

PROPOSED CHANGES TO STAFF TERMS AND CONDITIONS

STAFF FEEDBACK DURING FORMAL CONSULTATION

General Comments

- Many services have been operating for some years with temporary management arrangements, following incomplete structure reviews and/or the early retirement of older members of staff. Many of these staff have had no additional payments to reflect their additional duties, but have carried them out in good faith and as a commitment to the efficient running of the Council and to ensure that a good service continues to be provided to our clients. To facilitate this, staff in these services often work many hours over and above their contracted hours, beyond those that can be claimed as flexi-leave and amount to a substantial amount of savings for the Council. These work practices represent a great deal of “good will”, often in effect as repayment for terms and conditions which indicate that the Council values its employees, even though, because of other pressures it is unable to offer comparable pay to counterparts in the private sector. However they have not been acknowledged as part of this process and therefore neither has the potential impact of the review of terms and conditions, and continued comparatively low pay, this “good will” and delivery of services in the future.
- It may not save jobs – we could sign up to this and services could still be restructured / reduce staff.
- Concern that if there is an economy boom – we will never get back the terms and conditions that have been lost.
- Concerns were raised for service delivery in the future with the significant cuts being made to staffing and T&C's.
- The staff information booklet states that savings of £347,000 per annum will be made by “Agency control/reduction”. This is a substantial saving that has not been subject to any further explanation in the document. Staff would be like to be informed of where this saving has come from, and whether further savings could be made, especially in light of the proposed reduction/removal of the car user allowance.
- I have read the attached questionnaire with the intention of providing feedback. I have worked out my potential loss of earnings based on the proposed additional unpaid leave, loss of relocation allowance and changes to the car user agreement and I do not believe I will be financially able to continue to run my car if these changes are implemented. My car is essential to my role. On this basis I consider your proposals constructive dismissal and I cannot willingly accept the changes to my terms and conditions.
- I am not prepared to check the box that suggests I accept you should consider issuing me notice to terminate my existing contract and immediately offer me re-engagement on a revised set of terms and conditions. I consider this a threat and a bully tactic. I would like to check a box that says you will: Remove essential car user allowance from those professionals who are not genuinely essential car users. Increase Council Tax in line with our statistical neighbours so that Trafford residents (like me) can collectively contribute to any shortfall in funding. Any remaining shortfall

should be met by Trafford's excessive financial reserves rather than asking my colleagues and I to subsidise public services from our own income.

- I do not personally find these proposals acceptable or defensible: Removal of ECUA; mandatory unpaid leave and; sick pay reduction. I have no comments on the other proposals.
- I have several concerns regarding the changes to the staff Terms and Conditions and would like to bring them to your attention. My Current Role involves the monitoring of 21 providers within the Trafford area, some as far as Bowden where there are no real bus routes or Train stops. The role which I'm sure you will agree is a valuable role for the people living in the establishments to ensure they receive a high standard of care

I was previously a registered Manager, I was fortunate to be redeployed however there was a significant reduction in my salary Approx. £400 per month and the additional cost of paying for car parking £30 per month, but at the time I felt it was better to have a job rather than no Job, as you can imagine this meant making many changes to my personal circumstances as I live alone and this is the only income I have, one of the biggest changes I had to make was to move house as I could no longer afford the rent. I am fully aware and appreciate the cuts the council needs to make to meet budget target. I feel that I have been targeted enough to make a difference to those figures yet I am being faced with more cuts to my pay.

It has been very difficult being redeployed to a job with much less pay and has taken a lot of planning and sacrificing and now I am being faced again with more cuts that will only mean one thing sacrificing more things in life such as heating and food, Unfortunately I cannot reduce the costs of using my car for work as I could face losing my Job as this is a requirement of the role. The cost of living continues to rise and I am being faced with all these cuts and more, this is having a dramatic impact on my life and personal circumstances not to mention the effect this is all having on my pension.

- As I have been sat in the room listening to everyone's points I have made some notes about how the changes to my terms and conditions will affect me personally. For me the following changes will have a massive effect on me financially and they are:

- 1, Loss of essential car user, creating a financial burden of running my car including wear and tear.
- 2, Financial burden of the cost of business use car insurance, previously covered by essential car user.
- 3, Cost of parking at Trafford Town Hall (despite me only being in the office 2 days per week, there is no option for the parking charges to be worked out pro rata)
- 4, Financial burden of unpaid leave
- 5, Financial burden of private health insurance due to reduction in sick pay scheme
- 6, Loss of relocation payment as my permanent place of work was changed.
- 7, Changes to our pension scheme

Unison have also notified me in an email recently that there will be more cuts to come, where is this going to end? What about staff moral and how can staff expect to remain committed and loyal to Trafford Council if we keep being "hit" financially. In addition to the above points I raised yesterday I would like to inform you of what of a recent change to my terms and conditions that has had another massive effect on

me. Flexi time was removed from me (and the whole team) to generate a saving in the team. I can understand why that was considered as a viable option but there was no other alternatives offered to me in order to help me manage my work life balance. I used to use flexi to manage my travel time previously as I live in Glossop and commute each day and I had no problems with my daily commute as I avoided the worst of the traffic. I applied for compressed hours to help me avoid the worst of the traffic and to alleviate some of the stress brought on by my new working hours arrangement, I am now spending 4 hours each day travelling to and from work, this was refused as it didn't suit Trafford. My current situation means that I now have high blood pressure and the stress of travel isn't helping so I am now in the process of applying for compressed hours again, in the hope that Trafford can support me and my health and relieve some of the pressure that the travelling is causing. I don't feel confident this will be approved and as a result feel totally down on Trafford and have no confidence in them that they are doing all they can to protect staff's terms and conditions. It feels that it is all one sided and no consideration is being given for staff and the "real" affects all changes will have on them.

