

# Public Document Pack



**TRAFFORD**  
**COUNCIL**

## **AGENDA PAPERS MARKED 'TO FOLLOW' FOR BUDGET EXECUTIVE**

**Date: Wednesday, 19 February 2014**

**Time: 6.15 pm**

**Place: Committee Rooms 2 and 3, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford  
M32 0TH**

<b>A G E N D A</b>	<b>PART I</b>	<b>Pages</b>
<b>3a</b>	<b>Executive's Revenue Budget Proposals 2014/15</b> The following documents are attached:	<b>1 - 22</b>
	iv) Executive's Response to Budget Scrutiny Report	

**THERESA GRANT**  
Chief Executive

### Membership of the Committee

Councillors M. Colledge (Chairman), S. Anstee (Vice-Chairman), Dr. K. Barclay, Miss L. Blackburn, M. Cornes, J. Coupe, M. Hyman, A. Mitchell, A. Williams and M. Young.

### Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact:

Jo Maloney,  
Tel: 0161 912 4298  
Email: [joseph.maloney@trafford.gov.uk](mailto:joseph.maloney@trafford.gov.uk)

This agenda was issued on **Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2014** by the Legal and Democratic Services Section, Trafford Council, Trafford Town Hall; Talbot Road, Stretford, Manchester, M32 0TH

This page is intentionally left blank

### TRAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Report to:** Executive  
**Date:** 19 February 2014  
**Report for:** Decision  
**Report of:** Deputy Leader & Executive Member for Finance and the Director of Finance

#### Report Title

Executive Response to the Overview and Scrutiny Review of the Draft Budget Proposals for 2014/15

#### Summary

The Executive's Draft Budget Proposals for 2014/15 were agreed at its meeting held on 18 November. Directorate-based Scrutiny Topic Groups then held a series of preparatory meetings, to determine issues to be explored in greater detail in workshops held during December with relevant Executive Members and senior officers. On 27<sup>th</sup> January, the Executive was presented with the Scrutiny Committee outcome of those discussions and issues for the Executive's further consideration and response.

The Executive's response to each Scrutiny Committee recommendation is shown in the attached Annex.

#### Recommendation(s)

**It is recommended that Executive approve the response to the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations to the budget proposals 2014/2015.**

#### Contact person for access to background papers and further information:

Name:	Cllr Sean Anstee	Ian Duncan
Extension:	4884	4884

Relationship to Policy Framework/Corporate Priorities	Value for Money. The proposed budget for 2014/15 supports all key priorities and policies.
Financial	There are no financial implications arising from this report.
Legal Implications:	It is a statutory requirement for the Council to set and approve a balanced, robust budget and Council Tax level.  The Council's constitution requires the Executive's budget proposals to be considered by the Scrutiny Committee before final decisions are taken by Full Council.
Equality/Diversity Implications	None
Sustainability Implications	None arising from of this report.
Staffing/E-Government/Asset Management Implications	None arising from this report
Risk Management Implications	None
Health and Safety Implications	None

### **Consultation**

Not applicable.

### **Reasons for Recommendation**

To formally acknowledge the feedback from Scrutiny Committee concerning formal budget consultation

### **Key Decision**

This is a key decision currently on the Forward Plan: No

**Finance Officer Clearance** .....ID.....

**Legal Officer Clearance** .....JLF.....

### **CORPORATE DIRECTOR'S SIGNATURE**

*(electronic)*.....**WM**.....

To confirm that the Financial and Legal Implications have been considered and the Executive Member has cleared the report.

