%

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

The implementation costs will be met through the current project being delivered.

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

21.5

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
0.0	5.0	0.0

5.0

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### **ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**

**(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)**

Reshaped services will continue to offer effective support on a countywide basis for young children and parents/carers. Greater emphasis will be placed on the provision of services for those in most need of support/intervention.

### **ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS**

The integration efforts outlined in this Option For Change form will impact upon health partners and Public Health commissioned services such as health visiting. The commissioned partner for children's centre service delivery, NCFP, will also be affected..

The reshaping of Early Years Support arrangements will impact upon the early years provider network.

### **ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

Service integration activity will be undertaken alongside Public Health commissioners.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

An Equality Impact Assessment is updated and is a key part of the activity for delivering the current business case. The Equality Impact Assessment will be updated and amended to incorporate this option.

<b>WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)</b>	Yes
--	-----

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

The majority of risks and resultant mitigating actions will be identified and assessed through the Equality Impact Assessment process.



		Option Ref	B06
1. Service Area	SEND Policy & Provision		
2. Option Title	SEND Home to School Transport		
3. Summary of Option			
<p>This option will make savings through the development of personal budgets for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) home to school transport. The proposal is part of national SEND Reforms which require the County Council to offer personal budgets to families which will give parents greater choice and control when arranging school transport for their child. We will provide parents with support to manage their own personal budget.</p> <p>Currently there are 972 young people who receive home to school transport. The vast majority of these attend Nottinghamshire special schools; others attend local mainstream schools or non-maintained, special schools. The budget for home to school transport is £5.331m, equating to an average cost of £5,484 per pupil. However, the cost per pupil can vary from circa £3 to £180 per day, or £570 to £34,200 per year based on 190 days of learning in an academic year.</p> <p>The County Council is proposing to meet its statutory duties by offering a personal budget in place of the service in order to increase personal choice and flexibility to families whilst at the same time achieving savings for the County Council.</p>			
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option			
<p>It is proposed to review current models of SEND home to school transport with the view to offering a personal budget to families through a resource allocation system (RAS), This will provide greater choice and control to parents by offering the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• parents can make individual arrangements</li><li>• parents can pool resources to make joint arrangements</li><li>• third party facilitator can deliver transport on behalf of parents, for example a special school or charity.</li><li>• in exceptional cases where it is not possible to offer a personal budget, the County Council will retain a small contingency</li></ul> <p>The RAS would assess the value of the personal budget and allow the County Council to determine the size of the personal budget to be allocated to each family. The savings proposed will be made by limiting the overall size of the home to school transport budget over a two year period as shown in section 6.</p>			

The potential benefits of these options are:

- Increased personal control
- Increased flexibility
- An allocation system based on available funding

The potential difficulties include:

- Limited or lack of school and parent engagement
- Adverse effect on school attendance
- More vehicles arriving at school gates

The current expenditure for home to school transport is £5.331m. It is proposed that consideration be given to reducing the budget by 20% which will achieve savings of circa £1m.

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

- Parents will have greater control and responsibility for transporting their child to and from school through the allocation of a Personal Budget
- The council carries reduced employment, accommodation costs and other overheads, associated with the delivery of home to school transport.
- School communities increasingly shape the service available to them to match their local needs and priorities.
- Savings are realised by reducing the total transport budget available

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

5,332

NET  
£000

3,597

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	200	300	500	1,000
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

27.8%

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

### WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

The implementation costs would be met by the SEND Reforms Implementation Grant (circa £20K). Funds have already been earmarked to project manage this piece of work

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

### WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

### WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	0.0	0.0

0.0

There would be reductions to be realised from with travel and transport services; currently the level of reduction is not known.

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)

There are potential benefits for families who are able to manage the responsibility of a personal budget; there may be some families where this arrangement is less likely to succeed.

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

There will be an impact on existing contractors commissioned by NCC to provide home to school transport.

### ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There will be implications for Nottinghamshire transport services, both in terms of staffing and operational practices. These will be explored further with Nottinghamshire Transport Services.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

The provision of home-school transport is already targeted at a vulnerable group which is identified by their SEND. It is likely that the ability to be flexible will increase equality of opportunities rather than negatively reduce these.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)**

Y

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

**Risk:** There is a risk that parents would refuse to opt for a personal budget and to arrange home to school transport for their child.

**Mitigation Action:** We will offer support for families during the process.

**Risk:** There is a risk that these changes might undermine pupil school attendance.

**Mitigation Action:** Arrangements will be put in place to monitor attendance.

**Risk:** There is a risk that arrangements for home to school transport fall outside of quality standards and monitoring arrangements.

**Mitigation Action:** Systems will be put in place to monitor suitability of transport arrangements, in order to ensure the safety and well-being of young people.

