

Appendix B - Category B Outline Business Cases

Reference	Department	Service area	Title	Equality Impact Assessment Required & Undertaken
B01	ASCH&PP	Older Adults	Assessment and Care Management - Older Adults	Yes
B02	ASCH&PP	Older Adults	Use of NHS social care funding to offset budget pressures	No
B03	ASCH&PP	Older Adults	Reduce no. of social care staff in hospital settings by 15%	Yes
B04	ASCH&PP	Older Adults	Reduction in supplier costs - older person's care homes	Yes
B05	ASCH&PP	Younger Adults Commissioning	Reduction in supplier costs - Younger Adults	Yes
B06	ASCH&PP	Younger Adults Commissioning	Use of NHS social care funding to offset pressures	No
B07	ASCH&PP	Younger Adults Commissioning	Younger Adults Assessment & Care Management (A&CM) and Structural Changes	Yes
B08	ASCH&PP	Joint Commissioning, Quality & Business Change	Changes to the delivery structure of the Safeguarding Adults Team	Yes
B09	ASCH&PP	Promoting Independence & Public Protection	Reduction in Benefits Advice staff	Yes
B10	CFCS	SEND Policy and Provision	Independent Travel Training	Yes
B11	CFCS	Young People's Service	Young People's Service	Yes
B12	CFCS	Early Years & Early Intervention	Early Years and Early Intervention	Yes
B13	CFCS	Libraries, Archives & Information	Libraries, Archives, Information and Learning	Yes
B14	CFCS	Cultural Enrichment	Cultural and Enrichment Services	Yes
B15	CFCS	Country Parks	Country Parks and Green Estates	No
B16	CFCS	Looked After Children	Looked After Children Placements	Yes

B17	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Transport & travel Services	Efficiencies & Local Bus Service reductions	Yes
B18	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Waste management	Renegotiation of Waste Management Contracts	No
B19	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Waste management	Introduce a range of measures associated with HWRC's	Yes
B20	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Waste management	Provide financial support to Waste Collection Authorities to introduce kerbside Green Waste Collections	No
B21	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Energy Management	Increase Energy Contract Rebate Income	No
B22	E&R	Highways	Reduction in Rights of Way Service	Yes
B23	E&R	Highways	Increase charges for Blue Badges	Yes
B24	E&R	Highways	Deliver Road Safety Education as part of public health commissioning for Nottinghamshire	Yes
B25	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Catering	Schools meal price changes	No
B26	PPCS	Planning Policy	Restructuring - staff reductions. Income generation	No
B27	PPCS	Planning - Devt Mgmt.	Restructuring - staff reductions. Income generation	Yes
B28	PPCS	Economic Development	Development of a shared service delivery model with partners	No
B29	PPCS	Economic Development	Reducing the NCC contribution to Experience Nottinghamshire	No
B30	PPCS	Community Safety	Service Restructuring	Yes
B31	PPCS	Healthwatch	Reduce the financial contribution to HealthWatch Nottinghamshire	Yes
B32	PPCS	Playhouse	To cease awarding grant aid to Nottingham Playhouse in 2014/15	Yes
B33	PPCS	CVS Realignment	Redesign focus of service.	Yes
B34	PPCS	Democratic Services	Reduce Councillors' Divisional Fund	No

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B01**1 SERVICE AREA**

Older Adults - Assessment and Care Management

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?**Reduction of Assessment and Care Management (A&CM) budget in community teams by 10%**

The purpose of the Older Adults commissioning teams is to undertake community care assessments and ensure that appropriate care and support services are available to meet the identified outcomes for individuals. The key objective of the service is to promote independence and enable people to live as independently and as safely as possible. The community teams are based in 4 localities across the County, with a Group Manager responsible for each locality.

The proposal is to look at different ways of working, in order to maximise the time available to the community teams, allowing them to carry out their core functions. The planned implementation of the Care Bill will bring with it additional requirements for assessment staff. There will be an anticipated increase in demand for assessments which will impact on staff capacity. It is also expected that Councils will receive additional financial support to implement the Bill. At this stage it is not possible to quantify the expected increase in demand, or indeed the level of funding expected. This will be kept under review and as more information becomes available we will be able to assess the impact on Assessment and Care Management Teams.

This would be delivered by a Lean+ review of the existing way in which services are provided and resources are deployed. This would then go on to explore how services could be redesigned to meet the challenges and changes that are being faced, and deliver the potential efficiencies that have been identified.

At this stage it is thought that a 10% reduction in staffing levels may be achievable (15.9 FTE). This is in addition to the removal of other ancillary budgets, achieving a net saving of £659k.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

There are several areas that a Lean+ review could look to streamline the assessment and care management processes:

- 1) An increased use of the Customer Services Centre (CSC) to act as an effective triage service at the point of access to social care. The current Adult Access Team based in the CSC triage referrals for services, seeking to reduce the volume of work passed to community teams, by offering advice, guidance and support to customers. A recently established Occupational Therapy intake team operate on the same principles, and a Carer Support Worker will be focusing on Carers referrals. The impact of these "front of house services" will divert a number of people away from the community teams, enabling them to focus on the more complex cases.
- 2) The Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) will also assist in filtering out safeguarding work and result in less time spent unnecessarily investigating and undertaking safeguarding issues, without referring to community based Social Workers.
- 3) Exploring the potential for providers, service users and carers to become more involved in detailed support planning.
- 4) Social Workers spend 25% - 35% of their time inputting data onto systems, and a proportion of this time could be removed through the creation of a dedicated data inputting team.
- 5) Effective deployment of mobile working solutions, e.g. using mobile technology to input assessments whilst out of the office.
- 6) Reducing time spent by assessment staff and Service Organisers setting up care packages and liaising with numerous providers (brokerage function).
- 7) Increasing the scope and use of telephone based assessments for social care, as in occupational therapy, reducing the number of home visits.
- 8) Exploring different ways of joining up services with Health, e.g. integrated working and development of multi-agency teams across Older Adults services.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

5,793

NET
£000

5,715

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	165	494	0	659
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	165	494	0	659

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

11.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

158.9

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

15.9

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There would be the cost of a project team to undertake the review, and there may be some ICT development costs to implement changes required to systems, to ensure that they can support the new working practices. The cost of the team would need to be funded until the point at which savings were realised. The reductions will require additional Human Resources involvement to reconfigure teams and ensure HR processes are carried out appropriately.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

It is anticipated that Service Users would continue to receive an appropriate level of service, and in some cases they should experience a quicker response from the department as their needs/issues will be dealt with by the CSC in a more timely manner. We would continue to apply the eligibility criteria for services and some Service Users, as now, would not meet the thresholds and therefore not qualify for Local Authority funded services. The potential impact on service users has been considered in the Equality Impact Assessment that accompanies this outline business case.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Social care providers would be required to provide additional services (support planning), and would require additional training and support to carry out this function to the standard required.

Other partners such as Health, the voluntary sector and district councils may feel that additional pressure will be coming their way, as we divert and signpost more people at the Customer Services Centre.

Through better integrated services other partners may also experience additional savings and efficiencies.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Additional resources will need to be found to fund the dedicated inputting team for elements of Framework.

Changes will need to be made to IT systems, as our processes and ways of working change.

Additional capacity may be needed at the Customer Services Centre and in reablement.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation).

If so how?

This proposal will apply across all older adults and their carers. An initial Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken, which will be reviewed again following consultation.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Service users may have to wait longer than 28 days for an assessment, which could lead to longer waiting lists and unallocated work in the districts. Mitigation - we anticipate that the impact of the CSC and introduction of new ways of working (phone assessments, use of clinics etc.) will reduce demand on community based teams.

The CSC may not be able to reduce demand on district teams via diverting people.

Mitigation - District workers need to have clearly defined roles and responsibilities to enable more efficient and effective use of district time. This could be achieved through streamlining processes and doing things differently.

The proposals to integrate services across health and social care will require additional capacity if we are to achieve this successfully. Therefore, staffing capacity will be required in order to bring about these changes in the medium term, and therefore reductions made too soon will jeopardise this work.

We are currently dependent upon temporary funding providing additional Social Worker capacity through the reviewing teams. Funding currently ceases in March 2014. Mitigation - need to implement the new ways of working as a matter of urgency.

Some of the proposed actions are longer term solutions (integration) and therefore savings may not be realised quickly enough, as reductions in staffing cannot be made safely without alternatives being in place. Mitigation - investment in project management capacity to accelerate plans.

The CSC is facing reductions in staff and any 'additional' work required by them will require funding. Mitigation - CSC processes to be looked at, to ensure maximum efficiencies are achieved for least resource.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B02**1 SERVICE AREA**

Older Adults - NHS Funding

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Under NHS Operating Framework arrangements, the ASCH&PP (Adult Social Care, Health and Public Protection) Department receives non-recurrent funding allocations annually from NHS Bassetlaw and NHS Nottinghamshire County to invest in “social care services to benefit health and to improve overall health gain”. There is a stipulation under the arrangements that the funding should be used for social care services. This funding is known as NHS support for social care (Section 256) funding.

Annually, joint priorities on how this funding should be spent are agreed with Health colleagues (formerly with the Primary Care Trust and now with Clinical Commissioning Groups). In addition, it is monitored and overseen now by the Integrated Commissioning Board for Older People. Reports are also submitted to the ASC&H committee. The agreed 3 main priorities guiding how this funding should be spent include:

- a. To meet the needs of the growing population of older people.
- b. To temporarily support other services to avoid immediate pressure on health and social care; and
- c. To develop targeted services designed to prevent or reduce the need for more intensive health and social care input.

Of the annual allocation that Nottinghamshire County Council receives, £5.5 million has already been permanently committed and was previously agreed between the Council (ASCH&PP Dept.) and the then existing PCTs. This amount was to be used to fund emerging pressures across adult social care, and the rise in costs of some services. This now forms part of the Base Budget.

A further £4.0 million was agreed to fund demographic pressures, and £1.5 million to reduce the required savings on Supporting People, to lessen the impact on a range of community based services. This leaves £4.124 million to allocate to other additional spend. This proposal seeks to use £1.9m of the remaining £4.124m allocation to offset current expenditure in Older Adults commissioned activity.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal to use the S256 funding in this way fits with the above 3 main priority areas and the associated objectives and outcomes intended from the funding, as follows:

Intended objectives:

- To promote integrated and joint working across health and social care
- To enable people to retain their independence for as long as possible and avoid/delay their need for social care support
- To reduce the need for on-going support through reablement activity (a short term period of support which helps someone to return to independence after illness or a fall)
- To facilitate safe and timely discharge from hospital, in order to reduce unnecessary delays.

Intended outcomes:

- Reduced admissions to care homes
- Reduced numbers and levels of social care packages following a period of reablement
- Increased numbers of older people having their health and care needs met closer to or within their own home
- Increased numbers of people dying in their preferred place of death
- Reduced emergency hospital admissions

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,105

NET
£000

2,105

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1912	0	0	1,912
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,912	0	0	1,912

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

90.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There will be no direct impact on service users. However, indirectly they will benefit as use of the NHS funding to offset budget pressures will release more of the Older Adult's budget to spend on meeting service user needs.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There should be limited impact on Health, as the use of the funding proposed is in line with the jointly agreed priorities. However, Health may argue that there are lost opportunities, as the money could have been used to fund new services across Health and Social Care, which may have a benefit for them and their patients.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

It is to be proposed that the remaining £1.9m NHS social care funding allocation is allocated to help offset Younger Adult budget pressures. This will therefore take up all of the funding allocation, leaving nothing to be allocated to other areas (e.g. to support the Department's Early Intervention and Prevention Strategy).

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

There will be no direct impact on service users.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Whilst the Government has confirmed commitment to the tune of £2 billion per annum nationally for the duration of the Comprehensive Spending Review, it has not yet given any indication as to how the NHS £1 billion national allocation may be split in 2013/14 and 2014/15. There is therefore no guarantee as to the permanency of this funding, or the level of funding in future. Therefore, it would be prudent to identify an alternative funding source, in the event that the NHS Support to Social Care funding is reduced.

In addition, approval will need to be sought from the Clinical Commissioning Groups on using the remaining S256 funding allocation in this way.

To date, the funding has been used within the spirit of the guidance and has funded a range of joint services across all CCGs and the Local Authority. This has included innovative services in hospitals, the establishment of assessment beds in local care homes, and additional in reach home care services to help transfer people from hospitals in a safe and timely manner.

Should the funding be withdrawn or reduced in the future, then additional pressures will be created and some services recently developed may need to be withdrawn. Discussions are already taking place with Health colleagues to look at increasing their financial contribution to a range of services that benefit patients and provide savings for Health.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B03

1 SERVICE AREA

Older Adults - Social Care Staff in Hospital Settings

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal seeks to reduce the number of Social Care staff in a hospital setting by 15%.