SCRUTINY FINDINGS	VALUE OF SAVINGS £000	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE
<b>CFW – Adults’ Services</b>		
<p>1. Learning Disabilities – Personal Budgets for Transport (CWBA11)</p> <p>Members were advised that the proposed savings were deliverable. However, it was noted that a large saving was proposed (£200k), in an area potentially affecting a particularly vulnerable service user group. The saving was contingent on the development of a policy for assessment, and it was acknowledged in the report that significant input would be require to deliver the envisaged change. In this light, Members expressed concerns about both potential delivery risk to these savings, and the potential impact, both on the budget and service users, were this risk not to be avoided. The Group would therefore welcome any further evidence to demonstrate the achievability of the proposals.</p>	£200k	<p>The proposed saving is made up of 4 key areas of activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establishing a robust Transport Strategy which applies to Adults with a Learning Disability</li> <li>- Establish an approach to offer personal budgets to individuals eligible for transport</li> <li>- Embed Reablement and ensure regular reviews take place</li> <li>- Review the use of mobility allowance</li> </ul> <p>Establishing a robust Transport Strategy which applies to adults with a Learning Disability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The production of a Transport Strategy is fundamental to this Business Case</li> <li>- The establishment of a Transport Strategy will outline what transport costs are eligible for funding, how personal budgets will be offered, how Reablement will be integral to Transport and how the Council ensures that mobility allowance is used for what has been awarded for</li> </ul> <p>Establish an approach to offer personal budgets to individuals eligible for transport (£50k)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In line with other service areas, Trafford</li> </ul>

		<p>Council will establish an approach to offer individuals an alternative to commissioned transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Personal Budgets will be offered to those eligible for transport</li><li>- This work will be undertaken in partnership with Trafford Transport Trust to ensure that the most cost effective way of providing transport is found</li><li>- This approach could potentially reduce cost by providing more choice of transport which is more cost effective</li></ul> <p>Embed Reablement and ensure regular reviews take place (£80k)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In line with the principle of enabling individuals to become as independent as possible, Reablement will be embedded into the transport process</li><li>- This approach will mean that individuals will be assessed with a focus on Reablement</li><li>- Potentially individuals could have access to Travel Training if in the longer term this will improve their outcomes and reduce funding</li><li>- The Reablement approach will also ensure that individuals will receive regular reviews focussed on independence, creating greater resilience and progressing towards improved</li></ul>
--	--	---

		<p>outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This approach could potentially reduce costs as currently, transport is not regularly reviewed</li> </ul> <p>Review the use of Mobility Allowance (£70k)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trafford Council will establish a programme to review all individuals who receive Mobility Allowance</li> <li>- This approach, in line with the new Transport Strategy, will inform a process where Trafford Council will work with individuals and their families to support them to understand that the Council will now insist that Mobility Allowance is used for the reason it has been awarded</li> </ul> <p>This process will allow the identification of any “double-funded” packages to be stopped and will reduce costs.</p> <p>Delivery of the savings will be closely monitored throughout the year and any under performance managed across the Directorate and underpinned by Directorate reserves to reflect fluctuations in demand led budgets.</p>
<p>2. Enhanced Reablement Offer (CWBA14) and Enhanced Telecare Offer (CWBA15)</p> <p>The combined savings across these two areas amount to a very significant sum of not far short of £1M. Members clearly</p>	<p>£400K</p>	<p><b><u>Telecare</u></b></p> <p>Cashable savings will be made through reviewing all existing care packages and implementing Telecare to reduce costs. This will</p>

appreciate the benefits, in terms of independence and quality of life, which can accrue from the reablement and telecare approaches, and are supportive of continued investment in these areas. They did, however, raise a number of concerns. The scale of savings involved, and the fact they derive from demand-led areas, requires particular assurance of their deliverability. Members would wish to be assured of what contingency plans are in the event that predicted savings are not met, particularly in respect of those elements of this service which are not statutory, and which may therefore be more susceptible to funds being vired away from them. Members also recognised the benefits of telecare in many cases; but also noted that there will be significant groups of service users for whom personal contact and interaction are critical for the maintenance of their quality of life. In these cases, Members would not wish the attractiveness of telecare savings to outweigh the wider wellbeing benefits of an alternative approach, where this was in fact more appropriate for the service-user's specific needs. The group would welcome an assurance that any assessment of need would take account of the importance of mitigating isolation, and be based on a genuinely person-centred approach.

be through the use of new equipment that was not available at previous reviews, through the Children's Telecare implementation and through targeting areas where Telecare referrals have been low. Linking to Telehealth with the CCG will enhance the Trafford Telecare offer and may produce efficiencies in the programme. Review of other ICES services may produce some efficiency that produce savings.

The target of £400K reduction in current social care support packages will be achieved by a range of targeted Telecare interventions and ICES services efficiencies.