- My service is often dependent on staff being flexible and demonstrating an ability to go "the extra mile" .I am concerned that the changes to the terms and conditions will cause staff to take a more functional and ridged approach to their work and this will be to the detriment of the service.
- The proposals to half sick pay entitlement and enforce 3 days unpaid leave (A pay cut) leave me incredulous, overtime rates reduced to plain time is hardly an inducement. What's next? The professionalism of staff is NOT rewarded at all, in fact the terms and conditions plans are yet another nail in the coffin for staff morale. Being told how good we are and then being undermined at the same time will see yet more capable staff looking elsewhere. That's the truth of the matter.
- In response to the survey, I have ticked the box to say I agree, as I feel that we are not really being given a choice. If I don't agree I won't have a job.
- Will we continue paying for solicitors to have practising certificates? I said I did not know but that my personal view was that, given total expenditure is less than £5k and solicitors appearing in open court other than the magistrate's court probably need them, I would hope the authority would continue to fund them.
- Savings could be made by reducing the numbers of agency staff that are used. We currently have two agency social workers in our team.
- There are other consultations going on at the same time and this is another burden for staff, they feel it is another attack on the workforce. There are comments that are being made such as "you're lucky to have a job" and "you should be grateful that you still have a job". Just wondering if every other option has been look at before coming up with these proposals.

There is a further concern that when redundancy and retirement is considered, that it is the lower scales that are targeted and the senior levels are left untouched. It doesn't appear that anyone has looked at making savings at the levels above. Have senior manager levels been reviewed.

- I don't want to pay for other peoples' mistakes. We are being attacked unnecessarily. There is an accounting issue central to all this. Where are the losses coming from? Council services are under attack.
- Would like to see more robust attack on reducing agency staff.
- Some services rely on the good will of staff. With the cuts and changes in T&C's (essential car user and 3 days unpaid leave) there is a risk that performance could slip. The pressure to hit government targets and performance may be affected by having less resources. Need acknowledgement of this. Staff will not be able to absorb impact of these changes.
- Has Trafford promoted enforced VR and VER? Maybe it could be opened up to 53 and 54 year olds and see if they would consider leaving in 12/18months?
- Colleagues work at a centre where there is no car parking charge but I have to pay, this isn't fair. We are all affected by the loss of essential car user allowance but some of us are doubly affected as we have to pay car park charges too.
- I'd like to see a commitment from the Council to review all of the proposals after 2 years not just the unpaid leave.
- We should stop staff claiming mileage between meetings/locations – if you're expected to work anywhere in Trafford you shouldn't get expenses for travelling round the borough.
- The consultation clearly outlines the reasons for the proposals. It includes:
 - Staff who have previously been transferred into the local authority under the provisions of TUPE

After enquiry it appears therefore to affect those NHS Staff who transferred to the local authority from Trafford PCT on 1 April. Those staff transferred on NHS terms and conditions but with a number of variations to their terms and conditions. These included taking some of their annual leave over the Christmas period for instance. The two major issues which affect the TUPE'd staff are annual leave and sick pay. These were not included in the variations in the agreements for transfer and all staff transferred on the understanding that their NHS terms and conditions would be protected. Staff are therefore confused about how the proposals affect them. Would they be asked to take an additional three days unpaid leave in addition to the leave agreed by their current NHS terms and conditions? Many of those who transferred have different annual leave allowances to council employees. This is not clear in the consultation document. Our understanding is that we would retain our NHS terms and conditions annual leave entitlements but asked to take an additional three days unpaid annual leave. Is this correct?

The calculators on the website do not allow the calculations for people on NHS terms and conditions. In terms of the sick pay proposals this is a major change to our NHS terms and conditions as it is to council employee terms and conditions and it does not fit with our protected NHS terms and conditions. Will the rest of our NHS terms and conditions be protected? We have already requested answers to these questions but had no response. We need greater clarity before we can make personal decisions on the proposals.

- How does this fit with all the on-going service redesigns – we should do service redesign only.
- It's because of the political environment – why don't we put up Council Tax – we don't care about staff.
- Once employees' conditions have been lost (which have been hard fought for in the past) then it will be very difficult to get these conditions back even when the current situation improves. It is always the temptation for the employer to keep costs to a minimum. Therefore I have grave doubts that the week of unpaid leave will be scrapped in two years' time even if the current situation has improved and so could be extended more than once.
- Payment of professional fees and subscriptions should be reviewed.