The number of assessments undertaken in some of the major hospitals has increased by more than 50% in the last 12 months. This is due to the unprecedented demand we are currently experiencing in hospitals.

Work is currently underway to introduce integrated arrangements in relation to discharges from hospital, which would result in the majority of assessments taking place outside of the hospital setting. Consequently, social care assessment staff would be located in the community.

This relies on the development of a range of Health and social care services being developed in partnership with local communities.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale for this project is that we would be able to reduce the number of Social Care staff required to work in a hospital setting if we change the work processes that are currently in place.

This would be specifically supported by the strategy to move to a model where service users are transferred from the hospital to be assessed, rather than having their assessments completed prior to discharge.

The resulting reduction in the number of hospital-based assessments would allow for a reduction in staff within the hospitals. Some staff would be required to undertake assessments in local communities, allowing a reduction in staffing numbers.

A small core team would remain in the hospital to undertake some assessments e.g. safeguarding and nursing care admissions.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,843

NET
£000

1,790

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	59	177	0	236
LESS Loss of Income	-10	-30	0	-40
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	49	147	0	196
WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?				10.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

50.4

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

7.6

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Existing joint working arrangements would be utilised. The SIGNS group in the South, and Frail Elderly Network in the North, are already working on these proposals.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users should experience a more speedy service and spend less time in hospital.

The potential impact on service users has been considered in the Equality Impact Assessment that has been undertaken on this proposal.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Health would see a reduction in their costs as service users would be discharged earlier.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on staff or service users has been considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment that has been undertaken on this proposal. It is not anticipated the proposal will have a disproportionate impact on staff or service users with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Health may not contribute to additional cost of increasing reablement services required to assess people out of hospital. High level commitment to the current Transfer to Assess project is required, to identify funding for new services or expansion of existing services.

Lack of capacity in the community may lead to delayed transfers of care from hospital settings. Need to agree a strategy up front to ensure services are in place before reductions in staffing levels are made.

There may be an increase in the number of people from health being discharged from hospitals. Mitigation: collaborative work through multi-agency groups (e.g. the SIGNS group) and the further development of joint strategies and commissioning plans.

There are a number of temporary staff currently being used following the loss of posts through organisational redesign and the increase in demand in hospitals. We are working with Health to identify funding to support staffing levels required. There could be additional funding from Health to contribute towards costs.

There is a focus on transferring people out of hospital quicker, which requires services to be available in local communities. Failure to provide the right services and sufficient capacity will lead to delayed transfers from hospitals. Mitigation: work could be undertaken with the independent / voluntary sectors to ensure appropriate capacity. Joint commissioning plans also need to be developed with joint funding arrangements in place.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B04**1 SERVICE AREA**

Older Adults - Reductions in supplier costs - older person's care homes

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to work with older persons' care home providers to reduce their costs. This proposal would be led by the Corporate Procurement team and is made up of the following:

1) Reviewing the cost make up of care home provision with providers by seeking ways in which they could reduce their cost base, using methods that seek joint advantages (e.g. providers sharing best value contracts with each other, providers purchasing together, profit sharing agreements, considering tiering arrangements). Alternatively, a re-design of the service delivery may be agreed by all relevant parties which reduces provider costs.

2) Considering other methods of procurement with non-strategic providers or unwilling suppliers. This might include using methods such as deploying Care Fund Calculator type tools, re-tendering demand away from those homes, working to re-designate homes, and intense 1-2-1 reviews applying Lean+ techniques to target cost.

3) Reviewing the current 5 band fee structure and assessing if consolidation of the number of bands would deliver an appropriate solution.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

1. The review of the 'Fair Price for Care' fee framework undertaken during 2012 resulted in an increase in fees paid to older persons' care homes based on the actual cost of care home provision and on the basis of rewarding good quality care services. The review was completed as the previous 'Fair Price for Care' fee framework and associated annual fee increases came to an end in March 2013. The review was undertaken within the context of legal challenges brought by care home providers against a number of local authorities in relation to their fee setting processes. At this time, the Nottinghamshire Care Association was challenging the Council about future fee levels.

70% of the current budget for older people's services is spent on long term care placements. Improving provider relationship management is one approach to reviewing fees, by working with willing providers to identify ways of reducing the overhead element of their prices without affecting their margins, or the element of cost associated with delivering the service. The Corporate Procurement team has proposed that work is undertaken with these providers on joint initiatives to improve supply chain and ways of working in order to reduce costs. Initiatives are entered into voluntarily by both parties, and at their own investment of time and money, with the intent that any learning is shared with other suppliers so that the supply base as a whole can be improved.

2. The use of procurement approaches to secure the services of good quality value for money services has already been 'tested' during the accreditation of younger adults residential services.

3. The 'Fair Price for Care' Framework and banding structure allocates differential rates across 5 bands. Reducing and consolidating the bands over a period of time may secure some savings - detailed financial analysis is required to determine what levels of savings could be achieved.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

71,124

NET
£000

41,850

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	2,500	0	2,500
LESS Loss of Income	0	-165	0	-165
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	2,335	0	2,335

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

5.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The proposal will require dedicated staff time from those working in both Corporate Procurement and the Department's Joint Commissioning Unit. However, this cost can be met from existing staff budgets.

A consultation process would need to be undertaken in relation to any proposed changes to 'Fair Price for Care' negotiated rates and will also require legal advice throughout the process.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The main service group affected by these proposals are older people (aged 65+). Some Band 1 care homes may not be able to sustain their provision due to their financial position, and this may impact on their ability to improve the quality of their care services. In these instances residents would be supported by the Council to find suitable alternative placements.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The proposed changes will impact on older persons' residential and nursing care providers in terms of a reduction in their costs and improved efficiencies. This will enable the Council to negotiate a reduction in the fees the Council pays. As some packages of care are jointly funded with Health, they will also potentially benefit from any negotiated reduction in rates.

Reduction in fee rates may lead to some providers exiting the market with a reduction in provider capacity. Whilst overall there is over capacity in the older persons' care home market, there are some geographical areas where there is limited provision.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

This proposal is in the main based on the Corporate Procurement Team's Supplier Relationship Management (SRM) approach, and therefore it will need to be led by them with support from the Market Development and Care Management Team.

This proposal also needs to link to, and complement, the corporate Commissioning Strategies that are being undertaken.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

All service users affected by this proposal are older adults aged 65+. If a provider was to stop provision as a result of this proposal and the service would have to be re-commissioned to another provider, then service users would be directly impacted.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Care home providers may not engage in the process to identify potential reductions to their cost base, particularly given that a Fair Price for Care review has recently been completed, which required providers to detail their costs. In progressing this proposal, further consultation will need to be undertaken with the care home providers.

The reduction in costs may have an impact on quality, which may impact on service users. In mitigation consideration will be given to seeking to improve quality as well as finding ways to reduce costs.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B05

1 SERVICE AREA

Younger Adults - Reduction in Supplier Costs

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal seeks to reduce supplier costs through:

- Re-tendering of services in Supported Living;
- Reviewing the supplier cost base, and
- Improved provider relationship management with all key Younger Adult care providers (including residential and nursing care, and supported living). This excludes home care.

There should be no change to the quality or level of service delivered to service users. The desired outcomes are:

- To achieve a 5% reduction in supply costs of residential nursing care providers and care support and enablement providers, through retendering of services and strategic development of the market. This cost reduction should be achieved without reference to package size or the number of hours of delivery, and should be viewed as a reduction in provider costs.
- Provide for improved management of the market and supplier relationships.
- Commissioning and procurement arrangements must provide for a robust process of quality assurance and quality audit to mitigate issues of significant harm and / or abuse to vulnerable people.
- The framework should, where possible, support the development of a good quality workforce with high rates of retention.
- Be sufficiently flexible to allocate responsibility for assessment, review and support planning to the most appropriate agency and / or individual to ensure that independence and choice can be promoted and business process is streamlined.
- Be able to respond to the current and future market requirements which may include; emergency and crisis support, long term support to individuals, the decommissioning of other forms of care and support, a range of providers to meet the complexity of needs across disability services.
- Improved, more transparent relationships with providers.
- Providers applying innovative solutions to achieving efficiencies.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

As part of existing efficiency measures, fee reductions have been negotiated with supported living and residential care providers to those with learning disabilities, physical disabilities and those with mental health needs. To date, this has achieved savings of £1.4m. However, a review of budget and performance benchmarking data suggests that the unit costs in some areas are still higher than comparable local authorities. Therefore, this proposal seeks to continue this activity, as follows:

- The existing Care, Support and Enablement Framework will end in March 2014, and will be re-tendered later this year. Various options are being explored, including replacing the existing provider list with fewer providers, thus achieving economies of scale.
- Improved provider relationship management, i.e. working with key providers to improve the supply chain, ways of working, and identify ways of reducing the overhead element of their prices. Any learning will be shared with other suppliers, so that the supply base as a whole can be improved. Some levers that will be explored include: economies of scale through volume; price benchmarking, e.g. reviewing the use of care funding calculator tools and the reference costs within these; specification standardisation; and back office sharing. Some projects may be delivered by clustering providers together, whilst others can be delivered through a one-to-one relationship.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

64,159

NET
£000

54,718

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,400	900	700	3,000
LESS Loss of Income	-216	-139	-108	-463
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,184	761	592	2,537

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

4.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

This proposal will bring capacity issues and will require a set of specific skills mix. Hence, the proposal will require dedicated staff time from those working in both Corporate Procurement and the Department's Joint Commissioning Unit. It is estimated that 2.5 FTE will need to be assigned to deliver these savings over a 24 month period of time.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The main service group affected by this proposal are younger adults (aged 18-65) with learning disabilities, autistic spectrum disorders, physical disabilities and mental health needs.

Service users should see no change in the quality of care received. However, where price reductions can not be successfully negotiated with a provider, and ultimately the service would have to be re-commissioned, service users would have to be moved to a different provider.

Wherever possible, we will aim to avoid re-commissioning. Where this is unavoidable and a service user must move to a new provider, a process will be put in place that involves service users and carers to minimise disruption. A re-assessment of service user needs would be undertaken, involving both them and their social worker, and the outcomes of this reflected in the Individual Service Contracts that would subsequently be put in place and have to be met by the new provider.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Those that will be most impacted by this proposal include the:

- Providers of residential and nursing care for younger adults with learning disabilities, physical disabilities and those with mental health needs.
- Providers of supported living for younger adults with learning disabilities, autistic spectrum disorders, physical disabilities and those with mental health needs.

These will see a reduction in the unit cost we pay to them. Providers operating across the whole of the County will be impacted.

As some of the care packages are jointly funded with Health, they will also benefit from any rate reductions negotiated with providers.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

This proposal has potential links to other savings options put forward by the Adult Social Care, Health & Public Protection Department, and will also need to link to, and complement, the corporate Commissioning and Category strategies that are being undertaken. Joint working across the Older and Younger Directorates, involving Corporate Procurement, Market Management and the Department's Joint Commissioning Unit is therefore being undertaken.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

As above, the main service group affected by this proposal are younger adults (aged 18-65) with learning disabilities, autistic spectrum disorders, physical disabilities and mental health needs.

This proposal will impact most on service users with learning disabilities, as this is the largest service user group, and where most expenditure is incurred, rather than due to any potential differential impact.

The impact on all service users has been considered as part of the equality impact assessment that has been undertaken on the proposal.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

1. **RISK:** The tender exercise produces unexpected high fee rates. **ACTION:** by benchmarking fee rates, capping rates and pre-tender market engagement.

2. **RISK:** Inability to transfer all existing commissioned activity to new fee rates. Rise in non contracted activity through increased use of Direct Payments with more expensive suppliers.

ACTION: Pro-active communication with Service Users, encouraging use of quality assured managed services and ensuring Direct Payment rates are pegged to contract rates.

3. **RISK:** Providers have already accommodated rate reductions over the past 2 years. Risk that having to sustain more will destabilise the market. Risk that achieving a further 5% reduction to supply costs (£3m gross saving) is not viable. **ACTION:** Approach should lead to improvements that will reduce costs whilst maintaining margins. Engaging suppliers in feasibility studies, market exploration workshops and collaborative discussions prior to any changes.

4. **RISK:** The quality of service provision is negatively impacted by the rate reductions, leading to potential safeguarding issues: **ACTION:** in terms of the Care Support and Enablement framework, the risks can be mitigated by ensuring a new framework improves supplier relationship and develops a more partnership approach with providers. This will allow better reporting of issues and concerns, and facilitate no increase overall in safeguarding referrals.