Homecare recipients will be a key target area and through review and reablement process this area will seek to save approximately 60% of the overall target.

The remaining 40% will be achieved through the children's services Telecare programme, potential developments with Telehealth and through Telecare interventions across other health & social care service areas such as Mental Health, Learning & Physical Disability and Public Health. A new Telecare brokerage service will aim to increase the use of Telecare within BME communities an area which has a limited success to date.

As contingency ICES services which include



	<p>£400K</p>	<p>Minor &amp; Major adaptations and community equipment services will target support to compliment Telecare interventions and further reduce alternative care costs.</p> <p>As always Telecare is not the answer for all vulnerable adults and social isolation is a risk. To ensure that each Telecare intervention is suitable Health &amp; Social Care professionals make all the referrals and these staff are trained to make sure that any Telecare intervention that reduces a Homecare package does not leave the individual isolated. If this is a risk a level three monitoring package would be recommended from Trustcall which includes 3 weekly welfare visits as well as the alarm monitoring service. THT Trustcall staff double check all assessments to ensure that when they implement Telecare the referral has not left the individual isolated.</p> <p><b><u>Re-ablement</u></b></p> <p>It is correct that the reablement service is a front line demand led service but it is also important to note that the reablement and assessment service in Trafford is significantly different to other reablement services throughout the country. Trafford's reablement service undertakes two functions within the same process which includes both the assessment of need as well as identifying the reablement</p>
--	--------------	---

	<p>potential of each individual. The service plays a crucial gatekeeping role enabling us to reduce pressure on demand led front line services / budgets. Trafford's reablement service is one of the highest performers in the North West because of its dual role. The client group we serve are vulnerable adults / older people with fluctuating care &amp; health needs.</p> <p>From a savings perspective early or re-accruing intervention due to on-going hospital admissions / long term condition management provides us with the tools to re-enable people on a continuum by reducing dependency on long term or increased levels of services. In December 2013 reablement achieved 59.4% reduction in the hours of care required long term.</p> <p>The re-ablement service is supported by a number of others such as the outreach team. This team works with individuals around the areas of social inclusion. The outreach workers do not just assess this specific area, they work with people to find a service which is best for them which doesn't mean a council funded or commissioned service.</p> <p>The reablement service is also closely linked &amp; supports the telecare project which forms part of every assessment we undertake again reducing dependency on services.</p>
--	---

		<p>The reablement service is also committed to the new tele health project along with our health partners which again can only benefit with the savings we have put forward.</p> <p>Delivery of the savings will be closely monitored throughout the year and any under performance managed across the Directorate and underpinned by Directorate reserves to reflect fluctuations in demand led budgets.</p>
<p>3. Running Costs / Inflation – All Services (CWBA19)</p> <p>The group noted that the savings proposed here were again very substantial, exceeding £420k, and Members were advised that this built on savings already achieved in the previous two years. Members would appreciate further detail on where precisely these savings will impact, what percentage of the relevant budget line this represents, and what percentages of savings in this same area were made in the two previous years. Whilst the group was advised that residential and homecare rates were explicitly excluded from this proposal, Members would welcome greater assurance on the impact and deliverability of this saving, given the cumulative year-on-year effect, the likely reducing scope for further efficiencies, and potential impact on procurement, support services, etc.</p>	<p>£420k</p>	<p>The running cost/inflation savings of £420k is a continuation of savings already achieved in previous years. However given that this will be the third year of such savings a different approach has been used compared to previous years.</p> <p>The proposed saving is approximately 50% of the 2014/15 inflationary increase allowing some services to be excluded like Ascot House and the Meadowside Centre where services are delivered directly from these establishments. No allocation has been made to the Social Work, Reablement and Assessment Teams as they provide key demand management roles.</p> <p>The £420k savings are allocated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Older People Services - £35k ( 44% of allocation) from externally contracted services</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical Disabilities - £52k (33% of allocation) from Supported Living (£24k) and community equipment (£28k)</li> <li>• Learning Disabilities - £227k (42% of allocation) from Supported Living</li> <li>• Mental Health – £46k (50% of allocation) from payments for services (£16k) and Supported Living.</li> <li>• Supporting People - £37k (100% of allocation) from contribution made to external agencies.</li> <li>• Other Services - £23k (100% of allocation) from back office services e.g. Support Services, Adaptations, Equality and Diversity Teams and Other Adult Services</li> </ul>
<b>CFW – Children’s Services</b>		
<p>1. Children In Care Placements (CWBC2)</p> <p>Members noted that the delivery of approaching £500k of savings was significantly dependent on the increase in the use of in-house carers. The recruitment strategy was already described as “comprehensive”, raising the question of whether there was a natural limit on the scope for further development. Members would welcome further assurance on how robustly quantifiable savings estimates in this area actually are. Members also raised the question of the nature of the impact of costs (education, health, etc.) in respect of out-of-borough children who were being fostered in the borough.</p>	£480k	<p>The savings of £480K identified for children’s social care placements are recognised as challenging in light of the increasing demand experienced during 2013-14 and an upward trajectory of numbers of children in care in line with national trends. In recognition of the demographic pressure in this budget area, an additional £483k has been identified to support this demand led budget. The increase in numbers in the first half of this year has levelled off and the need for children to come into care is minimised by a strong focus on support and prevention at a lower level of need where safe and appropriate. The unit costs of placements</p>