Changes relating to Car Users

- Some experienced social workers who are on the top of their scale may carry out hundreds of miles every month. Losing their essential car user allowance will mean they lose a lot of money.
- Social workers have to transport people who are difficult to manage in their cars and their cars get damaged. The social workers receive no compensation for this and take out special insurance. I will not be transporting people in my car.
- The criteria for the critical car user scheme appears to be very tight/limiting, therefore if the changes relating to car users should be supplemented by a car pool and/or clarification in relation to the use of taxis within the Borough for site visits not readily accessible by efficient public transport (i.e. not Town Hall to Sale or Altrincham etc. via Metrolink). The cycle pool offers a good sustainable option, but will often not be a practical alternative. The introduction of a car pool or clarification in relation to the use of taxis will reduce staff time spent in travelling to/or from their main place of work therefore efficiencies would be maintained in the workplace; i.e. less time spent travelling, more time at the desk doing the job. Such a proposal could therefore amount to an efficiency saving, given that many staff, who do not meet the criteria for critical car users, may no longer use their car for work purposes and therefore will take more time to carry out their tasks.
- Scp 28 cut off is discriminatory and will have more of an impact for those who need the money i.e. single mothers. Need to take into account personal circumstances and decision should be made on whether the car is critical for the role.
- Consider pool cars which would be cheaper than critical car user and consider electric cars as well.
- Some senior officers (e.g. senior planners) with more expertise who are paid over scp 28 will not get essential car user but planners will. This is unfair.
- Lots of feedback from those over scp 28 and the fact that they require their car to do their role/carry equipment etc.

- I have been looking at the questionnaire for the critical car users and it is not very clear. It does not mention any time the car is used outside normal office hours. We are on a rota to cover the service up till 9pm each evening and weekends. We do plan visits in advance to work in the community but we also cover emergency visits when needed.
- Not happy about mileage going down to 45p per mile from 52p per mile. Bigger engines as petrol keeps going up in price and we are sent further afield, sometimes 9 miles first call – no allowance.
- The MST service operates in the community and not in any service buildings, all sessions take place in the family home and sessions are 3-4 per family every week. The Trafford area is a large area and families on a case load can be spread throughout the borough. We would not be able to respond to family's needs in a timely way by working on public transport. When applied for the job we were not considered eligible without having a driving licence and without owning a car. Therapists cannot physically do their days work without a car, so on days when cars are not available are unable to work. Most of the mileage is for work, causes wear and tear on the car. Limited overheads due to not needing building for sessions. Attending to family in the community means overcome DNA/engagement. Against the MST model not to be in the community, risk losing licence.
- I would like to offer my own feedback to the proposal around essential car user allowance. I do not agree with the proposal to only allow critical car users below a certain spinal point to claim this. From my own perspective this does not take into account the fact that I would be reasonably expected to use my vehicle as much if not more than my own colleagues below that salary scale. This also does not take into account any other factors which may affect myself or other colleagues in a similar position i.e. who have leased or hire purchased cars for reliability, who travel longer distances to work than many colleagues and who do use car willingly to support their role and their colleagues. Of course it is difficult to decide where to make these savings and I suppose for myself it is hard not to view this as a salary cut when I would still be expected to do the same duties and distances, in fact my area is now a lot larger and I use my car more than ever.
- Planners must use their car every day for work so it is essential that they receive the allowance. They do a site visit for every planning application they undertake. There is a concern that the criteria for the new Critical Car User scheme hasn't been shared with the workforce.
- The MST service operates in the community and not in any service buildings, all sessions take place in the family home and sessions are 3-4 per family every week. The Trafford area is a large area and families on a case load can be spread throughout the borough. We would not be able to respond to family's needs in a timely way by working on public transport. When applied for the job we were not considered eligible without having a driving licence and without owning a car. Therapists cannot physically do their days work without a car, so on days when cars are not available are unable to work. Most of the mileage is for work, causes wear and tear on the car. Limited overheads due to not needing building for sessions. Attending to family in the community means overcome DNA/engagement. Against the MST model not to be in the community, risk losing licence.