**Risk:** This innovative and radical proposal may not achieve the predicted level of savings, especially by 2015/16.

**Mitigation Action:** Management capacity and specialist financial advice will be made available to progress the project.

At worst, it is conceivable that there could be duplication in costs with administering transport arrangements if only a proportion of the school population take up the option of a personal transport budget.

<b>Option Ref</b> B07	
<b>1. Service Area</b>	Targeted Support and Youth Justice
<b>2. Option Title</b>	Targeted Support and Youth Justice Cost Reductions
<b>3. Summary of Option</b>	
<p>This option reduces staffing and programme costs for youth justice provision in the light of a significant and consistent decline in youth offending rates and anti-social behaviour attributed to young people in recent years that has led to increased capacity within the Youth Justice Service. A reduction in these costs is possible without any significant impact on the ability of the Service to meet demand.</p> <p>Core youth justice services, innovative intervention approaches and the ability to intervene early, including outreach directly into hot-spots, would be retained.</p>	
<b>4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets all of the statutory obligations on the Local Authority</li> <li>• Targets the most vulnerable</li> <li>• Capitalises on the reduction in first time entrants to the youth justice system</li> <li>• Makes the best use of Grants</li> <li>• Options do not have significant risk of increasing costs for the Council elsewhere (e.g Children's Social Care)</li> </ul>	
<b>5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outcomes will remain unchanged although the targets may need to be revised.</li> </ul>	

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

9616\*

NET  
£000

6,366

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	500	0	0	500
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?\***

**7.9%**

\*Does not include the draw down of reserves in 2014-15

\*\* 11% net saving - including the savings from existing business cases

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

The estimated redundancy costs associated with this business case are £128,000.

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

145.57

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	8.5	0.0	0.0

8.5

## 9. Anticipated Impact

**ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**

(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)

The amount of youth justice crime prevention activity may be reduced if proven youth offending rises

**ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS**

None

**ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

None

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposals will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

The proposal to reduce staffing and programme costs within the Youth Justice Service (YOTs) will have limited impact in respect of service users with particular protected characteristics. Programmes will continue to be bespoke after an assessment of individual need.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)**

N

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

**Risk:** There is insufficient resource to deal with spikes or rises in youth offending

**Mitigation:** We would regularly monitor changes in trends and workload and quality and report to the Partnership Board any risk issues so that additional resources can be deployed.



Option Ref		B08
1. Service Area	Children and Young People's Sports and Arts	
2. Option Title	Service redesign including arm's length operation	
3. Summary of Option		
<p>This option proposes a phased move away from the Council delivering Saturday morning performing arts centres and performance groups, towards alternative arrangements and work to develop the Council's Instrument and Music Teaching programme and County Youth Arts offer at arm's length from the Council.</p>		
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option		
<p><b>(i) Phased transition of Saturday morning centres/performance groups</b></p> <p>Saturday morning performing arts centres operate in 4 locations across the County, and are discretionary provision provided by the Council in addition to curriculum music and performing arts activities in schools. Overall levels of annual subsidy per participant are approximately £255. Charges to participants have been increased in recent years, but the introduction of charges in 2011 and subsequent increases have received mixed feedback from parents and carers.</p> <p>For this provision to be cost neutral to the Council, participants would be required to pay around £15 per week based on a 23 week programme (approximately £5 per hour as sessions last for 3.5 hours). This assumes that people would be prepared to pay and that participant numbers (750 approximately, in total, out of a Nottinghamshire school age population of 100,000+) remain the same. Many local authorities no longer offer this provision, with young people accessing instead local clubs, school and voluntary group provision.</p> <p>There are 6 performance groups attended by low numbers of young people. This is also discretionary provision offered in addition to school based curriculum activities.</p> <p>The Council would seek to transfer the provision to schools to manage directly, or other third parties/independent providers. This transition has taken place successfully elsewhere, but would require pump priming funding to support the transition. The scheduling of the proposed budget reduction (2016/17) allows time for such transition arrangements to be put in place. Should a successful transition not be possible, it is anticipated that the provision would need to close in order to deliver the required savings.</p>		



## **(ii) Development of arm's length model**

There is the potential to reduce revenue costs further by managing Instrument and Music Teaching and County Youth Arts provision at arm's length to the Council. There is precedent in neighbouring authorities, where music and instrumental teaching provision and a community arts offer for young people has been successfully moved outside of the authority and in doing so contributed to reducing revenue costs. The offer would concentrate on the delivery of the programme of Instrument and Music teaching in schools and a county wide community arts offer using the central base of the "Old Library" in Mansfield.

There is currently work underway to investigate the most appropriate operating model, options for consideration include

- The development of an in house TECKAL compliant organisation;
- The formation of a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO);
- Alignment with the current work in Libraries and Community Arts to form an arm's length body.