		<p>are robustly managed and have been reduced over three years by using an increasing number of foster placements, including family and friends foster carers and minimising the use of costly external placements.</p> <p>We are not at the limit of further developments with regard to foster care as developments are about increasing the number of carers able to take teenagers and manage challenging behaviour at all ages through training and support, in addition to increasing numbers of carers. We are continuing to expand the number of foster carers including family and friends and this has the potential to continue. All placements and plans are scrutinised rigorously to ensure they are effective and value for money. The impact on health and education costs for children living in Trafford who are in care to other authorities is minimal as schools receive the budget for children in their school directly and this includes those from other boroughs. The specialist nurse for children in care does provide health assessments for out of borough children in Trafford and sign post to services as needed but the cost of this is small and is mitigated by Trafford children receiving services in the area where they live in return.</p>
<p>2. Market Management (CWBC5)</p> <p>Members noted the advice set out in the report that</p>	<p>£350K</p>	<p>The allocation of inflationary increases has been risk assessed against all areas of service. Each service area will receive a minimum of 1%</p>

<p>achievement of the £350k of savings “should not have a service impact but could be challenging for providers”. Notwithstanding this, Members noted that significant elements of inflation are not directly within the Council’s control, and had concerns about the potential impact of non-achievement of this target on the internally-provided elements of service provision. Members would welcome further information on contingency plans in the event of non-achievement.</p>		<p>inflationary increase (excluding staffing costs) and in some areas such as in-house foster care payments the full inflationary increase of 2.8% has been applied.</p> <p>Savings have been removed prior to budget allocation for 2014-15 to ensure achievement of savings target. Impact on internal services will be managed during the year through the monthly budget monitor. This is a robust process covering both assurance of the saving and impact on services. We have an excellent track record of managing any in year challenges created by demand led budgets and using reserves effectively to mitigate if contingency is required.</p>
<p>3. Connexions – Costs Reduction (CWBC28) and Connexions – Reduced Targeted Service Offer (CWBC29)</p> <p>Members noted that the total savings across these two areas amounted to £160k. Whilst they were advised that this followed on from previous reductions, and that statistics for NEETs remained generally positive, Members queried how far this was sustainable, noting that the budget proposals report referred to “service reduction and risk of higher numbers of young people not progressing to education training and employment”. Members requested details of what proportion of the total budget these savings amounted to; and similar figures for the past two years. They also queried what account had been taken of the possible adverse social, and therefore financial costs, of this policy choice, particularly when viewed in conjunction with</p>	<p>£260k</p>	<p>The budget saving for these two savings areas is £260K. There are clear risks from reducing the budget by this amount which equates to 30% of the budget for targeted services. The risk will be mitigated as far as possible by the positive partnership working with schools and Trafford college to share the responsibility of supporting young people into education employment or training and by continuing to promote the traded service which is provided at a universal level in schools who purchase it but which actively mitigates against young people becoming NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) at a later date though positive engagement early. Connexions maximises</p>