- With regards to the replacement of Essential Car Allowance, our service has a number of employees who have always met the criteria of Essential but have remained in the category of Casual Car User. The reduction in petrol allowance will be a further blow to a service which requires its employees to use a car of their own in order to carry out their peripatetic role. This does not cover the wear and tear of our vehicles due to the mileage done for work purposes and the substantial increase in the cost of petrol over recent years.
- I understand that cuts are necessary in this present economic climate, and that the mileage rate is being reduced from 52p to 45p per mile. We in the Sensory Impairment Support Service have never had essential car user allowance although it is part of our current terms and conditions that we have a car to get from one school to another to support children throughout the borough with a sensory impairment at their chosen school and feel this will have an impact on our finances in being able to run our cars for the boroughs benefit and as such should be exempt from this change.
- I also do not agree with the proposed change in the amount of car mileage paid. In order to do the job, which is peripatetic, we need to provide our own vehicle which we obviously have to tax, insure and maintain as well as paying for petrol. These costs are always going up so just keeping the allowance at the same rate means the value of it is going down, so cutting it reduces it even further.
- The changes to the current Terms and Conditions means that I will lose approximately another £90 a month something I can ill afford, I have made enquiries regarding using my car for work, if we are going to lose this amount of money, I was informed that I have to use my car as I am classed as an essential car user, which I agree I am yet I am not going to be entitled to essential car user allowance this doesn't make any sense. Since moving Jobs I am using a lot more petrol which is very costly, my care insurance has gone up, there is more wear and tear on my car.
- With regard to the changes to essential car allowance I am very concerned that staff will not (as a consequence of the loss of essential car users allowance) use their cars in connection with their work with children in care and this will undermine the ability of the service to provide important services e.g. it will not be possible to respond to an urgent safeguarding issues, children cannot be moved between placements without a car and care leavers cannot be assisted to move to new properties if aftercare workers do not use their car's for this task. Could consideration be given to maintaining essential car users allowance for designated staff in certain service sectors where the use of a car is an absolute necessity?
- You are proposing to drop these from 52 to 45p per mile. This is of concern to me as I do not feel this covers the extra costs I incur in running the car for repairs, tyre and other wear and tear, insurance costs for additional mileage and carrying business insurance. I am on casual use as is but this measure would make me very reluctant to use my car to attend meetings, site visits across Trafford and the North West and definitely not to carry tools or notice boards or gazebos to events and activities.
- At the consultation information session on 28th October at Sale Waterside, the proposal was put forward that highly paid senior managers at the council should have to forfeit a bigger proportion of their salary via unpaid leave than lower paid employees. The response to this was understandably that this would not be

appropriate, as all staff should be treated as equally as possible, and that the council could not discriminate based on an employee's salary.

Why then, are myself and my colleagues being discriminated against on the basis of our salaries, as part of the proposed changes? Because as social workers we earn above SCP28, we will not be considered for the Critical Car User allowance.

During the information session it was said that the SCP28 cut off point was one used nationally as a basis for differing terms and conditions – but this only normally relates to paid overtime, which is a completely different thing as overtime is something outside of normal business and something people normally have a choice about. Car use is an everyday essential in our team; not for our convenience but to allow us to fulfil our roles and Trafford to provide an appropriate service to its most vulnerable residents. I want to make the point that the social work service we provide is not an 'optional extra' but a statutory responsibility on the council.

The point I made at the information session I will reiterate here, as I am not sure how strongly it was taken on board by HR. The changes to our terms and conditions – less time spent at work and reluctance on behalf of staff to use cars for work purposes in all but the most dire emergencies – will impact on Trafford residents. If Trafford wants to continue to provide good public services, it must allow its staff to do so by resourcing us to an acceptable basic level.

My suggestion is that any new criteria be applied to all those currently receiving essential car user allowance, regardless of salary. This should be based on criteria such as the need to carry children or vulnerable adults, the need to respond quickly to urgent situations, the need to carry equipment, running of a duty service, or a requirement to complete work at numerous locations most working days. The precise frequency of such events is irrelevant – if we are expected to do these things regularly as part of our job then our car use is critical.

- Due to the pay scale that I and fellow social workers earn we will be penalised from getting the essential car allowance. During the meeting it was expressed by HR representatives and the two counsellors that they would look at each employee equally. However, this was contradicted when we were told that SCP 28 has been chosen as this is the national cut off point for overtime. Overtime has no correlation with the essential car allowance. By the council choosing SCP28, it has failed to recognise that there are services, such as the social work teams which require the essential car allowance to meet the demands of their daily role.

Social workers in the community social work and sensory team work with vulnerable adults who live in the borough. As part of our job we operate on a duty system and there are many occasions when we have to take vulnerable adults in our cars to place of safety. To ensure I can take vulnerable people in my car we have to be covered for business insurance, which is an added cost to my insurance.

Critical car criteria: Having looked at the criteria, it appears that this is more of a questionnaire. The questionnaire does not take into account how individual services operate. As a social worker, I feel that social workers on certain teams should be entitled to the essential car allowance. By working in the community we need to use our cars to support and monitor the cases of vulnerable people in the Trafford borough. The duty system which the social workers use is unpredictable and to ensure that we provide a high quality service that Trafford expects for its residents

then social workers need to have their cars and their essential car allowance. It may be useful for you to look at teams, managers and social workers who currently get the essential car allowance but do not require this allowance as their roles do not require them to leave their main building.

- We should introduce a pool car parking permit for staff. This was on the back of concerns raised that some staff who are due to lose their ECU allowance under the proposals are still required to be in the office from time to time & therefore have to either pay for staff car parking or find alternative car parking. It was felt that having a small number of 'pool' staff car parking permits for the main council buildings where staff are required to pay for car parking would lessen the impact on staff. It was cited that Manchester have introduced such a scheme.
- I have no objection to any of the changes other than the proposal to remove the Essential Car User Scheme. The main reason for this is that I joined the authority in July this year and the paperwork I received relating to the role I am undertaking stated that an essential car user allowance would be payable. I therefore made an informed decision to join the authority on the basis of the package of information that I was provided with at that time.