This budget saving is profiled to impact in 2017 allowing time for the chosen arm's length delivery solution to take effect.

## **5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?**

### **Phased transition of Saturday morning centres/performance groups**

- (i) Continuation of the current offer if successful transition arrangements can be effected.

### **Development of arm's length model**

- (ii) Continuation of the current offer, if successful arm's length arrangements can be established, that:
- Meets the requirements of the national music strategy and retain levels of instrument and music teaching in schools
  - Promotes and delivers a county wide (targeted) community youth arts offer
  - Retains a commitment to work with those most vulnerable and disadvantaged
  - Develops and manages a relationship with the independent sector to promote local opportunities

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

4,300

NET  
£000

927

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving		200	150	350
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>350</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

**37.8%**

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	100	0	0	100

This is the estimated costs of achieving an arm's length solution to continue elements of the existing provision moving forward

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

**79.0**

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	4.0	3.0

**7.0**

## 9. Anticipated Impact

**ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**

**(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)**

**Phased transition of Saturday morning centres/performance groups**

- (i) Continuing access to service provision for young people will be ensured if transition arrangements can be put in place. If this is not the case, service users will not be able to access this provision.

**Development of arm's length model**

- (ii) Continuing access to service provision for young people will be ensured if transition arrangements can be put in place

**ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS/PARTNERS**

Schools and third party/independent providers will be approached in respect of future delivery arrangements. The Arts Council, which funds Nottinghamshire's Music Hub activity, will be consulted.

**ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

None.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not expected that there will be any negative impact on service users with protected characteristics if opportunities to continue some, if not the majority of the provision in partnership with a local delivery agency are realised. However, given that these opportunities need to be explored further, it is important to maintain focus on the impact that the proposal may have on service users with protected characteristics.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)**

Y

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

### Risks

#### **Phased transition of Saturday morning centres/performance groups**

- (i) Service closure: Mitigating actions will be the exhaustive pursuit of effective and successful new delivery arrangements

#### **Development of arm's length model**

- (ii) In relation to the development of an arm's length arrangement to manage future provision the risks are
- Ensuring managerial and financial stability.
  - Meeting the timescales for development of a new arrangement to fall in line with required budget reductions
  - Taking a cohort of employees forward into a new way of working outside of the Council
  - Maintaining existing business relationships many of which rely on the corporate brand of the Council to ensure quality
  - Management capacity in a new company to deliver the business model required
  - Building in safeguards required by national agencies that will be relied upon to continue to fund activity.
  - Developing back office infrastructure and competencies

#### **Mitigating actions are:**

- Appropriate levels of financial, legal and HR engagement and advice
- Detailed staff, customer and partner consultation and engagement
- Learning from existing arm's length operators in similar fields.
- Strong political support from the outset with assurances
- Outcome based Service Level Agreement in line with funding support
- Agreements to disaggregate central support costs
- Process leadership



		Option Ref	B09
1. Service Area	Early Help and Children's Social Care		
2. Option Title	Integrated Family Support Model		
3. Summary of Option			
<p>This option proposes to improve services and reduce the costs of family support provision through the establishment of integrated, co-located Family Support arrangements, combining resources from Early Help and Children's Social Care Services.</p> <p>A review of the support provided to children, young people and families will establish integrated, co-located Family Support arrangements, combining resources from Early Help and Children's Social Care Services.</p> <p>Early Help Family Support colleagues work with vulnerable children and families to support them in achieving a range of positive outcomes and also try to prevent them from needing involvement with Children's Social Care. They address issues such as behavioural issues, parenting difficulties, problems with drugs or alcohol, problems with attendance at school, anti-social behaviour, homelessness and the impact of parental illness or disability and act to keep children safely at home with their families where possible.</p> <p>Children's Social Care Family Support colleagues work primarily to help return children to their families if it is safe and appropriate to do so, and to prevent breakdowns in adoptive, foster or kinship families, for example, by addressing challenging behaviours.</p>			
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option			
<p>There is a growing international research base that indicates that effective earlier intervention can improve outcomes for children, young people and families whilst reducing long term costs for the public purse. Thus, if early help and edge-of-care family services are streamlined and strengthened, and delivered effectively via evidence based interventions, social care provision costs can in the long term be reduced.</p> <p>Direct savings will be delivered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Utilising grant income from central government that will become available as part of phase two of the Troubled Families programme to offset revenue spend.</li><li>▪ Delivering proposals which cluster family support services in localities and make best use of local knowledge when commissioning. Savings will be drawn from changing service structures and models of operation.</li></ul>			