5. **RISK:** Rates paid across residential/ nursing care show interdependencies with Continuing Health Care rates. **ACTION:** early engagement with NHS colleagues to determine impact of spend changes on any collaborative / Supplier Relationship Management discussion.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B06**1 SERVICE AREA**

Younger Adults

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Under NHS Operating Framework arrangements, the County Council receives non-recurrent funding allocations annually from NHS Bassetlaw and NHS Nottinghamshire County to invest in “social care services to benefit health and to improve overall health gain”. There is a stipulation under the arrangements that the funding should be used for social care services, and the funding can be used to address budget pressures. This funding is known as NHS Support for Social Care (Section 256) funding.

Annually, joint priorities on how this funding should be spent are agreed with Health colleagues (formerly with the Primary Care Trust and now with Clinical Commissioning Groups). The agreed 3 main priorities guiding how this funding should be spent include:

- a. To meet the needs of the growing population of older people;
- b. To temporarily support other services to avoid immediate pressure on health and social care; and
- c. To develop targeted services designed to prevent or reduce the need for more intensive health and social care input.

Of the annual allocation that Nottinghamshire County Council receives, £8.5 million has already been permanently committed (£1.5m towards supporting people, £5m increased demand for Nursing and dementia beds, £1.6m increased demand for direct payments for Older Adults, and £0.4m for increased demand for short term/interim placements), leaving £4.124 million to allocate to other additional spend.

This proposal seeks to use £1.9m of the remaining allocation to offset current expenditure in Younger Adults commissioned activity.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal to use the S256 funding in this way fits with the above 3 main priority areas and the associated objectives and outcomes intended from the funding, as follows:

Intended objectives:

- To promote integrated and joint working across health and social care.
- To enable people to retain their independence for as long as possible and avoid/delay their need for social care support.
- To reduce the need for on-going support through reablement activity.
- To facilitate safe and timely discharge from hospital in order to reduce unnecessary delays.

Intended outcomes:

- Reduced admissions to care homes.
- Reduced numbers and levels of social care packages following a period of reablement.
- Increased numbers of older people having their health and care needs met closer to or within their own home.
- Increased numbers of people dying in their preferred place of death.
- Reduced emergency hospital admissions.
- Reduced emergency hospital re-admissions.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,019

NET
£000

2,019

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,912	0	0	1,912
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,912	0	0	1,912

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

95%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The proposal will apply across the whole of Nottinghamshire.

There will be no direct impact on service users. However, indirectly they will benefit as use of the NHS funding to offset budget pressures will release more of the Younger Adult's budget to spend on meeting service user needs.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There should be no impact on Health, as the use of the funding proposed is in line with the jointly agreed priorities.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

It is to be proposed that the remaining £1.9m NHS social care funding allocation is allocated to help offset Older Adult budget pressures. This will therefore take up all of the funding allocation, leaving nothing to be allocated to other areas (e.g. to support the Department's Early Intervention and Prevention Strategy).

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

As above, there will be no direct impact on service users and no disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on them.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Whilst the Government has confirmed commitment to the tune of £2 billion per annum nationally for the duration of the Comprehensive Spending Review, it has not yet given any indication as to how the NHS £1 billion national allocation may be split in 2013/14 and 2014/15. There is therefore no guarantee as to the permanency of this funding, or the level of funding, in future. Therefore, it would be prudent to identify an alternative funding source, in the event that the NHS Support to Social Care funding is reduced.

In addition, approval will need to be sought from the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) on using the remaining S256 funding allocation in this way.

To date, the funding has been used within the spirit of the guidance and has funded a range of joint services across all CCGs and the Local Authority. This has included innovative services in hospitals, the establishment of assessment beds in local care homes, and additional in reach home care services to help transfer people from hospitals in a safe and timely manner.

Should the funding be withdrawn or reduced in future, then additional pressures will be created and some services recently developed may need to be withdrawn. Discussions are already taking place with Health colleagues to look at increasing their financial contribution to a range of services that benefit patients and provide savings for health.

Any existing commitments against the S256 funding will need to be reviewed, to ensure there is sufficient funding to cover the proposed use of £1.9m of the funding.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B07**1 SERVICE AREA**

Younger Adults Personal Care and Support - Care Management and Assessment Teams

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The purpose of the Younger Adults Assessment and care management service is to commission services that meet individuals needs, ensure people can live independently, and keep people safe. Key activities undertaken to achieve this include:

- Undertaking assessments of need for social care services, both on service users and carers, and providing support to meet eligible needs.
- Undertaking assessments required under the Mental Health Act and Mental Capacity Act.
- Provision of information and advice, equipment, accommodation and care, through personal budgets.
- Safeguarding of vulnerable adults and delivering preventative services.

The current structure of the service is a mix of district based teams, locality based teams and county-wide teams. This proposal seeks to:

- Disestablish some of the county-wide teams .
- Streamline the assessment and care management process, informed by a Lean+ review.
- Subsequently, refocusing staff time, roles and responsibilities.

It is proposed to create a county wide Transformation Team [that](#) can work on specific areas and projects, such as reviews, national projects such as Winterbourne View, and other national or local initiatives that require a short term focussed approach. The workers in this team will have a range of skills and knowledge to enable them to respond to initiatives and provide additional capacity across all specialist teams.

The aims of these changes are to:

- 1) Ensure that management and support costs are aligned to comparator authorities;
- 2) Focus staff time on care management; assessment, commissioning, and review work only;
- 3) Ensure that safeguarding activity is focussed on people with immediate risk of significant harm;
- 4) Improve the proportion of staff time spent as contact time; and
- 5) Reduce the cost of the assessment and care management service.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

When compared to performance and budget benchmarking information on other Local Authorities: the total no. people served is high (except Mental Health) and the level of service high; management and support costs are high.

Staff time is currently spent on supporting providers and undertaking home visits, providing additional carer support, providing professional support, brokerage, support planning and case management. Staff are seen as the first point of contact, and service users / families and providers have high expectations of what to expect from the services.

Demand on the teams is increasing, however analysis of working time shows that staff spend a disproportionately high amount of time on non service user contact activity. The development of a centralised data inputting team, together with the Lean+ review of systems and processes, should reduce individual and team workloads. The creation of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub in Nottinghamshire has reduced demand on safeguarding activity across all service areas.

In view of the above, and in line with the proposed new model of social care and Use of Resources Policy, in future:

- Social care funded services will be arranged at the time they are required, for the period they are required, to meet specific outcomes.
- Assessment and care management will be proportionate for people who are likely to have eligible needs and have gone through a period of reablement.
- Safeguarding activity will be limited to people with immediate risk of significant harm.
- More use will be made of phone, online and clinic style appointments. Home assessments and reviews will only be undertaken where the level of risk and need warrants this.
- Wherever possible, we will place more responsibility with providers, underpinned by clear contracts.
- We will also explore the potential for providers to take on support planning duties.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

10,867

NET
£000

9,969

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	250	700	250	1,200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	250	700	250	1,200

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

12.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

260.2

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

55.5

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Overall savings have been estimated from disestablishing county-wide teams and reducing staff in the commissioning teams, whilst creating a countywide Transformation Team (Temporary for 2 years). This equates to the loss of the following permanent posts: 3.5 Team Manager posts, 7 Advanced Social Work Practitioners, 16 social workers/supported living coordinators, 3.5 Team Leaders, 19.5 Community Care Officer/Day Service Coordinators posts, and 6 Promoting Independence Workers. Redundancy costs will apply.

There will be staff resource costs associated with undertaking the review of the current A&CM process. There will also be some premises and ICT development costs to implement changes required to systems, to ensure that they can support the new working practices.

Staff in the district based disability and mental health teams, and county-wide teams, will be impacted. There will be no specialist Aspergers' service. This work will be absorbed by a smaller number of Mental Health staff. LD commissioning teams have seen the smallest reductions, but they have lost the capacity that currently sits in the Supported Living Team and the New Lifestyles Team, which currently work in LD services. They have also lost Team Leader posts. This work will have to be absorbed by the Learning Disability teams. There is a reduction in Mental Health Advanced Social Work Practitioners that are, in the main, AMHPs (Approved Mental Health Practitioners). This has been mitigated by an increase of 3 FTE AMHPs in the countywide AMHP Team.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The changes will mean a cultural change for staff, service users, carers and providers.

The service user group affected by these proposals are younger adults (aged 18-65) with learning disabilities, physical disabilities, mental health needs and Aspergers. Staff, service users, carers and providers for all service areas will see:

A reduction to the total number of people served and a reduction in the level of service provided. The level of service that individuals will receive will depend on their level of need:

- Those with intermediate levels of need (the majority of service users supported) will receive long-term episodic care management.
- Those with high levels of need will continue to be supported and receive long-term/enduring care and case management.
- There will be less home visits, and more contact via phone, online and clinic style appointments.

Support to carers will be focussed on those that provide a substantial amount of care, especially in Learning Disability.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Social care providers will receive less support with case management and it will be explored whether providers should be expected to undertake support planning. Where providers request or require support to meet their contractual requirements, they will be expected to pay for this.

Providers will be expected to oversee day to day needs, supported by annual reviews by commissioners.

Other public authorities such as District and Borough councils, Police, Ambulance and other services may experience a different response to requests for support.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

- Any reductions to business support, if approved as part of a separate savings proposal, will require staff and managers to undertake such duties themselves.
- Any changes to the Safeguarding Adults Practice Team, if approved as part of a separate savings proposal, will push the work associated with organising and checking best interest assessments and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding work to operational staff, particularly team managers. However, the majority of assessments are already undertaken by the teams, and a co-ordinator post is to be retained within the Safeguarding Team to facilitate the smooth transfer of functions to operational staff.
- Any reductions to staffing in the Joint Commissioning Team, which will mean less support to operational staff with contracting and quality monitoring support.
- Any reductions to the number of Day Service bases or short-breaks provision will increase commissioning requirements by operational staff, and the number of complaints they will have to deal with.

The Older Adults service is also proposing changes to its Assessment and Care Management process. As part of this proposal, the creation of a dedicated data inputting team is suggested, which should release some social worker time to focus on other duties. The review will have to factor in Children, Families and Cultural Services' processes. More use of phone / online channels will push more resource requirements to the Adult Access Team. Similarly, more START and reablement diversions will be needed.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

As above, the service user group affected by these proposals are younger adults (aged 18-65) with learning disabilities, physical disabilities, mental health needs and Aspergers.

Those who receive a service from the Asperger's Team will be affected, as the proposal include disbanding this team. Whilst their specialism will be retained within the remaining locality teams, there will be no longer be a dedicated service provided.

Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on service users and staff has been considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment undertaken on the proposal.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk; The teams have insufficient capacity to manage workloads. Mitigation: focussing staff duties on core elements of service delivery should reduce activities that need to be undertaken.

Risk; that the disestablishment of county-wide teams will impact on delivery of initiatives such as meeting the Winterbourne View Report requirements, responding to the Autism Bill, Partnership Approaches and delivering other savings proposals. Mitigation; The development of a transformation team will help to provide capacity to undertake specific areas of development and reassessment activity as they arise, across all specialist teams.

Risk; Reduction in the level of staffing together with the work required to implement the full range of saving options will impact on the teams abilities to maintain performance levels across a number of areas such as waiting times, reviews, assessments, etc. Mitigation; The council will need to identify an appropriate level of performance expectation.

Risk; Undertaking home visits provides useful information on living conditions and family circumstances which may be lost. Mitigation; risk assessment should identify where home visits are required

Risk; The new Care Bill will increase the need for assessments to be undertaken on service users and carers. This will increase the number of assessments required and will require A&CM staff to undertake proportionate assessments. Any reduction to A&CM staffing levels, and changes to the process, will need to factor in such requirements and ensure there is still sufficient capacity remaining. Mitigation; Therefore any reductions in A&CM staff across younger and older adults services must be considered at the same time, in order to give staff an equal opportunity in enabling pools and to avoid unnecessary compulsory redundancies.

Risk; of safeguarding issues arising for those not supported. Mitigation; Safeguarding activity will be focussed on people with immediate risk of significant harm.

Risk; increased complaints and potential legal challenge in meeting council responsibilities, and due to service user dissatisfaction. Mitigation: undertaking consultation.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL**Proposal Ref.****B08****1 SERVICE AREA**

Adult Social Care Health & Public Protection - Safeguarding Adults Team Structure

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Safeguarding Adults service consists of two separate teams - the Safeguarding Adults Practice Team and the Safeguarding Adults Strategic Team. The Strategic Team comprises 3.8 FTE staff and the Practice Team 4 FTE staff, both managed by a 0.8 FTE Group Manager. The Government has made a commitment to legislate for elements of adult safeguarding and to place it on a statutory footing. In Nottinghamshire, there is a well-established multi-agency Safeguarding Board and partner agencies contribute funding towards the staff within the Strategic Team.