Ordinarily my overall experience gained from both private and public sectors would command a higher grading than that which I am currently receiving. My decision to accept the lower grading was therefore balanced against the other benefits attributable to the post. In support of this, I can confirm that I took a reduction in salary to take up the post at Trafford. Whilst I understand that the authority has to make budget cuts, I do consider that there needs to be some further consideration where staff could be adversely affected having regard to the circumstances described above. I would therefore be pleased to learn your thoughts on the issues raised above.

- I accept that in a time of austerity, adjustments need to be made in this area. I also accept that the available budget should be focused on critical users in the lower pay bands. This will, however, mean that many officers who are in the grades immediately above the critical user cut off will struggle, upon losing an essential user allowance, to run anything other than a shared family car, which may not always be available to them. I note that in the response to consultation, on the issues, there is a comment that: "It is expected that where required, employees will still provide their car for work purposes, and public transport will not be used in most cases" I also note that at an information meeting I attended, it was indicated that this requirement will be included in the contracts of new employees if necessary to the post. It is wholly unclear what criteria will be used to judge which posts will have this requirement as a contractual term. It was also not made clear either, whether this requirement will be included in contracts upon which existing staff may be re engaged in April 2014. This issue requires clarification.
- The removal of essential car user and replacement with an alternative based on pay rather than the need of a car for business purposes is unfair. They seemed more concerned for social workers than themselves. There was some talk of refusing to sign new contracts if they required a car to be made available.
- The proposed changes taken together represent a significant drop in my income and will make it harder to be able to afford to have a car. I could not do my job without a car and therefore object to not being seen as an essential car user. The income

threshold should not be reduced as it will exclude many community staff who rely totally on their car. This is even more important now that we are expected to take on 'agile working'.

- In relation to critical car user, there are 2 elements – the need to identify the critical car user balanced with the need to save money. The 2 elements have been lumped together. Some of the higher earners that will not qualify because of their salary may be in posts that require them to have a car to carry out their role. It could be just as significant for the higher earner to have the allowance removed, as for the lower earner. People live to their means and have financial commitments too. There needs to be consideration of the role rather than the salary. It is likely that the majority that have the allowance removed will be the higher earners, who do need a car available but will fall outside of the criteria.

The proposals don't explain properly how this works. A lot of staff are above the level but need their cars for work. This needs clarifying. A manager may need to respond at very short notice to a call about an incident, whereas some of the staff in the team do not have this demand and could plan their work around public transport etc. Social Workers sometimes have to respond at short notice and there is no way they could carry out the role without a car. There needs to be a clearer explanation of how the criteria work. It should be based on the role, not on the pay for the role. The need to identify is critical but shouldn't just be about the lower bands that would be affected. If morally this is the best way forward, it shouldn't be ruled out that some of the higher paid staff will be critical car users.

- There was a suggestion that essential car user allowance should be retained for staff who need to use their car for work e.g. SW's, Support Time and Recovery workers but paid on a sliding scale depending on banding.
- Staff now have to pay for parking and are losing essential allowance and are still expected to use their car for work. Not a lifestyle choice, essential for the job. Car park fees not applied consistently so some colleagues still getting free car parking and this is not fair. Suggestion that staff could be issued with a 'badge' to use in their car which would permit them to park for free in Council car parks/on the road for a certain time period (like a blue badge). Suggestion that staff losing essential car user could be allowed free car parking.
- The rationale behind consultation on this saving is flawed on three fronts, firstly the maths supporting the justification has not included all factors for consideration, secondly the logic underpinning the approach is not robust, and thirdly, full information on the assessment criteria for the proposed critical car user scheme was not made available throughout the full consultation period. Each of these areas will now be addressed in turn.

Maths

Page 5 of the terms and conditions review booklet states that 694 employees receive the lump sum of ECU per annum, this represents a total payment per annum in the range of between £587,124 and £668,322 dependant on the size of the car engine (£846 and £963). This does not factor in any additional costs associated with claiming mileage at the various rates.

The proposal states that £467,000 per annum will be saved by moving staff onto a critical car user scheme with recompense of £423 per annum to fewer employees.

Extrapolating this information, this results in payments of £201,322 being made per annum to approximately 475 employees.

However what has not been factored into these savings calculations are those members of staff who are currently on ECU but do not claim mileage expenses, and there are no metrics available for the extent of historic unmade claims, and so have not been taken into account for the estimates of savings being made. By way of example, if an employee were to do between 20 and 45 miles per week carrying out council duties and who previously relied on ECU to cover the costs of this, but then proceeded to start claiming this expense to recoup the costs of not receiving a payment, this may result in an additional cost to the council.

In this scenario it could result in an annual mileage expense claim of between £468 and £1053 under the new rate of 45 pence per mile. The first mileage scenario would still result in a saving of circa £378 - £540 per annum to the council, however the second scenario would actually result in an increased cost to the council of £90 per annum, rather than the predicted saving of £963.