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

- Families in need of early help will be effectively supported.
- Children will be kept at home with their families wherever possible and when it is safe to do so, by increasing positive edge-of-care outcomes. The number of children on Child In Need and Child Protection Plans will be stabilised and, in the long term, reduced.
- Integrated Family Support arrangements able to deliver effective interventions in a flexible way within localities, will be established.
- Co-located teams, situated and resourced according to need within localities, following consistent methodologies which are compatible with approaches across Children's Services, will be in place.
- An effective delivery structure for Phase 2 of the Troubled Families programme will be in place.
- A stable, suitably-qualified and supported workforce with clear development pathways will be in place.
- A defined performance and outcomes framework will be in place.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

9,369

NET  
£000

5,583

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	0	1,000	1,000
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

17.9%

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

**These are currently being calculated, and will include costs of training, IT resource, and potential redundancy costs.**

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

138.7

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

2015/16    2016/17    2017/18

0.0            0.0            15

15

The services within the scope of the Integrated Family Services Review are provided by a mixture of Nottinghamshire County Council and external partners under contract. The proportion of staff affected employed by NCC and external providers may change as the review progresses and this may change the projected FTE reductions.

## 9. Anticipated Impact

**ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**  
(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)

Improved Family Support delivery arrangements will provide better outcomes for families as early as possible

**ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS**

Supplier matrix – there may be changes to existing contractual arrangements and partnership activity with health partners, voluntary sector providers and the Police.

**ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not expected that there will be any negative impact on service users with protected characteristics. However, given the intention to establish integrated arrangements that will significantly change current working practices, it is important to assess, in detail, what impact the proposals may have on service users with protected characteristics.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)**

Y

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

Risk	Mitigating Actions
That final analysis of the required service outputs / outcomes and the finances make the saving undeliverable	Continuous review of savings options and the project scope.
That early intervention programmes are not as effective as research suggests in preventing need for Social Care intervention	Research into efficacy or otherwise of interventions – concentrate on programmes which are <i>proven</i> to be effective
That integrating overall management of the model may result in knowledge gaps	<p>Ensure a support network is in place – legal framework must be very clear, and managers should have support in place to translate the framework into practice.</p> <p>Ensure consistent legal approach across the management structure – clear principles and policies in place.</p>
That a merged, locality-based team will not affect structural and support savings, and may actually increase costs, which will threaten the achievement of cashable benefits	Deliver optimum locality based working arrangements.
Staff will be unwilling or unable to meet training requirements within project timescales	Put support in place for colleagues who are unable to meet training requirements, by providing mentors, deadline extensions.
The new Business Support Service Offer and reduced numbers may not be able to support the new structure	Consult with Business Support management so that the new structure can be defined to include effective business support. Carry out business process reviews to re-engineer processes, reducing reliance on business support
That not enough structure will not be in place to support the next phase of the Troubled Families programme from April 2015	<p>Prioritise Troubled Families in terms of workstream delivery. For example, provide Troubled Families workers with mobile devices and access to social care information as a priority ahead of other teams within scope.</p> <p>Prioritise reviews of Troubled Families processes so that new processes are embedded in time</p>



		Option Ref	B10
1. Service Area	Arts Development Service		
2. Option Title	Staffing Reduction		
3. Summary of Option			
<p>This option maintains an advisory and grant seeking function for arts provision including rural touring programmes, engaging young people in culture and supporting external programmes and fund raising.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rural touring programmes (Village Ventures)</li><li>• Support to the arm's length body (for Libraries, Archives, Information and Learning) to engage children and young people with culture</li><li>• Contribute to the wider learning offer of the new body</li><li>• Support external funding programmes and fund raising for arts activity in Nottinghamshire</li></ul> <p>Savings would be delivered through staffing reductions. Of the current £289k annual cost of the service, £140k would be retained within the contract for the new body, commencing 2016/2017. <b>Total Saving = £149k</b></p>			
4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option			
<p>This option allows the Council to maintain its role as National Portfolio Organisation (NPO) for rural touring (and its relationship with Arts Council and 22 local authorities across Notts, Lincs and Leics) and retain some capacity to provide creative opportunities through the new arm's length organisation.</p>			
5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?			
<p>The new arrangements will maintain a limited arts offer, as a strand of the new Library based arm's length organisation. This will include limited capacity to develop the arts, and to provide a small scale arts development capacity that includes Village Ventures.</p> <p>There will be a reduced range of arts activity and programmes, including targeted arts programmes, though community led options for their continuing operation will be explored.</p>			



## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

942

NET  
£000

374

\* existing business case  
£85K

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	149	0	149
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>149</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

**39.8%**

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

**WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

**6.5**

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	3.5	0.0

**3.5**

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)

- Potential loss of specialist creative spaces.
- Reduction of creative opportunities for targeted groups including older people, young people with special needs, early years and hard to reach groups.
- Reconfiguration of major events and learning programme including Earth and Fire International Ceramic Fair through seeking alternative arrangements.
- Reduced schools programme, creative opportunities for families and creative workshops.

## ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

The funding reduction will impact upon the Team's ability to support Arts Council initiatives at both a local and national level, and to utilise Arts Council related funding initiatives.

The reduction may impact upon the access of creative arts sole traders to employment opportunities, and community organisations in respect of access to support to develop arts in their localities.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

A reduction in capacity may have a disproportionate impact on those with protected characteristics in accessing and participating in the arts.

<b>WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)</b>
--

Y
---

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

**Risk:** Reputational risks associated with the potential reduction of events and courses.

**Mitigation:** Exploration and establishment, where possible, of alternative delivery models, including community led initiatives, to ensure the continuation of key events and courses.

**Risk:** National Portfolio Organisation funding for Rural touring, although allocated on a 3 year basis, is dependent on Arts Council England confirmation after its annual budget settlement. Therefore this is a risk that National Portfolio Organisation funding could be withdrawn 2015/16. In addition the 22 local authorities who buy into the scheme may withdraw/reduce funding to a point where the programme is not viable.



**Option Ref** B11

**1. Service Area**

Culture and Enrichment (Sports Development)

**2. Option Title**

Reduction of revenue funding

**3. Summary of Option**

The option reduces revenue funding support for sports development activity by 2017/18, whilst supporting opportunities to seek new external funding to continue key elements of the Sports Development's core programme into the long term future.

**4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option**

Over the next two years, working alongside the County Sports Partnership core team, it should be possible to attract external funding to continue key elements of the Sports Development function's core programme.

The timing of the budget reduction is linked to providing a suitable amount of time for the County Sports Partnership to seek other funding opportunities to cover shortfalls post 2017. Whilst this is not guaranteed the deadline will give a clear focus and challenge that will be understood by all partners and stakeholders.

**5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?**

The proposal offers a medium term business as usual approach and a wider opportunity to work with the County Sports Partnership to share management resource and expertise to shape a joint offer. In the medium term, the Sports Development functions key activities to support clubs, coaches and participation will remain in place.

**6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget**

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

346

NET  
£000

261

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	0	108	108
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

**41.4%**

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

### WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	0	0	0	0

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

### WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

6.6

### WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	0.0	3.3

3.3

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)

The type of work undertaken by the current staff team is designed to support the sporting infrastructure of communities, clubs and individuals and as such, if external funding is not secured, capacity will be lost to undertake this type of work post 2017.

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

Nottinghamshire County Council has forged a number of important strategic partnerships that in turn bring external resources for sports related activity into the County. If external funding is not secured, capacity will be lost to undertake this type of work post 2017, and access to national funding streams may not be realised.

### ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposals will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)

N

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

**Risk:** A reduced resource commitment means development and funding opportunities will be missed.

**Mitigation:** Time is being allowed to seek other funding to continue activities, and some work programmes could be picked up by the County Sports Partnership.



**Option Ref** B12

**1. Service Area**

Rufford Abbey Country Park

**2. Option Title**

Improve customer offer and reduce revenue costs

**3. Summary of Option**

This option proposes an options appraisal and implementation of a new operating model to reduce revenue costs and improve the visitor offer at Rufford by 2017. The three models being appraised are retaining in-house, creating an arms-length trust body or partnering with a third party organisation or consortium.

**4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option**

The rationale and evidence base for three future options outlined below will be worked up and brought back for consideration and selection by Members. The options being considered broadly fit into three categories.

1. Retain operation in-house with required capital investment found by the Council and/or a third party funder (e.g. Heritage Lottery)
2. Develop or appoint an arm's-length arrangement to develop and manage the site on behalf of the Council
3. Procure a third party management organisation to develop and manage the site on behalf of the Council

**5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?**

The outcomes will be reshaped management arrangements for Rufford Abbey Country Park, and a revised and improved customer offer that will at least maintain current visitor numbers.

**6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget**

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

2,414

NET  
£000

643

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0		303	303
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>303</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

47.1%

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

### WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION COSTS?

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	700	0	700
Revenue Costs	0	100	0	100

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

### WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

### WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	0.0	0.0

0.0

Note – This figure is difficult to establish at this point as it will be dependent on the type of delivery model chosen for future delivery.

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)  
TBC following the options appraisal.

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

TBC following the options appraisal.

### ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

TBC following the options appraisal.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposals will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)**

NO

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

**Risk:** That staff and service users feel isolated from the review process.

**Mitigation:** Sound consultation and communication processes being implemented throughout the process.

Other risks and mitigating actions will be included in the options appraisal.