<p>point 4 below.</p>		<p>partnerships and creativity across a range of providers to enable young people to access support and education, employment or training in a way that suits them.</p> <p>The social implications of this policy choice saving were considered and although recognised as a significant risk, the current performance indicates that this remains a manageable risk as the December NEET figure was 3.9% which was lower than last year. Performance will be closely monitored in order to maximise our ability to sustain high performance and this will be linked to the increasing integration with other services supporting teenagers such as YOS, through which we hope to minimise the collective impact of budget reductions as far as possible.</p>
<p>4. YOS – Costs Reduction (CWBC30) YOS – Reduction in Grant Assisted Projects (CWBC31)</p> <p>Members considered that the proposal for an integrated service should incorporate more detail of precisely how the £150k savings would be achieved. The Group was advised that, whilst money had already been withdrawn from the service in the current year, a positive impact on offending rates had still been achieved through a greater concentration on preventative initiatives. Similarly to concerns on other proposals, Members would welcome further assurance on how secure predictions are that this effect could be continued and expanded into the future, and hence how robust the savings, and impact</p>	<p>£150k</p>	<p>The saving has been made by reducing overall staffing levels as part of the integration of the Early Intervention and Prevention work of the YOS into our Area Family Support Teams.</p> <p>A greater emphasis is being placed on universal services delivering a preventative and early help model to support vulnerable families and young people. The Area Family Support Team is a co-located team of multi-professionals e.g. health visitors; social workers; Education Welfare Officers; youth workers; school nurses; Connexions staff; CAMHS and YOS.</p>

<p>assessments, in fact are.</p>		<p>Early help and specialist service functions from YOS and CAMHS are now within the Area Family Support Teams so there is closer working and improved communication and concerted efforts to deliver services to those families who are the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Continual achievement of the Key Performance Indicators for YOS is monitored through the YOS Governance Group and the CFW Leadership Team. Any risks or reductions in performance will be identified and managed robustly through normal performance management procedures.</p>
<p>5. Music &amp; Education Psychology Service (CWBC27)</p> <p>In respect of the Education Psychology Service, the Group noted that the envisaged increase in SLA income appears to be £15k on the basis of £27k, i.e. in excess of 55%. Members would welcome confirmation of the basis of this projection, and whether the income increase derives from price or activity levels. If the former, Members would welcome any assurance which can be given that schools will not fail to access an important service.</p>	<p>£15k - £27k</p>	<p>The increased income generation target is based on activity levels and is in line with our projections based on current take up of services and information provided by schools. The level of buyback from schools in the current academic year has exceeded expectations and discussions with them indicate this will expand further.</p>





	Application Delivery Platform and Checkpoint Firewall. £22K	has been cancelled. The mobile application development licence has also been cancelled. Savings have been achieved. The £22K represents 0.03% of the overall ICT annual maintenance budget.
	Staff Development Opportunities	Recruitment into the development opportunities has started and is likely to be completed before the end of February. The savings indicated for 14/15 £36K will be fully met. Additional marginal saving in 13/14 will also be realised. The £36K saving represents 0.016% of the overall staffing budget.
	Closure of Services at Friars Court.	Most services have now been decommissioned at Friars Court and savings for 14/15 will be achieved as these have primarily been discontinued in 13/14 due to the accommodation strategy.
	SIMS Backup	The discontinuation of services savings relating to Friars Court £19K equate to 0.028% of the overall annual maintenance budget.  Implementation has started and the backup solution is in at ten schools currently. This is achieving £2500 income per year. There are another 19 schools who are scheduled to start taking this service which will generate £4750 bringing the total to £7250 which is slightly better than the £7K forecast.