Practice Team: The team comprises three full time Social Worker Practitioners (grade C) and one full time Team Manager (grade D). The team is also supported by two Business Support Officer posts. The Team is responsible for overseeing arrangements in accordance with the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DOLs). It ensures the co-ordination of best interest assessments under the safeguards, and the senior practitioners also undertake some assessments in their own right. However, the majority of the assessments under the legislation are undertaken by operational staff based in locality teams. It is proposed that the Team Manager and two of the Social Worker Practitioner posts be dis-established, with one Senior Practitioner post being retained in order to co-ordinate the smooth transfer of the majority of the team's functions to locality based operational managers.

At the same time, it is proposed that the Council's Deputyship function is moved from Adult Care Financial Services into the safeguarding service as its focus is on safeguarding vulnerable people against financial abuse. By transferring the majority of the team's functions to operational teams it will create capacity for the retained Senior Practitioner post to manage the staff who undertake deputyship work.

Strategic Team: this Team comprises a Board Manager (grade D), a Quality Assurance manager (grade C), a Service Improvement Commissioning Officer (grade B) and a 0.8fte Training co-ordinator (grade B). It is proposed that the Service Improvement Commissioning Officer post (grade B) is disestablished. The focus of this work has been on updating policies and procedures and it is felt that the work could be supported by other departmental staff who have responsibility for updating policies with primary responsibility and oversight of the work by the Quality Assurance manager.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

- In addition to undertaking the complex administration processes, the practice team has invested a significant amount of time in raising awareness of the Mental Capacity Act and supporting specially trained assessors. The Team has also been involved in ensuring procedures and practices are in place to work within the legislation.
- This phase of work to meet the legislative requirements has now moved into a state where it should be absorbed into mainstream activity. A significant amount of expertise has been developed in operational teams, with over forty Best Interest Assessors, trained and accredited to undertake the role. Group Managers in operational teams have also become skilled in understanding the intricacies of how Deprivation of Liberty safeguards work, what processes need to be followed and the requirements to have sufficiently trained assessors.
- The support offered to external partners needs to be withdrawn as they should now have reached a state of competence regarding Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.
- The establishment of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) in Nottinghamshire has begun to have an impact on the numbers of Safeguarding Adults assessments required. It is anticipated that the number of safeguarding enquires leading to the need to undertake a full safeguarding assessment will continue to reduce, thus freeing up time in teams for the specialist assessors to undertake more DoL assessments.
- The recent wholesale review of policies and procedures completed by the Service Improvement Commissioning Officer will leave us well placed to respond to any changes required to our safeguarding policies and procedures.
- The retained Senior Practitioner post will develop integrated processes and systems, in order to facilitate the shift of responsibilities for undertaking assessments, co-ordinating the range of different professionals and activities required to complete the process, and ensuring the availability of trained assessors, solely into district teams.
- This new way of working will ensure that the overall responsibility for quality, availability of staff, workforce capacity, coordination of the process, and compliance with the legislative framework will rest with operational managers, with support and leadership from the retained Senior Practitioner.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

478

NET
£000

465

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	172	0	0	172
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	172	0	0	172

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

37.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

7.8

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

4.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There will be redundancy costs associated with the 4.0 FTE posts to be dis-established.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service Users will experience no change in the way Best Interest Assessments under the Deprivation of Liberty safeguards are undertaken. The proposal is about moving the responsibility from a central team to operational teams located in districts. There will be no impact from a service user's perspective and in reality they will not know the change has taken place. Service users will not be affected by the deletion of the Service Improvement Commissioning Officer post as the work will be absorbed elsewhere, and it does not involve any direct contact with service users.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Managing Authorities are care homes and hospitals who make the applications to the local authority to deprive someone of their liberty. Like the local authority, they are responsible for ensuring that they are compliant with the Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. To date they have benefitted from a high level of support from the Safeguarding Adults Practice Team to complete the required forms to a high standard. It is now felt that this level of support is not sustainable, nor should it be provided on an indefinite basis. The Managing Authorities will therefore see this support withdrawn to them.

All partners will continue to have access to multi-agency guidance and procedures and will not be affected by the disestablishment of the Service Improvement Commissioning Officer post.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

This proposal will have most impact on operational staff located in the districts.

Best Interest Assessors located in the districts will receive less scrutiny of their reports. They will also be required to absorb approximately forty additional assessments per year (the amount of assessments that are currently undertaken on average by the Safeguarding Adults Practice team).

Signatories (i.e. those who are required to sign off and approve Deprivation of Liberty applications following an assessment) will have the additional responsibility of ensuring that the process has been completed properly and the documentation has been through a quality assurance process.

Team Managers who line manage the social workers and senior practitioners undertaking the assessments will have a greater span of control regarding workflow. They will be accountable for ensuring the work of their staff is done in a timely way, enabling them to have a complete picture of the team's workload. This will mean they are able to balance priorities as required, and not be dependent on a central team allocating work.

The function of coordinating the range of professionals who are required to participate in the assessment process will move to operational teams.

The majority of work undertaken by the team in conjunction with Learning & Development to support universities with the accreditation of new best interest assessors will shift to Learning & Development. Staff with responsibility for updating other ASCHPP policies and procedures will resume some responsibility for the Safeguarding policies and procedures, with support and direction from the Safeguarding Quality Assurance Manager.

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal involves internal staffing changes and will not directly impact on external service users.

Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on staff has been considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment that has been undertaken on this proposal as part of consideration of all proposals affecting staffing changes within the Department. However, at this stage it is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on staff with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Transferring responsibility for the functions currently undertaken by the Practice Team to the district teams, at a time when separate savings options are proposing changes to district teams, will bring capacity issues. However, in reality this should not bring much more additional work, as the district teams already undertake the majority of assessments and it is anticipated that the number of referrals coming via the MASH will reduce. In addition, the retention of the one Senior Practitioner post will help with co-ordinating the smooth transfer of duties. Team Managers who have previously had limited involvement in undertaking the duties will be supported by the senior practitioner to develop a greater understanding of their new responsibilities and how to execute these.

As indicated above, the local authority has a statutory duty to undertake its function as the supervisory body under the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. It is critical that all process and assessments are co-ordinated in a timely way, as any deviation from the legislation may result in criticism from the court of protection and is likely to be scrutinised as part of any Care Quality Commission review of services. In mitigation, the retention of the senior practitioner post will support the transfer of the co-ordination responsibilities to a nominated operational team manager post, which will ensure robust coordination so that the local authority continues to meet deadlines for completion of Best interest Assessments in accordance with statutory requirements.

There is a risk that some of the activities undertaken by the team may be lost, but with sufficient time and the retention of the senior practitioner to plan and consider how and to whom the essential elements of the service are passed on, this risk can be mitigated. Examples of other areas of service that could pick up work currently undertaken by the practice team :

- Operational teams (co-ordination of process and all assessments)
- Other members of the Safeguarding Strategic Team (for example policy)
- Absorbed into the mainstream functions of other county council departments (e.g. organisational learning and development)
- External agencies (for example checking of the forms for Managing Authorities).

The roles within the process can be scrutinised to ensure an appropriate level of post is undertaking the appropriate role. For example, team managers may be the appropriate level to sign off and approve authorisations. It is proposed that the retained Senior Practitioner post and the Deputyship functions come under the line management of the Safeguarding Adults Board Manager as the only remaining Band D post within the Safeguarding Adults Team. This could potentially create some tensions amongst partner agencies who contribute financially, and they would need to be assured that the level of support to the Safeguarding Board would not diminish. It will be timely to review the roles and responsibilities of all team members in the strategic team to ensure best use of resources given the additional remit of the team, and thus enable the associated risks regarding any potential tensions with partner agencies to be predicted and managed. Any risk associated with the deletion of the Service Improvement Commissioning Officer post will be in relation to ensuring policies and procedures are up to date and in line with any new government requirements. It is anticipated that these risks will be managed by the redistribution of the work within the department. In the event of unanticipated urgent changes being required, the work could be undertaken via a project manager appointment on a temporary basis.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B09

1 SERVICE AREA

The Benefits Advice Team provides both general and specialist advice in relation to welfare benefits, responding to 2000 queries per year. It is largely a telephone based service based at the Customer Service Centre (CSC). The aim is to maximise peoples' income through benefit claims.

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

There are 3 Benefit Advisors and 1 Senior Advisor who provide advice, support, information and training to the Council and voluntary organisations on benefit matters. The proposal is to target the support available and to reduce the service to one post.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Benefits Advice Team is a discretionary service and by targeting the support available, this can be achieved by one post.

The post will:

- Produce web information relating to welfare benefits, tax credits and advice provision.
- Target promotional campaigns to inform residents in Nottinghamshire and relevant Nottinghamshire County Council staff of welfare benefit related issues.
- Provide guidance to CSC staff on basic welfare benefit matters.
- Implement a phased cessation of the training programme for staff on welfare benefit matters, and signposting to alternatives.
- Cease telephone benefit advice to customers at the CSC and instead signpost people to the Department of Work and Pensions and alternative sources of help.
- Cease face to face advice to staff and instead signpost people to alternative sources.
- Cease policy input to the Council on welfare benefit matters.
- Cease presence at local forums.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

142

142

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	45	45	0	90
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	45	45	0	90

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

63.4%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

4.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

3.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The proposal will require dedicated management time to deal with the processes to reduce the numbers of staff and to develop advice and guidance available to support the public on the website and alternative source of support.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

This proposal will impact on low income groups across the whole county. See section 11 for mitigating actions.

- 1) Reduced capacity to support members of the public who need benefit support resulting in a potential loss of income.
- 2) Economic downturn coupled with major changes to the law relating to welfare benefits means that the number of people facing financial hardship is increasing
- 3) Major changes to the law occurring at a time when free advice to the public has diminished, which could limit information to vulnerable people.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Insufficient capacity to support the voluntary and community sector who provide benefit support to vulnerable people.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Insufficient capacity to support members of staff who need access to benefit support to advise customers appropriately.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal will have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on those living on a low income. The Equality Impact Assessment on this proposal considers its potential impact on service users, staff affected, and protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

RISK - Loss of specialist advice on pension and benefit entitlements at a time when major changes to the law relating to welfare benefits are due to be implemented **MITIGATION:** Refer to local advice agencies where available or the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP). Up to date information will be provided on the website for staff and customers with self help materials developed.

RISK - Members of the public may not receive timely benefit advice which could result in a loss of income, particularly vulnerable disabled people.

MITIGATION: Signposting to the DWP and other advice organisations. Increasing information available through the public website.

RISK - Economic downturn coupled with major changes to the law relating to welfare benefits means that the number of people facing financial hardship is increasing. **MITIGATION:** Signposting to the DWP and other advice organisations. Increase the public's awareness of alternative sources of help through info on the public website.

RISK - Reduction in skills and knowledge of voluntary and community sector groups across the county due to loss of expert training and support. Increased pressure on remaining advice agencies in the County. **MITIGATION:** Signpost to the DWP. Up to date information available on the website and identify national and local support services.

RISK - Loss of policy input on benefit issues and how they impact on the core county council business, including the impact of welfare changes on social care income and the forthcoming Care Bill. **MITIGATION:** The Service will prioritise the work and the support available, to provide this support.

RISK - Impact on CSC advisors and the ability to offer simple benefit advice and signposting within existing resources **MITIGATION:** Up to date list of advice agencies is maintained by the Council to signpost to. Up to date information available on the website for staff and customers

RISK - Impact on social care workers and other staff who will need to become familiar with welfare benefits and changes **MITIGATION:** Phased cessation of training courses to staff to increase awareness before reductions made.

RISK- Capacity to deal with enquiries at the CSC. **MITIGATION:** Signpost to other agencies.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B10

1 SERVICE AREA

SEND Policy and Provision - Independent Travel Training

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To realise savings totalling £500,000 by implementing the Independent Travel Training (ITT) project. This will involve developing pupil independence when travelling from home to school so that there is a reduced reliance on expensive tailor made transport arrangements. This will encourage young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) to travel independently to and from school in preparation for independent adult life. Schools will need to engage with an independence curriculum and this will increase their understanding of associated travel costs which will lead to the development of creative, more cost effective solutions for pupils.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The County Council's Transport and Travel Services team (TTS) has looked into the potential benefits that might be realised by the introduction of a scheme of independent travel training for young people with special needs in Nottinghamshire. This includes an assessment of the potential savings that could be realised if these young people access public transport themselves rather than relying on transport provided by the Council. Young people assessed as being suitable for independent travel training, progress through a 'RAG' (Red, Amber, Green) rating system of milestones until they are deemed able to travel independently. A number of pupils with SEND have been identified as having the potential to receive training. The average unit cost for pupils with SEND using home to school transport is £3,800 per annum.