		Option Ref	B13
1. Service Area	Highways		
2. Option Title	Establishing an alternative service delivery model for the whole of the Highways Division		
3. Summary of Option	<p><i>To investigate the establishment of a jointly owned local authority company with CORMAC (Cornwall Council's highways company) to manage and deliver Nottinghamshire's Highways Services. This option offers the best balance of efficiency, control, risk, commerciality, and experience. Decisions on this will be subject to the formal approval of a detailed business case, business plan and a legal agreement with CORMAC.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reasons for looking into an alternative service delivery model for highways are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>our highways budgets continue to fall from both government grant cuts (e.g. 47% cut in Integrated Transport Measures grant) and the need for budget savings;</li> <li>a more commercial approach will secure more highways work for the team from outside the County Council – by competing for contracts with other councils and developers;</li> <li>there is evidence from other local authorities that this will improve staff morale and productivity and help retain skills and expertise. Also it will spread fixed over-head costs, for example the cost of our depots, across a greater turn-over reducing the cost for Council work;</li> <li>to deliver efficiency savings in the order of £1M per year from the highways revenue budget when established.</li> </ol> </li> <li>This would both transform the highway service and contribute to the necessary budget savings. The principle is that the same level of highways service would be provided but at lower cost. However, this proposal is about operational efficiencies and will not in itself fix more holes in our roads, speed up the repair of street lights, enable more drains to be cleared, or answer customer enquiries more quickly as all these depend on the budgets available.</li> <li>It is proposed that the option transfers the whole highway division to the alternative service delivery model to create the opportunity to further integrate teams and drive an additional efficiency to support the saving of £1M per year from the highways revenue budget when established.</li> </ol>		



4. Detailed negotiations would establish the joint venture and consideration will also be needed regarding how the Council will manage this arrangement.
5. Alternative service delivery model options for highways include:
  - a. joint venture with a public sector partner – e.g. CORMAC, NORSE;
  - b. local authority owned company – 100% owned by Nottinghamshire County Council;
  - c. joint venture with a private sector partner;
  - d. outsourcing.
6. A commercial highways service will need commercial support services which may need to be provided externally from the Council. The effect of this will be evaluated as part of the development of a detailed business case and subsequent due diligence

#### 4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option

1. The creation of a new highways company for Nottinghamshire County Council in a joint venture with CORMAC would be completely in public sector ownership because CORMAC is 100% owned by Cornwall Council.
2. The new Nottinghamshire Company would have a strong public ethos, and be under the control of the Council with board representation by a County Councillor and senior council officer. The company would deliver at least 80% of its work directly to the Council. Policies and priorities for that work will be set by the Council through Service Level Agreements approved, reviewed and monitored by a committee of the County Council.
3. The Nottinghamshire Company would be a subsidiary of CORMAC. This would provide benefits to the new company from the already established CORMAC support services and systems including group finance services, insurance, pension fund, group IT, group business control, and cash flow. A further significant benefit would be immediate access to the support for increased commercial tendering and established record of delivering external contracts.
4. Whilst the group company would hold the majority of the shares the Articles of Association would be drafted to enable Nottinghamshire County Council to maintain control over the significant decisions and strategies that are of greatest importance to the Council. Also the powers of the Board would be moderated by establishing Reserve Matters for those issues that must be referred back to the County Council to ensure that the new company delivers the targets set out in the annual Business Plan.

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

1. Current Nottinghamshire highways staff would transfer to the new Nottinghamshire Company under TUPE conditions relating to their pay, terms and conditions and pensions. The new company would also offer its own terms and conditions to current staff and to new staff, all consistent with the commitment to Living Wage and similar to the current CORMAC arrangement. Based on CORMAC's previous operating experience (e.g. increase in jobs of 17%) any increase in external work will benefit staff in terms of greater job certainty and longer term prospects.
2. An appropriate break clause to protect the interests of the County Council will be agreed as part of detailed negotiations and due diligence.
3. The Nottinghamshire Company would generate a surplus or profit on both the work provided to the company directly from the Council and work for external clients through commercially won contracts. CORMAC are prepared to guarantee the first year's rebate and would also take liability for any losses. Any surplus would be shared:
  - a. a rebate or refund direct and entirely to the County Council budget – in effect budget that was not needed due to efficient working practices.
  - b. a taxable profit split 50:50 with CORMAC. This reflects an additional benefit to Nottinghamshire from the increased external work won.
4. Subject to the development of a detailed business case, the benefit to the County Council would be through further efficiency savings and/or increased surplus (profit). A detailed business case is under development to determine the level of savings but initial indications are that a saving in the order of £1M in the first full year of operation of any of the options could be achieved.
5. To achieve the savings the model would be commercially operated and managed independently of the County Council but in close partnership. The Council would retain ownership in the Company and would continue to set overall direction, determine the key priorities and the capital programme of works.
6. The services delivered through an alternative model would need to be specified by the County Council to ensure that they meet the Council's policies and priorities.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

31,000

NET  
£000

24,100

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	0	300	750	1,050
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>1,050</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

4.4%

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	200	0	0	200

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

517.9

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	28.0	28.0

56.0

Note these staff reductions may not be necessary if enough external work is secured.