Some particularly busy teams have not felt there has been sufficient time each week to make mileage claims, but may instead make efforts to claim their full expense in the future. The ramifications of this should not be dismissed lightly.

Logic

Either the council accepts that some roles require that access to a car as a prerequisite to be able to undertake a role, or it does not. If it is accepted that access to car is a necessity for a given role then the method for assessing this need should not be predicated on the rate of an employee's salary, but in the extent of reliance placed on use of a personal vehicle to conduct council duties in a timely manner.

It is not appropriate to include a salary-based assessment for whether an employee should receive a car allowance or not, as this does not reflect service need, but indicates that the council views this payment as an unnecessary perk for staff on higher salaries. To combat this inequality, a fair and robust assessment of whether certain roles require access to vehicle, or not, should be undertaken to remove instances where people have been given this allowance inappropriately. This assessment should be provided equally to existing employees, new recruits and new roles. Secondly, if it is accepted that access to car is a necessity for a given role, then the remuneration for the expense of maintaining a vehicle used to undertake council business should fairly reflect the amount it costs the employee. If this remuneration is too low, the employee is essentially cross-subsidising these cuts on behalf of other council services, when saving should be made in more appropriate areas to ensure transparency and fairness.

The costs of maintaining a vehicle include the following standing charges:

1. Car tax (VED)
2. Insurance
3. Cost of capital
4. Depreciation

And the running costs include:

5. Fuel
6. Tyres
7. Service and labour costs
8. Replacement parts
9. Parking and tolls
10. Breakdown cover

The [AA](#) has summarised these costs. For the cheapest type of petrol vehicle, the standing costs come to a total of £2,292 per annum, with additional running costs of

23.3p pence per mile. If you combine these figures and do a total of 5,000 miles per year, this would result in a total cost of 68.65 pence per mile.

None of the proposed car user allowances or mileage payments cover any of these costs.

Assessment criteria – Critical Car User Allowance

It is generally accepted that a 45 day consultation period should be provided where proposals will affect 100 or more employees.

However additional information pertinent to the assessment criteria for the Critical Car User Allowance was only added to the intranet on 29th October, 2 ½ weeks before the end of consultation period on 15th November. This should have been made available at the start of the consultation process.

It is not accepted that the content of the review simply relates to the halving of the allowance and the cut-off point at SCP28, and that the criteria for the Critical Car User allowance is an immaterial element of the consultation.

Car user allowance - conclusion

It has been demonstrated the potential savings in this area may not be as high as estimated, that the retained allowances and mileage expenses do not adequately cover the costs of safely maintaining a vehicle, and that the consultation has not been conducted in an equitable manner. Many of the services who rely on access to a car to carry out their duties in a time-efficient manner are the same services which actually bring income into the council. This cut is unfairly penalising those members of staff, rather than identifying savings in more appropriate areas. By way of example, one council employee is expected to conduct site visits in over 100 locations across the borough to monitor development activity. If activity is noted, these developers may be due to pay financial contributions to the council worth in the region of £18million. In this example, the provision of an adequate car allowance is a logical support mechanism to support the timely delivery of income to the council. Furthermore, staff who have been recruited to the Council recently should have been given fair access to the Essential Car User allowance for their role, and not prevented from receiving the payment because it is the subject of consultation for cost saving measures. The ultimate upshot of this proposal as it stands is that the burden of cuts relating to car user allowances are being placed on those services which rely on vehicles, rather than those services which have never needed this allowance. This may lead to a reduction in productivity, morale and ultimately income.

Car mileage payments

A rate based on HMRC standards is accepted. It is however questioned why this was not introduced years ago, i.e. at the time of the PARIS review.

In addition to the above, Planning Officers are required to make appointments with applicants and/or their agents (architects) early in the morning prior to them leaving for work, or when they have returned – this has personally been 7.30am onwards or 6pm onwards. The requirement of a car is an absolute necessity in providing this service which otherwise may not be able to provide if reliant on public transport. The provision of an adequate payment per mile is considered essential and was included in my employment at Trafford. The loss of essential car user and a loss in pence per mile would have a significant impact on my income which is at Grade 28. Planners have a case load of approximately 50 applications each has to be viewed as a statutory requirement to make a reasoned judgement of the possible implications regarding design and impact upon neighbouring occupiers and the local environment. Secondary visits are not uncommon with conditions to be discharged regarding

materials (bricks etc.) The use of a pool vehicle must be considered and calculations of its financial implications need to be shown to verify that you have assessed this transparently. Furthermore, the planning department is key to providing economic growth in Trafford and, as such, needs the resources to work efficiently and retain the knowledge of existing staff. The proposals may detrimentally harm the effectiveness of this department and in doing so, the prosperity of Trafford as a whole. I implore you to include Planning Officers within the critical car user assessment, even if it is Grade 28 and below. Although we do not deal with vulnerable people etc. the part that the planning department has in attracting and retaining investment within the Borough is massive and cannot be understated.