Case studies have shown that this could be significantly reduced to £800 per pupil realising a saving of £3,000 per student.

It is anticipated that approximately 165 pupils could fall within the scheme and achieve savings of £500,000 whilst also improving independence and preparation for adult life.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

3,550

NET
£000

3,550

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	200	300	500
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	200	300	500

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 14.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There has been some initial investment in delivering independent travel training through the employment of travel trainers. Activities undertaken by other transport proposals will have a knock-on effect on how effective this project might be, in particular if bus routes are removed as part of transport transformation.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

This will benefit service users through the development of independence skills for use in later life.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Any reductions will impact on external transport providers and not on the County Council.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment is required for this proposal because adjusting travel support could adversely affect vulnerable families without providing an adequate alternative. An assessment will need to identify whether certain children with protected characteristics can be reasonably expected to travel independently.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

1. Young people with SEND using public transport - this will be monitored and we will ensure that training is of a high quality.
2. Efficiency will depend on areas over which we have no control e.g. public transport routes.
3. Parents could choose not to opt for independent travel for their child.
4. Implementation will be dependent upon the capacity of schools to support this initiative

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B11**1 SERVICE AREA**

Young People's Service

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to restructure the Young People's Service, including a reduction in the numbers of managers and changes to the deployment and working hours of youth work staff. This will be implemented from October 2014 and will deliver a locally-based youth work offer that operates from 31 Centres and 4 mobile facilities (reduced from 38 and 10 respectively) for 37 weeks of the year (reduced from 42), with the mobile provision operating on a county-wide basis in areas of the highest need that do not have local building-based provision. This will maintain a strong open access service for young people, with an increased focus upon the areas of highest need. There will also be an increase in support to the voluntary youth sector to mitigate the reduction of provision in some locations.

In addition, the Service will continue to offer strong specialist youth work services, including: participation work for children and young people, youth work services for Looked After Children, management of the Notts Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme, vocational training for teenagers and specialist youth clubs for disabled young people (though this provision will reduce from 15 youth work sessions per week to 12 countywide). The Service will decommission open access play provision.

The Service will seek to identify alternative arrangements for future delivery from the Young People's Centres listed below, and will work with local communities and stakeholders to achieve this. If this cannot be achieved, the following Young People's Centres may close from October 2014 - those selected are based on the following criteria:

- Deprivation Factors
- Number of young people in each District/Borough
- Value for money (the capacity to engage the largest numbers of young people)

Bassetlaw and Newark & Sherwood

- Balderton YPC - (Council building - currently closed for health and safety reasons)
- The Core YPC (Southwell) - (Council building - currently open 5 evenings per week)
- Collingham YC - (Community venue - currently open 1 evening per week)
- Winthorpe YC - (Community venue - currently open 1 evening per week)

Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe

- The Lodge YC (Arnold) - (Council building - currently open 2 weekend sessions)
- Bingham YPC - (Council building - currently open 4 evenings per week)
- Ruddington YPC - (Council building - currently open 5 evenings per week)

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To provide access, within the resources available, to the best value, high quality youth work, through safe, enjoyable and positive activities for children and young people outside of the school day and increase support to the voluntary sector to help maintain wider provision.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

5,760

NET
£000

4,550

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	675	675	0	1,350
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	675	675	0	1,350

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

29.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

127.6

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

44.8

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

N/A

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The proposals will deliver an increase in practical support for the voluntary youth and play sector to develop and maintain provision. In addition, work to support those young people in areas that most require youth work support will be protected.

However, there will be a reduction in open access building and mobile youth provision in terms of both locations and opening pattern. The ending of commissioned play provision will also reduce provision for younger children.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be an increase in demand on the voluntary youth sector in localities where provision closes or is reduced.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Increased support to those services delivering early help services to young people.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment is required for this proposal because the reduction in service provision will impact on service users.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: An increase in reports of nuisance behaviour in those areas where provision is reduced.

Mitigation: To support the community and voluntary sector to meet any additional need, the recently created Youth and Play Voluntary Sector Development team will increase; its role will be expanded to include practical training opportunities for the voluntary youth sector. Consideration will also be given to transferring surplus mobiles and mini buses to the voluntary youth sector.

Risk: Some young people may struggle to reach their full potential in: relationships with peers and adults, formal education, the world of work, their local community.

Mitigation: An increase in direct early help support work with those young people who require additional support.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B12

1 SERVICE AREA

Early Years & Early Intervention

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal has 2 key elements: First, to identify and deliver savings across the Service's core management structure, deliver premises related savings (utilities, maintenance etc.) and identify contractual efficiencies/opportunities for efficiencies arising from the integration of services with health partners over a 3 year period. Second, to undertake a review of children's centre provision, in conjunction with communities and the current children's centre service provider consortium, in order to establish a county-wide "cluster" delivery model for children's centres, operational from 2016. The review will seek to maintain universal children's centre provision that meets statutory and regulatory requirements, whilst placing increased emphasis on targeted provision for families that require most support, focused in geographical areas of highest need. The precise configuration of children's centres will be determined by the results of comprehensive local consultation.

The review will establish a revised and reduced staffing model for children's centre provision, that would see clustered children's centres share management and staffing costs. To help generate the savings required, children's centre provision will be delivered from fewer premises with a greater proportion of outreach work and delivery from community venues.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal represents the most effective and deliverable means of reducing cost, whilst protecting core early years and children's centre service provision within the resources available to the Council.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

17,200

NET
£000

17,200

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,000	0	3,000	4,000
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,000	0	3,000	4,000

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

23.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

26.8

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

4.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Additional capacity, drawn from the Corporate Improvement Programme, will be required to undertake the children's centre review and establish the clustering arrangements. There will be one-off property costs associated with the reduction of premises and potential for Department of Education capital claw back.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Year 1: Minimal impact to service users.

Years 2 and 3: Potential impact on family access to children's centre services, including vulnerable families and those in rural areas. The clustering and staffing model selected and implemented will seek to minimise this impact

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Children's centre services are delivered for the Council by Nottinghamshire Children and Families Partnership, a consortium made up of County Health Partnerships, North Nottinghamshire College and Family Action. Appropriate contractual variations/reductions will need to be agreed with the service provider, therefore. In addition, changes to the delivery model for children's centre provision will impact upon joint work/service delivery with schools and health providers.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Reduced premises for children's centres will impact upon other Council services that deliver from the current children's centre buildings network. These include Children's Social Care and the Targeted Support and Youth Justice Service.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment is required for this proposal because the impact on service provision may be significant. Furthermore, the Childcare Act 2006 issues statutory guidance for local authorities in Section 5D, which places a duty on local authorities to ensure there is consultation before any significant changes are made to children's centre provision in their area.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: Cost reductions delivered by reductions in premises will be offset by potential claw back of capital costs by the DfE.

Mitigation: Liaison with the Department of Education regarding premises reduction and continuation of core service offer; reflection of original capital funding programme in reshaped premises network.

Risk: Clustering and remodelling staffing could result in increased risk around meeting Ofsted regulatory standards and requirements, particularly in respect of reach.

Mitigation: Ofsted have recognised clustering as a viable delivery model and have amended the Inspection Framework to reflect this. Ofsted will be made aware of the Council's clustering work.

Risk: Other local authorities that have reduced premises/clustered provision have faced legal challenge. There is a statutory requirement when closing children's centres for a period of public consultation.

Mitigation: Thorough and statutorily compliant consultation will take place before the implementation of the clustering model.

Risk: Lack of integration with commissioned health services.

Mitigation: The integration of Public Health within the Council provides an opportunity to further develop universal and targeted children's centre services, and will support the development of integrated provision encompassing health professionals such as health visitors and school nurses.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B13

1 SERVICE AREA

CFCS - YFC - Libraries, Archives, Information and Learning

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This business case outlines 3 key strands that saves 11.3% of the Service revenue budget, amounting to £1m. In delivering the required savings, the Council will maintain a strong library service offer that meets its statutory library duty in full. The 3 strands are:

1. Undertake a staffing and general budget review, and a review of general programmes – including reducing management layers and staffing, reducing general costs and streamlining non-core library programmes/services.

2. Establish a redesigned library service for Nottinghamshire, by 2015/16 to be delivered via 2 complementary networks. First, a maintained County Library Service will offer a full range of services from larger libraries, in addition to the current mobile library service. Second, a network of Community Partnerships Libraries will be developed where, with support from the Council, communities are enabled to self manage their library, based upon specific local needs and circumstances. For each Community Partnership Library, a detailed support package will be offered. Savings will be generated by reduced premises and staffing costs for the Council.

A revised capital programme will be developed including a capital fund to allow and provide an incentive for community organisations to engage in self managed arrangements, and also to modernise the remaining network of library buildings.

The County Council will commit to maintain a form of library provision or access to library services in designated community partnership locations to meet local circumstances/demand if a community partnership cannot be developed or fails in the future.

3. Alternative operating model – develop a new operating model (Trust/Social Enterprise) by 2016/17 for Libraries, Archives and Community Learning, in order to reduce costs and support the generation of increased income.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To deliver the actions required to reduce service expenditure by 11.3%, whilst maintaining a comprehensive Library and Archive services offer, and meet statutory duties.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

13,370

NET
£000

8,880

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	250	375	375	1,000
LESS Loss of Income	0		0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0		0	0
NET SAVING	250	375	375	1,000

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 11.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

233.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

18.2

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

A revised Libraries capital programme to provide for required investment in community partnership libraries and modernisation of statutory library buildings.
Alternative operating model set-up costs.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The maintained library service would aim to serve at least 95% of current visits and 93% of active library members. Community partnership libraries would be supported to provide a service in the current locations based on the needs of those communities and current library users. Community partnership libraries will be low use, smaller libraries, which will be identified using a range of data and an assessment of their suitability to meet the local communities library and information needs. Reductions in resources and non-core programmes will be offset against savings made through the development of community partnership libraries, improved circulation of stock and changes to internal reservation charges.

The development of an alternative operating model will change relationships with users, communities, and other stakeholders (increased customer participation and consultation through a new governance model is possible).

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The following organisations would need to be consulted/involved in the service changes proposed:

Nottingham City Council, HM Prison Service, NHS Rampton.

Users of sites by other organisations

Parish Councils/community centres who are landlords

Potential Community Partnership Libraries partners

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Customer Service Points

Registration Services

Central Support Services (ICT / Finance / Property)

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

An Equality Impact Assessment is required for this proposal, however, due to the ongoing provision of the statutory service that deals with the majority of current users and the commitment to maintain library provision in the community partnership areas there will be no direct impact. Reductions in resources will reduce the range and depth of stock which will be mitigated by maintaining professional posts to select stock and by altering charges to improve stock circulation. A specific assessment may be required for each library, its local community and any Community Partnership Library support package. The Council will ensure it meets its statutory library duty.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

MEDIUM RISK

Possible judicial review around the Council's statutory library and archive duties and equalities impact

Reduced public and customer satisfaction

Reduced Management - increased risks around health and safety/building management

Meeting increased demand in remaining provision - existing staffing levels may be inadequate to meet customer demand

New operating model financial savings in rates offset by increased VAT liabilities

New operating model requires access to central support services whilst it also provides opportunities for increased efficiencies independent of the Council

MITIGATION

Support of the development of community partnership libraries

No forced deployment of community partnership libraries

Improved stock circulation and exploitation of library stock

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B14

1 SERVICE AREA

Cultural and Enrichment Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is for a two phased approach that will encompass efficiency savings of £200K in year 1 (this will include a number of small scale service reviews resulting in post reductions and vacancy retention). Year 2 and 3 reductions of £600K will be achieved by a combination of reshaping existing service offers and introducing new service delivery models. There are four service blocks that currently make up the Cultural and Enrichment portfolio:

1. Arts and Sports for Children and Young People: The proposal is to deliver the required savings through a reshaping of the Notts Performing Arts and County Youth Arts out-of-school offer from September 2014. The proposal will:

- Support out-of-school arts activities taking place across the county, will enable activities to fit with local needs and enable the new service to target areas where there is greater need for arts activities for children and young people.
- Deliver a more coherent core service for children and young people that promotes progression in the arts, including music.
- Maintain a core of activity from the existing service areas which will help in retaining children and young people in arts activity.
- Ensure that clear progression routes are available and affordable to all young people. Arts projects will target those children and young people who have greatest need e.g. they live in areas where there is limited existing provision or there is low a level of engagement in arts activities, and/or they face challenging circumstances because of disability or background and family economic circumstances.
- In the main, savings will be delivered through reduced management, teaching and support staff costs.