	CRM (Customer Relations Management) Solution	The CRM project is currently evaluating bids received as part of the tendering exercise. Recommendations from the evaluation are on track for early March 2014. Savings will be determined by a rationalisation of systems, processes and services. The project governance is maintained by George Edwards (Project Executive) and Ridhwaan Hafezji (Project Manager).
<p>2. Contact Centre Review (TR11)</p> <p>The savings proposed derive in part from the reduction of 2 x fte staff, in response to a projected reduction in call volume. Given the envisaged pressure on services arising in part from other budget proposals, the Group was not convinced of the likelihood of such a reduction; and this view appeared to be supported by an apparent significant increase in the call volume trend over the past 12 months. Members felt that this saving would be dependent on a more robust assessment of factors contributing to this trend in order to demonstrate its deliverability.</p>	£44k	<p>The increase in call volumes to the Contact Centre over the last 12 months were mainly as a result of the changes to the waste management collection system. The calls have now dropped back to pre-change levels.</p> <p>New operational ways of working have also been adopted at the Contact Centre with staff using dual screens. This significantly increases the efficiency with which staff can deal with calls. The trial of dual screens was very positive and now 50% of Contact Centre staff use them. In January this resulted in a saving of 52 hours, the equivalent of 13 hours a week. The remaining staff will start to use dual screens over the next two months.</p> <p>Work is on-going with services to increase self-service via the website which will lead to fewer calls and the new CRM system will facilitate this. In addition the new CRM system will also lead to efficiencies in how the calls are handled.</p>

<p>3. HR Staffing Review (TR12)</p> <p>Given savings already secured in this area, Members expressed concerns regarding the magnitude of the proposal for 2104/15. It was suggested that the savings estimate was to a degree aspirational rather than quantified, particularly given that the report acknowledged that the operating model has yet to be determined, and that any slippage in savings would be met from reserves. Given that some of the cost reduction was predicated on developing business with schools, Members raised the question of how significant budget reductions would facilitate this; the levels of confidence on the part of the Executive that this was achievable; and whether any general contingency planning had been done, apart from a potential call on reserves. Members would welcome greater assurance on these points, and consider that close review of achievement against targets will be necessary.</p>	<p>£200k</p>	<p>It is accepted that significant savings have been achieved by the service in recent years. However, alongside other services in order to meet the budget challenge the service has committed to a further saving of £200k.</p> <p>Initially, 50% will be part of an on-going review of training spend plus a review of the AGMA training procurement framework, where a re-contracting of this arrangement should bring increased efficiencies.</p> <p>In terms of the remainder, this will be considered in a broader HR context as the service looks to be more commercially focussed and investigates a number of partnership opportunities.</p> <p>These alongside some further process improvements will help support the proposed savings. T&amp;R reserves will underwrite these proposals initially.</p>
<p>4. Redesign of Partnerships &amp; Performance / Safe &amp; Strong Communities (TR13) and Communities Support (TR17)</p> <p>Members noted that the volume of proposed savings across these areas (£350k) was large, and that this was additional to significant savings listed for the previous two years. This raised questions of whether additional savings of this magnitude were deliverable and, if so, why they had not been identified in</p>	<p>£350k</p>	<p>The savings in 2014/15 are phase two of the initial review in 2011. Earlier delivery of these savings would not have been possible without a significant impact on the service.</p> <p>A full functional review, performance data analysis, is underway, in consultation with the business, to agree which functions will continue</p>

<p>preceding years. Members raised a number of specific concerns, including: the impact of on the range of functions supported by the staff concerned, including Locality Working and performance data monitoring and analysis; the extent to which the proposed structure would be flexible and responsive to changing demands across the services involved. Members would welcome assurance on these points, and that the fitness for purpose of the structure would be kept under review.</p>		<p>as is, cease or continue but be delivered in a different way (i.e., reduce failure demand).</p> <p>A period of six months has been identified to implement this change and will be funded from T&amp;R reserves in relation to deferring the date of voluntary redundancy for three members of staff.</p> <p>In terms of flexibility and responsiveness, the Performance structure has been strengthened by the inclusion of a Strategic Performance &amp; Policy Manager, with expertise in Social Care. In addition the transfer of the Performance function to Democratic Services has been made with the New Operating model in mind.</p> <p>The merging of the Partnerships and Communities team will also provide flexibility and capacity to respond to changing demands. It will support the development of Locality working, along with developing further capacity within Communities. Again this is aligned to the New Operating Model.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the structures will be under review during the first 12 months.</p>
--	--	---