- I am employed as a mobile supervisor for Services for Education which includes school meals, crossing patrols and cleaning. As my job title suggests, I am required to commute between schools across Trafford Borough, I could not carry out my job without the use of my car. I monitor services provided and supervise the staff involved in school meals, crossing patrols and cleaning. To do this, I need to visit the schools, which are often not on bus routes. Additionally to commuting between the schools, I always carry items in my car including : - Uniforms for the staffs crossing lollipop sticks, temperature probes and order books, moving raw and cooked food, crockery, cleaning equipment and chemicals. The boot of my car is always full of equipment required by the above services. Indeed there are many occasions where meals cleaning or crossing patrols could not operate without my essential delivery service if I need to carry any personal belongings in the boot of my car, I have to empty it of Trafford Council's equipment first.
- Many of the staff employed as cleaners, crossing patrols or kitchen staff do not have access to a car. It is a regular requirement for me to transport staff to other schools where there are shortages due to sickness etc. In addition to the inconvenience of always having a boot full of equipment, I have to take out full business use insurance and can incur damage to my car which I would not suffer if I did not carry out these vital duties for Trafford Borough Council. I therefore request that I should continue to receive essential car user's allowance.
- Critical Car User Designation Process – Questionnaire. I have a specific piece of feedback about one aspect of the above proposals. I am responsible for managing a small team of Enforcement Support Officers, who provide generic enforcement support to all the Teams within Public Protection (Licensing, Environmental Health, Trading Standards, Pollution & Licensing. These are Band 5 roles, currently requiring the provision of a car and qualifying for essential user allowance.

A key aspect of their role is regular night time working, typically at weekends, addressing a range of enforcement issues. This is likely to involve travel around different parts of the Borough, making visits, logging observations etc. on behalf of the various teams. It is not unusual for this to include working between the hours of midnight to four o'clock in the morning. Public transport is not an option on a number of fronts, including staff safety.

I note from the draft questionnaire that the necessity for this type of working is not one of the current factors to be scored. My concern is that this could result in these roles losing essential altogether, staff choosing not to provide a car for work and the service unable to deliver a required enforcement presence at a time when it is coming under considerable pressure to do so. I would urge in the strongest terms for a re-think on this point. Due account should be taken of the fact that the current

arrangement are a really efficient way of maintaining service provision with reduced resource – they can pick up multiple jobs for various teams in one night. They need their car to do it. Please include this aspect of out of hours working as a factor on the eventual questionnaire. The service to the public will suffer if we are no longer able to do it in the current way.

- This consultation response is for the Building Control Service. These details have been discussed between staff for inclusion within this response. The main emphasis of the response concerns the Car Allowance proposal that will affect Building Control Staff and more importantly will affect the delivery of the service that Trafford Building Control service provide to the residents of Trafford, the effectiveness of the Clerk of works service that Building Control provide and also for those partnership schemes that Building Control work on as part of the National Partnership scheme run by our LABC organisation.

Trafford Building Control service is a Statutory service that is provided by Trafford Council and that has to operate within a fully 100% competitive environment due to the opportunity that is in the market place for residents, professional Architects, Agents, Developers and Builders. They all have the option to use the services of either Trafford Council's Building Control Service or that provided by one of our competitors within the private sector who provide a building control service.

At the moment there are approximately 10 regular private building control organisations that are competing for the same work that we are competing for and so in order to promote our service to enable those decision makers to choose the service provided by Trafford building Control over the private sector building control service providers, we have to provide a more efficient, flexible, cost effective, reliable and robust service that suits the needs for all types of clients such as those mentioned above. One of the main differences that distinguishes our service from the private sector service providers is our ability to fit into the clients time frames for construction to avoid any delays and provide a flexible quality service that is delivered on a daily basis as is requested by our clients and delivered by all building control officers.

There are several main areas of our service that will be substantially affected by the council's proposal to effect the terms and conditions related to car user allowances that staff currently receive. The first area is the provision of carrying out daily site inspections on the applications and building works that we have been engaged upon. The second area of the service that will be affected is the provision of the Clerk of works service that Building Control provide for the clients of the Asset Management Major Projects team. And finally, the delivery of enforcement procedures on a speedy responsive basis where residents have notified building control of concerns relating to properties.

For this response the figures that follow are those that have been collated from our database system to highlight the aspect of the service that relies upon staff having the use of a vehicle on a daily basis and being provided with the correct level of payment for remuneration of their vehicle to deliver the building control service and clerk of work service to that level that the clients require and upon which our appointment is based.

- 2012/13 - £641,000,000 was the total earned income brought into the council by building Control service.

- 2013/14 – £425,000,000 is the earned income brought into the council by building control to date for this year.
- 2012/13 - 6258 - daily site inspections carried out to deliver the required service
- 2013/14 - to date – 4200 daily site inspections carried out to date to deliver the required service
- 2012/14 – 461 is the number of enforcement level 1 cases pursued by building control to date for this year with a resultant additional income of £50,000 to date.
- 2012/13 - 40 enforcement level 2 cases with a resultant additional income of £10,500.00
- 2013/14 - to date – 33 enforcement level 2 cases with a resultant additional income of £1,800.00 to date.
- 2012/14 to date, a total of £71,000 additional income has been provided by the CO Works service following daily site inspections carried out.