2. Outdoor and Environmental Education: Savings will be achieved through:

- (i) Reductions in revenue budgets (principally staff training, printing costs, minor premises works and equipment purchase budgets)
- (ii) A combination of increased income based on refreshed business plans for each unit and/or the development of alternative ways of delivering the service across some/all of the current provision, including consideration of charitable trust models.

3. Community Sports and Arts: The proposal is based on retaining as much of the existing provision by working differently. In the case of the sports provision there is an opportunity for the County Council to minimise the impact on current service provision by investing in the existing County Sports Partnership, which would deliver the Council's service objectives through a new contractual arrangement. In Arts, the development of an independent charitable arts organisation to deliver the Council's objectives will be explored; this new organisation would undertake direct delivery together with targeted development work in community settings. Savings in both areas will be delivered through streamlining and management cost reductions.

4. Achievement and Equalities Team: The proposal is to integrate the existing team's function across two aligned service areas (Targeted Support and Youth Justice, and the Support to Schools Service) to enable the team's face to face and school advisory/support functions to be maintained. Savings will be delivered through management/staffing reductions.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale for a phased approach is that in some areas a minimum of 18 months will be required to establish new ways in which services could be delivered and/or to complete the service restructuring required. The aim is to retain as much front line delivery and targeted activity as possible.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

8,288

NET
£000

3,513

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	200	550	50	800
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	200	550	50	800
WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?				22.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

140.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

25.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Yes - funding may be required to support the establishment of alternative ways of delivering services. In particular financial analysis, legal, risk and insurance and property expertise would be required to ensure successful transitions to new ways of working.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

In year 1 it should be possible to maintain levels of service provision with a minimal amount of disruption to front line service users other than with the changes to the service provision in Arts and Sports for Children and Young People. In years 2 and 3, depending on the levels of success of new operating models/service reshaping, it is possible that provision will reduce in some areas.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Many of the services provided currently receive significant external funding and as such partner agencies will want to understand the impact of the proposals of their investment with the County Council.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

In the short term there will be considerable pressure on the support services that will be required to support the review and implementation of the changes required to achieve the savings.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

Equality Impact Assessments for all four strands of this outline business case will be produced to ensure that those people with vulnerable characteristics are not disproportionately affected by the proposed changes.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

1. Arts and Sports for Children and Young People

- A needs analysis by an external agency was commissioned and produced in summer 2013. This project engaged stakeholders including children, young people and their parents/ carers who use existing services as well as staff and other stakeholders. The recommendations from this review are helping the service to shape the proposals to best fit the needs of children and young people in Nottinghamshire.
- There is enough flexibility in the proposal to allow for targeting of activities where there is most need. For example, arts centres and projects could be located where there are fewer existing options for children and young people or a higher proportion of families who do not engage in arts/ cultural activities.
- Children and young people engaging in activities which will no longer be delivered will be signposted to activities in the new service offer and/or informed about options by other providers including, for example, theatre and stage schools, young people's groups delivered by arts organisations.

2. Outdoor Environmental Education

- In the medium term, the offer in this area will remain broadly the same albeit with a renewed focus on income generation.

3. Community Sports and Arts

- The potential to retain service provision comes out of the opportunity to develop a partnership model in sport and a new way of running or delivering the arts service based upon the formulation of an independent arts body.

4. Achievement and Equalities Services

- The reduction of posts will in some part be mitigated by the integration of the remaining resources with other services that are engaged in similar work.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B15

1 SERVICE AREA

Country Parks and Green Estates

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is for a two phased approach that will encompass year 1 efficiency savings of £150K. This will be achieved by a number of small scale service and staffing reviews. Alongside this, savings will be made by reshaping grounds maintenance arrangements across the sites.

Phase 2 reductions of £350K to be implemented in years 2/3 will be achieved by a combination of reshaping the existing service offer to generate increased income/reduce costs and the potential introduction of new operating models for the parks and wider green estates. The proposals would also include a review of the events programmes to ensure that events across all sites are at least cost neutral. There will also be a full review of the existing staffing structure.

To support the phase 2 reductions work will commence immediately on a number of strands of work which will include.

- **Review of green estate holdings and the subsequent generation of maintenance and management cost savings**
- **The introduction of a revised commercial offer across the parks with particular focus on Rufford Country Park.**

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale for a two phased approach is that a minimum of 18 months is required to establish new operating models and/or to complete the fundamental service reshaping required to achieve the savings targets. The proposal is aimed at maintaining as much frontline delivery as possible.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

4,420

NET
£000

1,600

4 5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	200	140	160	500
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovisi	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	150	160	190	500
WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?				31.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

92.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

10.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Yes - in phase 2, funding would be required to support the establishment of alternative operating models. In particular, sector-led financial appraisal, legal, risk, insurance and property expertise could be required.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

It should be possible to retain the majority of current operating levels with limited impact on direct service users.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There is close scrutiny by English Heritage and English Nature on the operation and management of the Country Parks. Future funding from these agencies will be subject to the Council's strategic vision for the sites moving forward.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

In the short term there will be pressure on support services who will be required to support the review and implementation of the changes required to achieve the savings. As always, it should be recognised that changes proposed to current practice on the Country Parks may have a knock-on effect to other Council departments, particularly those providing a direct service (e.g. cleaning and grounds maintenance)

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment is not required for this proposal because it does not directly impact on frontline provision or vulnerable groups.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risks

The second phase proposals carry a level of risk as they are predicated on a successful outcome of a new operating model for commercial activity.

Mitigating actions

- Early engagement with the Improvement Programme to establish the true commercial potential of Rufford Country Park.
- Member engagement and sign-up to the Green Estates and Rufford Development Plans in October 2013
- Development of new proposals that will attract external capital funding

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B16

1 SERVICE AREA

Looked After Children Placements

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal builds on existing work to reduce reliance on expensive external (privately run or out-of-county) residential placements and the use of independent fostering agency (IFA) placements for looked after children.

The proposal is over 4 years to release savings from:

- The reduction in use of independent fostering agencies and privately run or out-of-county residential placements.
- Increased number of council managed fostering placements.
- Increase in Special Guardianship Orders and adoption.

This work includes increasing the recruitment and retention of Nottinghamshire County Council's own directly recruited and managed foster carers; reviewing the cases of children currently in private or out-of-county residential placements and minimising the number of children entering residential care whose needs can be met in a family placement.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Detailed analysis of local data and benchmarking information shows that a higher proportion of children are placed in external residential care (privately run or out-of-county) than average which impacts on total spend on Looked After Children placements. 41% of foster placements are with independent agencies.

In order to reduce total spend on placements, there needs to be a shift in the proportion of placement type, with a smaller proportion of children placed in more expensive placements (residential and Independent Fostering Agency) and a larger proportion in lower cost placements (County Council fostering, special guardianship orders, adoption) where this is in the best interest of the child.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

37,000

NET
£000

37,000

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	2,320	2,570	1,700	6,590
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	2,320	2,570	1,700	6,590

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 17.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The costs involved with implementing this proposal have been taken into account when calculating the savings targets. There will be costs associated with recruiting, assessing, training and providing social workers for additional Nottinghamshire County Council foster carers.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Where appropriate and safe to do so, looked after children may be moved from a residential or independent fostering agency placement to alternative placements. These moves will only be planned where a new placement is identified that fully meets the needs of the child and the transition between placements will be carefully planned and supported. As far as possible and where appropriate, children and young people newly entering placements will not be placed in residential or Independent Fostering Agency placements unless their needs cannot be otherwise met.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reliance on independent fostering agencies and external (private out-of-county) residential providers who are commissioned by the Council will reduce, resulting in reduced income from Nottinghamshire County Council for these organisations.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is expected that a full Equalities Impact Assessment will be required following consultation on proposals to any service changes.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

- Increased targets for recruitment of additional foster carers may not be achieved
- Whilst robust analysis and forecasting has been carried out, future changes in Government policy and unpredicted demand for Looked After Children placements could affect the ability to deliver savings

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B17

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Transport & Travel Services - Local Bus Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reconfigure the supported local bus service network to reduce expenditure by 30% between 2014 and 2016. This can be achieved through a mix of service efficiencies and reductions. This will result in a loss of early morning, late evening, Sunday and bank holiday and some peak/off peak services.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The budget for supported bus services in 2013/14 is £6m (32% of the TTS budget). A 30% reduction will achieve £1.8m of savings which will be managed through service efficiencies to the value of £1.1m and service reductions of £700k. The service reductions are for contracts providing off peak, early morning, late evening, Sunday and bank holiday services which are high cost and low patronage.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

6,000

NET
£000

6,000

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	800	1000	0	1,800
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	800	1,000		1,800

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

30.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The reductions will limit the transport options available to service users. In some cases there will be no alternative Public Transport option. Access to health appointments, essential shopping and leisure may be affected through changes to off peak services. This may impact on personal independence and mobility. It may require service users to alter their normal travel pattern to use alternative services or have slightly longer journeys using connecting services.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Service reductions will impact on education providers, retail and leisure providers as well as limiting economic growth.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

This could impact on access to Libraries and leisure attractions with the changes to Sunday, evening, bank holiday and off-peak services. In some cases there may be alternative provision available.

CONSULTATION

There will be wide consultation with all stakeholders to ensure that the proposals are considered in a more informed way. This will be carried out between November 2013 and January 2014.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The proposals may have a higher impact on people who do not have any alternative travel options such as older, infirm people or people with disabilities. An initial Equality Impact Assessment has been completed based on current outline network proposals.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

(a) Risk - changes to evening, Sunday, bank holiday and off peak services may restrict access to key services and leisure activities for some people.

(a) Mitigation - In some cases there may be alternative transport provision available.

(b) Risk - changes to early morning services may affect journeys to work.

(b) Mitigation - analysis of usage shows low patronage on the affected journeys and in many cases there are alternative services available at a later time.

(c) Risk - the removal of funding for local bus services may result in commercial operators terminating the full service affected by the change.

(c) Mitigation - early discussions with commercial operators will aim to minimise any adverse impact.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B18

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Waste Management – Contract Savings

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Deliver financial savings through the renegotiation of existing waste management contracts.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The council operates a range of contracts with private sector partners to deliver elements of the waste management service. The County Council is currently in a position to renegotiate a number of these contracts in order to deliver financial savings and operational improvements.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

33,344

NET
£000

28,690

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	800	200	0	1,000
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	800	200	0	1,000

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

3.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

15.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There would potentially be a one off costs of around £100k required to pay for specialist legal and commercial advice, and to finalise any necessary contract variations.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None – Waste contracts are background activity, unseen by the public.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Relationship with partners could change through renegotiation of existing arrangements.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Legal and Financial services will be required to provide support and advice as required.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

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

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is potential that agreement may not be reached and savings may not therefore be delivered, although initial discussions indicate that this is unlikely.

Should savings not be delivered by renegotiation then the option of re-procurement will need to be considered.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B19**1 SERVICE AREA**

Transport, Property and Environment - Waste Management – Recycling Centre Service

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Introduce a range of changes to the Recycling Centre Service over a two year period to deliver financial savings. This includes:

- Implementing a permit scheme to use the Recycling Centres for all County residents.
- Closing Fiskerton Recycling Centre.
- Closing Langar Recycling Centre.
- Closing two or more Recycling Centres and developing a new large modern split level Recycling Centre to serve the Mansfield/Ashfield area and investigating opportunities in other areas.
- Increasing existing disposal charges for Asbestos.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposals seek to rationalise and enhance the existing Recycling Centre Service provision by developing enhanced facilities, closing uneconomic and environmentally compromised sites, and introducing new access management policies and revised and new charges for the disposal of non-household waste.

The existing Recycling Centre Van and Trailer permit scheme is to be extended to all Nottinghamshire residents to restrict trade waste and cross border inputs from residents of neighbouring authorities. The County Council currently meets the disposal cost of this waste which should really be met by the councils where the waste is generated.

The Fiskerton Recycling Centre receives the lowest tonnage of any recycling centre in the county and is located adjacent to an old landfill which is due for restoration. The planning permission for the landfill also currently requires the restoration of the recycling centre site. The Fiskerton Recycling Centre site is also outside of the PFI contract arrangements and can be closed with no contractual impact and with relatively short notice. There are alternative recycling centres with better facilities located at Bilsthorpe and Brunel Drive in Newark, easily accessible to the main population centre in Southwell.