SCRUTINY FINDINGS	VALUE OF SAVINGS £000	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE
<b>ETO</b>		
<p>1. Business Support Review (ETO9)</p> <p>Whilst this saving was listed as applying to both ETO and EGP, it was unclear from the report where this proposal would impact; and no reference appeared within the EGP savings schedules. Members agreed that it would be helpful for this to be clarified when the proposals are brought forward for formal decision.</p>	£102k	The saving from the review will only impact on ETO business support.
<p>2. Outdoor Media (ETO13)</p> <p>Members raised a number of concerns about these proposals, including the extent to which their delivery might be dependent on Planning or other third party approvals. Whilst the group was assured that the estimate had taken account of these issues, Members requested further information to demonstrate the proposals' robustness.</p>	£80k	A significant proportion of the income generation proposal will be delivered through digitisation for which approval has already been granted and a commercial agreement is in place. A small amount of income is assumed from additional sites later in the financial year for which approvals are required. The target for income takes account of potential risks and is considered robust.
<p>3. Highways Management (ETO18)</p> <p>Whilst Members were advised that the proposed savings related to managerial and supervisory posts, concerns remained, especially given the envisaged changes in some cases to inspection frequencies and tolerance levels, and availability of capital funding for structural maintenance projects, regarding the impact on the infrastructure. Members would request that the developed proposals are accompanied by a thorough assessment of the risks and identification of mitigation</p>	£100k	The proposed staffing changes will not compromise the carrying out of inspections and repairs in accordance with the Council's approved policy.

measures.		
<p>4. Parks Maintenance (ETO22) / Groundforce – Redesign &amp; Reprioritisation (ETO23)</p> <p>Especially in view of the level of savings proposed in these areas (£700k), and the fact that the inevitability of reduced service levels in some areas were already acknowledged in the Budget report, Members had raised queries in their preliminary meeting about their deliverability. Whilst responses were provided to the Topic Group, Members felt that concerns in relation to envisaged plant / equipment cost reductions, certainty of assistance from e.g. Housing Associations and Friends of Parks groups, and the overall assessment of impact had not been fully addressed; and would welcome further assurance on these issues in particular.</p>	£700K	<p>The achievement of savings in plant, vehicles and equipment is linked to new staff working arrangements which are on target to be implemented in April 2014.</p> <p>Positive engagement with Friends Groups has been undertaken and is ongoing.</p>
<p>5. Tree Unit – Operational Delivery Model (ETO24)</p> <p>Members had raised concerns regarding the potential impact on service levels in what can frequently be a sensitive and high-profile area. Members were advised that the proposals were explicitly designed to avoid any direct impact on front-line operatives. Members retained concerns regarding the misdirection of tree-related calls and the potential impact on the efficiency of the service, and were interested to know if there was any scope to enhance efficiencies in tree-related services delivered through ETO and EGP directorates.</p>	£54k	<p>The saving is being delivered through new arrangements in delivering the cyclical tree pruning programme. The saving does not impact on the tree inspections/inspectors.</p> <p>In addition, proposals are being worked up across ETO and EGP to maximise service efficiency and this process is ongoing.</p>
<p>6. Waste Management Sites – Rationalisation (ETO28)</p> <p>In discussing the proposals with the Executive Member, the</p>	£100k	<p>Further consideration has been given to the geographic spread of recycling sites across the borough and changes will be reflected in the</p>

<p>rationale for, and appropriateness of, the geographical distribution of the retained sites remained unclear; and equally the extent to which these proposals were based on, for example, usage tonnages rather than convenience for residents across the borough. Members had significant concerns on this point, and requested that further information be supplied to demonstrate why the proposal represented the optimal configuration.</p>		<p>final proposals. The changes will not impact on the delivery of the saving.</p>
<p>7. Public Protection Restructure (ETO30)</p> <p>The Topic Group expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposed reduction of £167k in what was thought to be already a comparatively small service area, but one which had its focus on delivering the Council's statutory responsibilities in sensitive and potentially high-profile areas. Members agreed that a thorough analysis of risk and mitigation measures was needed in view of the potential impact of these proposals.</p>	<p>£167K</p>	<p>The risks will be mitigated by better coordination of regulatory work, addressing gaps in skills and experience, and prioritisation of service delivery.</p>