## 9. Anticipated Impact

**ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**  
(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)  
Minimal

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

The alternative service delivery model provides an opportunity to consolidate the delivery of highway work into a single provider including work currently delivered by an external contractor from 2018/19.

**ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

Currently central support services are provided across the Highways Division by other County Council teams (HR, Finance, ICT, Property, Legal etc.) and the sourcing of these from outside the Council will have a financial impact on the remaining central services which is under detailed investigation.

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment**

It is not believed that the proposals will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)****N****11. Risks and Mitigating Actions**

Risks to delivering these efficiency savings / increased surplus return are:

- completion and conclusions of staff, trades unions and external consultation;
- reduced works budgets will reduce the opportunity to find and generate savings;
- implementation timescales including employee and Trade Union consultations will determine the savings profile;
- lack of external business opportunities;
- cost to Council of loss of contributions towards central support service costs and overheads.

Mitigation of the above risks will be managed as part of the development of a detailed business case, including appropriate planning and risk management, and due diligence undertaken on proposals.

## Option for Change

	<b>Option Ref</b>	B14		
<b>1. Service Area</b>	Transport and Travel Services			
<b>2. Option Title</b>	Publicity and Transport Infrastructure			
<b>3. Summary of Option</b>				
<i>To provide more information online. To reduce the current spend on publicity, roadside information, bus shelter cleaning and maintenance.</i>				
<b>4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option</b>				
<p>Whilst local authorities have a statutory duty to provide travel information, this can be done in a different way and at lower cost.</p> <p>Information is available digitally, signposting users to the National Traveline website and Golden Number locally and nationally for information. The majority of bus services are commercially provided (90%) and we will discuss the proposed changes with bus operators who may continue to provide additional information services.</p>				
<b>5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information to be provided digitally meeting the corporate digital strategy</li> <li>The cleaning cycle for bus shelters will be reduced from 12 to 6 cleans per year</li> <li>Easier access to information for those who have access and capable of using the internet</li> </ul>				
<b>6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget</b>				
<b>WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?</b>	GROSS £000 <div>25,043</div>	NET £000 <div>18,416</div>		
<b>WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?</b>				
	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	10	20	20	50
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?</b>				<b>0.3%</b>
The net budget is £200k for 2014/15.				

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	5	0	0	5

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT  
PERMANENT FTE  
STAFFING?**

**50.0**

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED  
PERMANENT FTE  
REDUCTIONS?**

2015/16 2016/17 2017/18

0.0 0.0 0.0

**0.0**

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

- Some users may not have access to the internet for which alternatives will be available; this will include printed timetables upon request and continued use of Traveline Golden Number.
- Approximately 40% of users access information at the bus stop or from bus stations so reductions in journey planning information may affect these users.
- Bus shelter appearance may deteriorate deterring passenger usage and increasing safety concerns.

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

- Bus operators may lose passengers, leading to reduced income and possible loss of some commercial services operating at the margin

### ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

- Loss of services may result in less opportunity for delivery of Independent Travel Training (ITT) to vulnerable users

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposals will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)** N

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

Risks: Outlined in section nine regarding service users.

Mitigation: Consult service users. Use local and bus operator internet facilities to access information in addition to the National Traveline telephone service.

## Option for Change

		<b>Option Ref</b>	B15
<b>1. Service Area</b>	Transport and Travel Services		
<b>2. Option Title</b>	Passenger Transport Facilities Charge		
<b>3. Summary of Option</b>			
<p><i>To negotiate with bus companies a modest charge for the provision of information and use of transport facilities.</i></p> <p><i>To reduce the budget by £63,000 between April 2015 and April 2018.</i></p>			
<b>4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce costs but maintain quality</li> <li>• Other Councils charge for the provision of these facilities</li> <li>• Local authorities can charge for information under the Transport Act 2000</li> <li>• The operators benefit from the provision of information on the roadside with Real Time Information proving to increase passengers by 2%</li> <li>• None or minimal impact on bus service provision</li> </ul>			
<b>5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the quality of the facilities to the current Quality Partnership standards in the conurbation</li> <li>• Ensure recent capital investment is maintained and replacement of infrastructure is not required earlier than forecast.</li> <li>• Ensure growth in patronage and reduction in congestion is sustained and people are not deterred from using passenger transport.</li> </ul>			
<b>6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget</b>			
<b>WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?</b>	GROSS £000	<div>25,043</div>	NET £000 <div>18,416</div>
<b>WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?</b>			
	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000
Gross Saving	15	23	25
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>
			<b>TOTAL £000</b>
			<b>63</b>
<b>WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?</b>			<div>0.3%</div>

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	2	0	0	2

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?				50.0
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## 9. Anticipated Impact

- No change in current provision or information and infrastructure so impact is minimal.
- The provision of integrated network provision at stops helps passengers without access to the internet via a pc or mobile device.
- The continuing provision of Real Time Passenger Information at stops reduces the uncertainties in travelling and helps those with disabilities i.e. visual impairment, access the bus service required.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposals will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

**WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)** N

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

Risk 1: The operators may ask for further infrastructure improvements to ensure consistent information facilities across the conurbation before they pay the charges.