In Southwell a new chargeable kerbside green waste collection service has recently been introduced from Newark and Sherwood District Council and Mansfield District Council in partnership - around 50% of inputs to Fiskerton are green waste therefore service impacts for residents are mitigated by the availability of this collection service.

The Langar Recycling Centre takes the second lowest tonnage of any recycling centre in the County and the district council, Rushcliffe, provide chargeable green waste collections in the area served by the site. Alternative recycling centres are available in West Bridgford, Calverton, and Newark, which are now within reasonable travel time of the main settlement of Bingham.

Potential exists to develop a new recycling centre "super site" to serve the Mansfield/Ashfield conurbation, with the associated closure of the existing sites at Kirkby in Ashfield, Mansfield and Warsop all of which suffer from operational constraints. This would require investment but would deliver additional operational savings together with improved facilities for service users.

Existing Asbestos disposal charges to residents will be increased for the next 2 years to reflect disposal costs, generating a small additional saving.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

33,344

NET
£000

28,690

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	205	505	0	710
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	205	505	0	710

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

2.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

15.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There would potentially be one off costs of around £200,000 to set up the permit scheme to cover purchase of permits or systems to administer and operate the scheme, and to meet the cost of communicating with residents. On-going operational costs would be met from the savings in waste disposal costs.

Capital costs of a new recycling centre supersite could be in the order of £2m but this would deliver operational savings of around £100,000 per annum.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Introduction of a full permit scheme will improve the availability and viability of sites by deterring cross border and trade use. Permits will be offered free of charge to residents and will therefore have no negative impact on service users. Applications will be processed in a number of ways to ensure the system is accessible to all.

Number of recycling centres reduced therefore more travel required to dispose of waste.

A new recycling centre "supersite" to serve Mansfield and North Ashfield would provide a much enhanced customer experience whilst delivering additional operational savings.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Relationship with neighbouring authorities may change by restricting cross border use.

Newark and Sherwood District Council, Mansfield District Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council may show an increase in customers requiring green waste collection but this will generate additional income for them and increase recycling performance.

A number of the proposals require negotiation with and agreement from Veolia to be deliverable.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

One-off requirements associated with service changes and systems for implementing and managing restrictions will need to be established using Corporate Communications, Customer Service Centre, Parking Partnership or similar.

A new recycling centre supersite would require input from corporate property, development control and other parts of the County Council.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects of the proposal on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Closing recycling centres or restricting access may reduce customer satisfaction levels, lower recycling performance and risk potential fly tipping.

Negative effects can be mitigated by ensuring sufficient notice and communication activity is undertaken and by supporting waste collection authorities to deliver alternative service opportunities as necessary to offset the loss of those facilities at the recycling centre (i.e. green waste collections).

Identifying a suitable recycling centre supersite, securing planning permission and the necessary contractual renegotiation with Veolia would be complex. However engaging early with Veolia and the local community, and ensuring sufficient notice and communication activity is undertaken, will help mitigate these potential risks.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B20

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Waste Management - Provide financial support to two waste collection authorities to introduce kerbside green waste collections.

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Provide financial support to two waste collection authorities to introduce additional kerbside green waste collections to help divert waste from landfill and increase recycling performance. Savings accruing to the County Council from reduced Landfill Tax payments would be used to make incentive payments. This applies specifically to Bassetlaw and Newark and Sherwood where recycling levels are particularly low due to the lack of kerbside green waste collections.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Re-using and re-cycling waste (including composting) instead of sending waste to landfill produces financial savings to the County Council. However, this incurs extra costs for waste collection authorities in operating collection vehicles and crews.

Making payments to the waste collection authorities in Bassetlaw and Newark and Sherwood to encourage them to collect green waste by subsidising their direct costs, or the amount they charge residents for the green waste collection service, should still result in a net saving to the County Council of £200,000.

This proposal will increase green waste collection services, reduce costs to the public and the County Council, minimise costs to the two waste collection authorities and lead to increased recycling performance.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

33,344

NET
£000

28,690

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £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
NET SAVING	0	200	0	200

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

0.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

11.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Potentially capital payments may need to be made to allow the two waste collection authorities to purchase additional vehicles and wheeled bins. Additional staffing resources may be required to assist implementation.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Increased service levels for residents who are able to access green waste collections (on a chargeable basis) where no service existed previously. Specifically in Bassetlaw and Newark and Sherwood.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Relies on the two waste collection authorities to deliver the service. Waste collection authorities who currently deliver the same level of service for either no cost (Broxtowe) or on a chargeable basis (Ashfield, Gedling, Mansfield, Rushcliffe) will feel disadvantaged and may seek funding from Nottinghamshire County Council which would be unaffordable.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

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

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk - Waste collection authorities who currently deliver the same level of service for either no cost (Broxtowe) or on a chargeable basis (Ashfield, Gedling, Mansfield, Rushcliffe) may feel disadvantaged and may seek funding from Nottinghamshire County Council which would be unaffordable.

Mitigation - Need to ensure any arrangements provide clarity and fairness and deliver improved performance.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B21

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Energy Management - Increase contract rebate

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To increase the rebate to support the energy and carbon management service for schools and other Council buildings, including the administration of the Council's central gas and electricity buying contract, which delivered an average saving of 15% over the last three years compared to average market prices for power.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Energy Team manages energy contracts on behalf of the council, including schools, with a value of around £15million each year. The costs of electricity and gas used are met by the individual properties/services as appropriate. Increasing the rebate levied on the contract will have a negligible increase on energy cost for customers, but will generate £200,000 of additional income to cover the costs of administration of the service.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

33,344

NET
£000

28,690

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	200	0	0	200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	200	0	0	200

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

0.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

5.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Minor - increase in costs to individual customers will be minor. Existing contract rates are already significantly below general market rates and therefore overall costs are still favourable.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minor - increase in costs to individual customers will be negligible.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

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

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk - Minor - potential loss of take up of arrangements reducing income.

Mitigation - as contract rates are currently very favourable take up should be unaffected, risk is very small.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B22

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways – Countryside Access

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to further reduce capacity and resources for the Rights of Way service. This proposal includes a reduction in works budgets.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Authority's principal duty is summarised as

- to maintain public rights of way (footpaths, bridleways etc.) and to keep them free from obstruction
- to map all of the county's paths on the definitive map
- to look after and promote the new open access sites and rights
- to maintain the Common Land and Village Green register
- to promote and manage a Local Access Forum
- to produce and publish a Rights of Way Improvement Plan

This proposal will reduce activity to a minimum level and remove any discretionary activities.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

721

NET
£000

721

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	100	50	0	150
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	100	50	0	150

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

20.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

11.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Potential staff redundancy costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

- reduced advice and assistance in particular to land managers, conservation organisations, the public and other local authorities
- Reduced response to complaints and defect reports
- Reduced annual and reactive maintenance of the path network
- Reduced advice to applicants on processing public path orders
- Increased customer complaints
- Increased legal claims
- Reduced proactive work with landowners
- Reduced proactive work with user groups and parishes etc.
- Further reduced partnership working

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

See above

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Potential increase in workload in legal and complaints functions.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation).

If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects of the proposal on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Consequences are identified in section 9 above – significantly:

1. It is likely that public expectation around the level of service is not met
2. Risks of potential increase in current level of complaints and insurance claims due to reduced budgets for maintenance of the network and reduced inspection capacity. This will be mitigated by targeting maintenance and staff resources on areas of greatest public use.
3. There is a risk of legal notices being served on Nottinghamshire County Council regarding claims for rights of way to be added to the definitive map.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B23

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Blue Badge Charges

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to increase the charge for a Blue Badge from £2 (the minimum) to £10 (as charged by most local authorities).

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

A contribution towards the administrative and assessment costs associated with considering applications for Blue Badges is offset by the income from the £2 permit charge is £34k.

The charge for a Blue Badge is set by national legislation with a minimum of £2 and a maximum of £10 for a permit which is normally valid for 3 years.

Most Authorities in the country, including Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Lincolnshire charge £10 for a Blue Badge.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

34

NET
£000

34

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	40	40	56	136
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	40	40	56	136

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

400.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None - there is an annual review of all highway charges for services.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users will incur an additional cost of £8 although this level of charge has been accepted by service users in other authorities. There has been very little resistance from Disabled Groups in those areas where the charge has been increased

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Anticipated impact on other organisations is minimal.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal will negatively impact on people with protected characteristics; however the proposal aligns the County Council with most other local authorities. An equality impact assessment may be required.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Consultation needed and comparison to other adjacent authorities.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B24

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways – Road Safety Education

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To include Road Safety Education in the future arrangements for commissioning public health in Nottinghamshire.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Road Safety Education is a statutory requirement of the Highways Authority. Under this proposal, road safety education would form part of the future arrangements for commissioning public health in Nottinghamshire. It is noted that cycle training and the School Crossing Patrol Service (SCP) will be continued to be funded from the Highways Safety budgets. It is expected that 3.5 FTEs will transfer under this proposal

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

79

NET
£000

79

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	79	0	79
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	79	0	79

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

100.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

3.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Redundancy costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Road Safety Education will be incorporated into a healthy Nottinghamshire initiative, which should provide a more coherent approach to the safety of residents.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The current partnerships formed with other organisations such as the Police will need to be reviewed

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minimal

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects of the proposal on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk to service users

Service users should experience a similar level of Road Safety Education from the new provider.

Risk to delivering these savings

Minimal risk of delivering this proposal subject to County Council policy and procedures for redundancies.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B25

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Catering & Facilities Management - Schools
Catering

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

After a five year price freeze, it is proposed to increase the cost of a primary school meal by 5% from £2 per meal to £2.10 in 2014-15.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The costs of providing the service have increased over the past four years due to inflation and rising food prices. The price change is required to ensure the service is able to break-even due to the budget pressures facing the County Council.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

16,084

NET
£000

15,573

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

This proposal will not generate any savings, but will enable the service to remain self-financing.

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

450.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

No significant costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Increasing the cost of a meal by 10 pence (£19 per year per pupil) could marginally discourage some parents buying into the service. This proposal won't affect pupils entitled to free meals as schools reimburse the County Council for each free school meal that is provided.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be additional costs charged to schools.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The proposals contained in this business case do not represent any changes to existing service provision other than the cost of the service. The financial impact of the price increases will fall on schools and families.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is market competition from the private sector and clearly should a school/academy decide to self manage this will result in loss of contribution to the County Council.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B26

1 SERVICE AREA

Planning - Planning Policy

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To generate income by charging Nottingham City Council for the preparation of the Joint Waste Core Strategy; streamlining the process to secure developer contributions with post reductions and merging the Planning Policy and Conservation teams.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Planning Policy team is responsible for the preparation of the waste and minerals local plans, minerals searches, external planning consultations and managing the Authority's developer contribution strategy.

The proposal is to make the service more efficient by redistribution of roles and by maximising income generation potential.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

413

NET
£000

413

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	73	0	0	73
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	73	0	0	73

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

17.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

8.1

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.5

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There will be charges for minerals searches and for planning policy advice. Developers will liaise with generalist rather than specialist staff over developer contributions.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Partners will be expected to meet the proportional costs of joint work being undertaken (e.g. on the Joint Waste Core Strategy).

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

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

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The proposed merger of the Conservation Team with the Planning Team will lead to the creation of a team with a diverse range of specialists requiring a greater managerial input from the team manager who may not then have sufficient time to undertake current duties. This may impact on the delivery of statutory functions and work may need to be risk assessed to ensure the focus on priority areas.

Projected income may not be realised. However, targets are considered to be achievable and their attainment will be monitored.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B27

1 SERVICE AREA

Planning - Development Management

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To introduce a charge for pre-application planning advice, generating up to £18,000 of income by 2016/17. To reduce administrative support by making better use of ICT. To consider options to share services with other neighbouring authorities.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Development Management team is responsible for processing planning applications to the County Council as a Waste and Minerals Planning Authority. The Team also covers the monitoring and enforcement of breaches of planning control. Both of these areas are statutory functions.

The proposal is to make the service more efficient by the redistribution of business support administrative roles and by maximising income generation potential.

No planning officer reductions are proposed because, when compared with other county councils, the Development Management team has a low staff level with a high case load (e.g. approx 47 applications per staff member compared to 29 applications per officer in Derbyshire). If staffing levels were to be reduced, there is a risk that the quality of the service would suffer. The Government is introducing penalties against authorities they consider to be performing poorly.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

570

NET
£000

183

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	64	0	3	67
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	64	0	3	67

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

36.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

13.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Applicants for Planning Permission would have to pay for a service that is currently provided at no cost to them. However, this cost is likely to be recouped by a shorter planning application process as issues will have been addressed pre application submission.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Consultees will be asked for information pre-application, as process will be front loaded, negotiations as part of the application process will be reduced.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Departments will have to pay for pre-application advice currently provided without charge. However if, as expected, the quality of applications improves, this will shorten overall timescales for planning approvals.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

A Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects of the proposal to charge for pre-application planning advice on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Applicants may not seek pre-application advice owing to charges and poor applications may be submitted, resulting in more staff input during the application process.

Detailed work will need to be undertaken to draw up an appropriate charging shedule to mitigate this risk.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B28

1 SERVICE AREA

Economic Development

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To set up a shared economic development service with other partners and restructure the service, saving up to £250,000.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Shared services are acknowledged to offer potential benefits to:

- lower management and operating costs
- improve learning and innovation by concentrating technical and managerial expertise and facilitating knowledge sharing
- increase service quality by forming a customer-oriented mindset
- enhance credibility and solve internal conflicts.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

3,203

NET
£000

1,116

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	250	0	250
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	250	0	250

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

22.4%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

10.3

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

3.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Potential for service to be enhanced if delivered in a genuinely shared way. Possible that more effective delivery could be an outcome, alongside efficiencies across the public sector partners. Better offer in terms of skills sets and expertise. However dependent on the size of a shared service, there may be significant capacity limitations.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Efficiencies could be delivered to all partners if a shared service model were delivered effectively. Contrasting priorities of partners could introduce tensions.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Greater clarity of purpose and authority if a shared service were achieved.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The economic development budget supports a range of initiatives focused on economic growth. It is proposed that this would be rationalised as part of any shared service arrangement. An Equality Impact Assessment would need to be conducted in relation to specific proposals to rationalise the budget to ascertain any adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics. This will be done during the process of determining specific proposals.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

This proposal would require significant discussion and negotiation with partners before it could be achieved. There is the potential therefore for delays in achieving this saving. The savings estimate is just that and may prove to be over-stated. It is not possible to carry out any further detailed modelling without clarity about which partners would be involved.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B29

1 SERVICE AREA

Economic Development

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce Nottinghamshire County Council's contribution to Experience Nottinghamshire by £100,000, leaving a total grant of £118,000.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Experience Nottinghamshire is the 'Destination Management Organisation' (DMO) for Nottingham and Nottinghamshire. It is a not-for-profit organisation funded by the City and County Councils and private sector contributions. It undertakes tourism marketing and promotions work for the County and City areas.

The rationale for the proposal is that supporting the visitor economy is of a lesser priority than other economic development priorities which focus on economic growth in high value sectors and employment (particularly youth employment) and skills development.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

3,203

NET
£000

1,116

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £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
NET SAVING	100	0	0	100

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

9.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

10.3

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

As for impact on other organisations, given the nature of Experience Nottinghamshire's work.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The proposal will result in decreased marketing and promotion of the tourism offer for Nottinghamshire which may result in fewer visits to the County from outside the locality and may result in a reduction in business for the tourism businesses of Nottinghamshire which in turn may give rise to lower levels of employment in the sector.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Decreased tourism and marketing and promotion activity is likely to result in fewer visits to the County from outside the locality and may result in fewer visitors to the County Council's cultural offer (ie. Country Parks etc).

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics at this point. However, an Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken by Experience Nottinghamshire, in conjunction with the Council, to understand the specific equality implications of the reduced contribution to the organisation.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Marketing and promotion work to showcase Nottinghamshire as a visitor destination would be reduced. However, County Council funding of the organisation would return to levels it was at up until the financial year 2012/13 which means that the organisation is unlikely to have to cease trading and some level of marketing and promotion activity for Nottinghamshire will be maintained, although the precise detail would need to be negotiated as part of a Service Level Agreement (SLA).

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B30

1 SERVICE AREA
Community Safety

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce community safety budget by 35% (£367K) by redesigning the service, disestablishing Safer and Engaged Communities Group and group manager post; moving parts of the service to other Council departments and reducing the commissioning budget.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To redesign Community Safety to reduce management costs and reduce operating budgets whilst retaining a core leadership role.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,051

NET
£000

1,051

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	367	0	0	367
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	367	0	0	367

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

34.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

11.1

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Maintenance of the Community Safety Team would ensure continuation of a meaningful level of service in respect of community safety

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

- Partners such as Police, Probation and districts will need to work with Public Health on domestic violence.
- Greater joint work with PCC, especially over strategic assessments, funding issues and planning.
- Key partnership work on the Safer Nottinghamshire Board and Community Safety Partnerships would be maintained

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

- Public Health taking over main policy drive for domestic violence – will need to continue this through period following the uplift of funding over next two years.
- Increased synergy with Trading Standards
- Community Safety Committee could be fully served by services under Public Protection – a more coherent and streamlined approach

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

A detailed Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects on hate crime, domestic violence, victim support etc arising from that part of the proposal which reduces the commissioning budget.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

- If Public Health are unable to pick up domestic violence work area and attached post, the reduction in 2014/15 would need to be secured through reductions in staff/management costs or initiatives budget.
- Community Safety and Trading Standards worked with greater synergy when in the same department. There is some real potential for increasing the amount of joint work which would flow from being in the same Group with streamlined management structure.
- The realignment option would provide significant cost reductions (35%) over the next four years while maintaining core service and the positive profile of the community safety work of NCC, which the Community Safety Team has provided corporately.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B31

1 SERVICE AREA

Community and Voluntary Sector Liaison

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce the financial contribution to Healthwatch Nottinghamshire by £145,000 by the end of financial year 2015/2016.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Local authorities with social care responsibilities are statutorily required to commission a Local Healthwatch for their areas to be a 'local consumer champion for patients, service users and the public' in the provision of publicly funded health and social care services. A non-ringfenced funding allocation from Government is included in formula grant to local authorities to support their local Healthwatch.

The rationale for the project is to remove the contingency funding retained by the Council for Healthwatch (£80,000) and to reduce the current Healthwatch Nottinghamshire contract funding by £15,000 (3%) in 2014/15 and £50,000 (10%) in 2015/16, having given the organisation - a social enterprise - time to develop alternative funding arrangements.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

482

NET
£000

482

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	95	50	0	145
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	95	50	0	145

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

30.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Healthwatch Nottinghamshire may be less able to undertake its role in engaging with and representing the views of service users to health and social care commissioners and providers. However, the services it undertakes will be designed, prioritised and delivered in consultation with communities and stakeholder organisations.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Healthwatch Nottinghamshire will be less able to act as a quality monitor and scrutinise publically funded health care services. However, the services it undertakes will be designed, prioritised and delivered in consultation with communities and stakeholder organisations.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Healthwatch Nottinghamshire may be less able to act as a quality monitor and scrutinise publically funded health care services.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is anticipated that the proposal may have a disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics (particularly older people and people with disabilities as primary users of publically funded health and social care services). An Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken to inform decision making in respect of this proposal. However, as an independent organisation, Healthwatch Nottinghamshire will need to consider the measures it needs to take to accommodate the reduced contract funding from the Council (if approved) and undertake an Equality Impact Assessment to determine the impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is a risk that Healthwatch Nottinghamshire will be unable to undertake the full range of services it is statutorily required to do. However, this will be mitigated by the fact that funding to Healthwatch Nottinghamshire will be gradually reduced to allow it time to develop alternative income streams (as was envisaged by Government as part of the guidance on Healthwatch). Moreover, its services need to be designed, prioritised and delivered in consultation with communities and stakeholder organisations which will ensure a focus on those outcomes which are important to the people and health / social care service users of Nottinghamshire.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B32

1 SERVICE AREA

Community and Voluntary Sector Liaison - Grant Aid

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To stop providing grant aid to Nottingham Playhouse from 2014/15 saving £94,500.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Nottingham Playhouse has received funding from the County Council for many years. A three year rolling agreement started in 2008/9 aligned to the Council's strategic priorities with outcomes (providing cultural opportunities to Nottinghamshire residents) being monitored. Funding was reduced from £137,923 in 2009/10 to its current level of £94,500 in 2010/11.

Members approved funding for the Playhouse for two years from July 2012. The Playhouse also receives Arts Council funding of £1.4m p.a, £200k from Nottingham City Council [who recoup much of this from charging rent on the building they occupy] and has just been awarded nearly £1m from the Arts Council/Heritage Lottery Fund to improve their site.

The grant aid budget funds 133, mostly charitable not for profit organisations, in accordance with the Council's Grant Aid Strategy.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,299

NET
£000

2,289

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	94.5	0.0	0.0	94.5
LESS Loss of Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NET SAVING	94.5	0.0	0.0	94.5

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

4.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The Playhouse is one of only two theatres in the region producing shows in their own auditoria and for touring. Whilst it does rely on grant aid, it also generates income and receives substantial funding from other sources. The reduction in funding may impact on the availability of concessionary rates and on the levels of activity aimed at younger people and other specific groups.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Potential impact on City Council as other local grant aid funder

Potential involvement from the Arts Council

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Sports and Arts Development (Cultural and Enrichment Services) may be impacted as they currently undertake detailed work with the Playhouse , including liaison on tours etc.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

Whilst the Council's grant represents a small part of the Playhouse's income, there is a risk that this will disproportionately affect activities or concessions that are specifically aimed at groups with protected characteristics. A more detailed EqIA will need to be undertaken in conjunction with the Playhouse.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

- Reduction in provision aimed at schools and other groups
- Concessions not available

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B33

1 SERVICE AREA

Community and Voluntary Sector Liaison

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To redesign the service to provide a greater focus on targeting deprived communities. This will save £245,000 and lead to the loss of six full time equivalent posts. Provide community development and funding support expertise which underpins the delivery of the County Council's strategic priorities at locality level to:

- Maximise the deployment of volunteers to support service delivery
- Enhance support to elected Members in performing their community leadership roles through direct support (operational/specialist/community/funding) in localities and strategic support at team manager level
- Align each post with a thematic/specialist focus in line with Council priorities and a co-ordinating role in targeted geographical areas
- Foster joint working with partners across the voluntary and community sector
- Manage and administer grant aid as part of a wider funding and community development service, with an increased focus on County Council priorities
- Stop providing support to Member Forums but work with elected Members to develop mechanisms they need in place to support their locality and community leadership work
- Radically redesign the service by changing the roles of the community engagement officers and voluntary and community officers.
- Securing external funding e.g. Lottery's Reaching Communities Fund/Awards for All, to maintain a proactive voluntary and community sector.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Redesign and improve the efficiency of community engagement, funding support and grant aid activity and securing Big Lottery funding (£0.5M) to ensure longer term sustainability for Community Resource Centres.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

489

NET
£000

489

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	245	0	0	245
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	245	0	0	245

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 50.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

14.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

6.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

- will provide more bespoke support to elected Members in discharging their community leadership roles
- will enable an improved emphasis on defining what localities' needs are and how best they are met to maximise resources
- will target resources, based on evidence, to deliver locally on the Council's strategic priorities. Will secure Big Lottery funding for Community Resource Centres and ensure dedicated support from officers in the team (will not be possible without team's expertise and local knowledge)
- will offer more cross sector working with the voluntary and community sector, including grant aided groups, to support vulnerable and hard to reach communities and individuals
- will focus on a clearly defined service offer to stakeholders to support the Council's localism agenda

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

This service realignment will support defined work with district, parish and town councils to meet council priorities. Will focus on professional support to voluntary and community groups to encourage greater independence and longer term sustainability.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

A Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects on support to the Voluntary and Community Sector given the Sector's role in supporting vulnerable people and communities.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is a risk that the Service is spread too thinly. The ability to carry out a meaningful local role will require refocussing and targeting addressed through risk assessment and prioritisation in line with strategic priorities.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

B34

1 SERVICE AREA
Democratic Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Reduce the individual allocation elected Members receive for their divisions under the Councillors' Divisional Fund from £10,000 to £5,000 each year.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Over time the funding allocated has increased from the initial £5,000 per division to the current rate of £10,000 per division per annum. It is proposed to revert to the original amount to reflect the Council's current and on-going financial challenges.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

682

NET
£000

682

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	335	0	0	335
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	335	0	0	335

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

49.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Beneficiaries are groups and individuals across the County representing a wide range of ages, interests, and needs. Experience shows that most of the payments are by way of small grants for specific purposes. The Fund is intended to support one-off items of expenditure and not for anything which would create an on-going financial commitment and so there should be limited impact in terms of disadvantage to recipients of support from one year to the next.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

As for service users.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

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

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The scheme was established in recognition that local democracy could be strengthened by enabling Members to respond speedily and effectively to issues and problems in their areas. It was envisaged that a relatively small amount of funding applied flexibly by Members with local knowledge could make a significant difference. The proposal will enable elected Members to still make positive interventions in their divisions but on a smaller scale.