Mitigation : The County Council has invested over £3m in passenger transport facilities and is looking to invest a further £0.5m over the three year period.

Risk 2: The increased cost borne by the operators, even though small, may have an impact on service provision in the conurbation.

Mitigation: Work with operators to reduce the risk.





<b>1. Service Area</b>	Waste Management
<b>2. Option Title</b>	Introduction of charges for the acceptance of non-Household Waste at recycling centres.
<b>3. Summary of Option</b>	
<p><i>The recycling centres currently accept some non-Household Construction and Demolition Waste (hard-core, bricks, soils, plasterboard) free of charge despite there being no legal obligation to do so and disposal incurring a cost for the County Council. This proposal is to introduce a pre-booking system and charging scheme for the disposal of this waste delivered in vehicles which currently require a van, trailer or pick-up permit.</i></p>	
<b>4. Rationale / Evidence Base for the Option</b>	
<p>The Council is proposing to follow the lead of other local authorities such as York, Somerset, Oxfordshire and North Yorkshire who have started charging to accept non-Household Wastes at their recycling centres.</p> <p>It is possible to accept this waste at a pre-determined cost at a core network of recycling centres/transfer stations by a pre-pay booking arrangement with electronic confirmation using the Customer Service Centre, in a similar way to the existing Asbestos booking arrangements.</p> <p>Having reviewed the charges made by the authorities noted above suggested charges would be linked to the existing van, trailer and pick-up permit scheme, and the potential carrying capacity of the vehicle as follows:</p> <p>Transit type LWB Van £60 + VAT Transit type SWB Van or pick-up £45 + VAT Double axle trailer towed by a car £45+VAT Single axle trailer towed by a car £35+VAT Small car derived van £35+ VAT</p> <p>Deliveries in a normal hatchback, saloon, estate car or MPV will remain free of charge.</p> <p>The charges above would be increased on an annual basis at a rate to be calculated, but not to be less than 5%.</p>	

## 5. What Will the Outcomes of the New Service Be?

The intention is to recover the full cost of the disposal of non-Household Construction and Demolition Waste (hard-core, bricks, soils, plasterboard) received at the recycling centre network delivered by these vehicles.

## 6. Projected Net Savings to the Budget

**WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?**

GROSS  
£000

33,000

NET  
£000

30,000

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?**

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Gross Saving	150	0	0	150
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
<b>NET SAVING</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>150</b>

**WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?**

0.5%

Note that the savings are indicated as saving against the overall Waste and Energy service budget (£30m including landfill tax of £12m), and not against the direct budget for this service element of circa £6m.

## 7. Estimated Implementation Costs

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	TOTAL £000
Capital Costs	0	0	0	0
Revenue Costs	20	0	0	20

## 8. Projected Permanent FTE Reductions

**WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?**

16.0

**WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?**

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	0.0	0.0	0.0

0.0

## 9. Anticipated Impact

### ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(incl. considerations relating to vulnerable people and communities & equality)

Some residents may believe that the Council has a duty to provide this service free of charge, even though this is not the case. This proposal is intended to provide for the needs of residents undertaking home DIY whilst recouping costs to the Council.

### ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS / PARTNERS

There is a risk that residents could either fly-tip this waste or put in their home residual waste bin, both of which would affect district councils.

### ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

It is not believed that the proposals will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

Not required at this stage, although the County Council needs to be mindful of this option in areas of high deprivation.

<b>WILL A FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE REQUIRED? (Y/N)</b>
--

N
---

## 11. Risks and Mitigating Actions

Risk: Fly-tipping

Mitigation: Experience shows that this may be an issue initially following implementation, but working with district enforcement teams and communicating our decision effectively (before and after) should mitigate this. Fly-tipping is typically only experienced as a short term response to change. If a charge to make cost neutral option was taken, then costs would be competitive with the private sector and offer the advantage that no minimum tonnage charges would apply.

Risk: This waste is put in the home residual wheelie bin

Mitigation: This is unlikely due to the weight of this type of waste, making the bin too heavy and consequently both the collection crews and vehicle weighing system would reject the bin.

Risk: Satisfaction scores may decline

Mitigation: Effective communication with users, clear pricing or refusal criteria displayed on the web, through the media and on site, should help to mitigate any short term decline.