The main comments that we also request to be fully considered individually by Trafford Council Management before any decision is made are as follows:

The figures used in the justification of the amount of savings the council will receive are not accurate and the savings highlighted in the consultation will not be realised. Further details can be given to underpin this comment at any time, however for clarity they have been omitted for this response. The service we provide relies upon a responsive daily same day site inspection service level to be carried as requested by our clients. We currently retain in excess of 80% of all building control work within the borough due to the level of service provided. We provide an additional dedicated Clerk of works service to bring in additional income. Due to the expected number of site visits that individual staff need to undertake to deliver the service. There is heavy reliance upon the use of an individual's car for this and to carry the necessary equipment and tools to carry out the service. This therefore attracts a higher cost to an individual for insurance purposes with higher maintenance costs for a vehicle. We carry out enforcement procedures and inspections across the whole of the borough. We carry out joint site inspections with other council services when required to do so such as Housing Standards team, planning enforcement team. We carry out the checking and inspection of all applications that Trafford Council receive for the adaptations of buildings for Disabled persons and upon which the costs for the delivery of this service are absorbed by building control as any fee income cannot be legally charged for. Responding to complaints in a speedy manner when received from all manner of sources both internally and externally. Our clients response comments from our customer survey results that are provided on every application confirms that the level of service we provide is satisfactory and acceptable regards to site inspections carried out, contact ability for same day site inspections and flexibility in delivery of the service which are all underpinned by the use of staff cars. We have already introduced a system of management to reduce the likelihood and number of wasted site inspections and efficient travel routes across the borough. All building control staff are required to carry their own health and safety first aid kit and all personal protective equipment (PPE) for site visits as is mandatory required. Staff are periodically required to use and take our own site inspection equipment to sites such as folding access ladders, torches, levels, camera on occasions at the same time and for the same inspection. Staff have to take numerous application files, plans etc. on a daily basis when conducting the daily site inspections. Building Control clients have confirmed on numerous occasions that familiarity and professional relationship is essential in this service and that they as a paying client wish to receive the service by the same individual on their scheme from start to completion. The staff members vehicle is available as a safe refuge area when site based issues arise during site inspections and enforcement works. Building control

have risk assessment processes in place that rely on the use of the car for some of the above aspects, especially for lone female worker scenario. The criteria proposed by the council where critical car user assessment is possible will not be available to any building control staff due to the salary levels. Also that full consultation was not carried out on this point to set the criteria level. The council have not confirmed whether any future proposed terms and condition changes will require a staff member to have access to a vehicle for work duties and if it will be optional or mandatory. Some areas of the borough that we have to provide the service within are not accessible other than by car. The council need to recognise the fact that some roles totally rely on the use of a vehicle to provide a cost effective, efficient service that clients expect and pay for. For the building control service there is a viable legal alternative to any proposal the council have put forward that will not attract any expense by the council and that will maintain the current level of car allowance. This proposal should be discussed fully and explored with Building Control Staff. The use of a council wide policy that is reliant upon an individual's salary level and whether they will be able to claim critical car user allowance is not logical. Surely it must be the job role and description of the individual that dictates the requirement for a vehicle and hence a car user allowance. Full disclosure should be explained as to how the SCP 28 cut off point has been arrived at? All levels of staff within the council need to be considered within this proposal. The council should not perceive the car user payment as a perk of an individual or as a part of their remuneration. It should only be seen as an essential part of the delivery of the service that relies on the use of a vehicle to conduct required duties for the role. The council should introduce an agreed effective method of assessment for all job roles within the council to ascertain who requires the car user allowance and at what applicable level. The blanket use of the proposal is not correct and does not fit all roles. The provision of an adequate car allowance scheme is a logical support mechanism to support the delivery of income to the council. A 45 day consultation period should be allowed for this aspect of the proposals where it affects over 100 persons. The new critical car user proposal was only recently added to the considerations in a less time period.

- As a family therapist the guidance for all interventions I complete are within the domains of the family and extended family's home. It was a pre-requirement of our job to have a car, so was recognized by the local authority that this was indeed an essential criteria. On an average day I travel a minimum of 25 miles for family treatment sessions. Due to the construct of our team and the therapeutic model we work to of being based within the family's home environment the local authority do not provide us with a space in which to facilitate therapeutic sessions. As multi-systemic therapist we work on a 1-1 basis with families at their convenience, this can frequently be morning sessions before school arriving at homes from 6.45am onwards and often meeting families after work for evening sessions which can finish after 9pm. Having essential car user ensures staff safety as our vehicles are always available outside of the family unit, meaning we can leave a family's home in the immediacy such conflict occur and we become unsafe. It also offers increased flexibility to service users with often complex needs by increasing our mobility at the starts and ends of working days – ensuring we are available to support their needs when required.

As a lone worker in families home having a car forms part of our risk assessments as we often work with families with anti-social and aggressive behaviour so being able to exit and get to safety if needed is essential.

Having a vehicle is an essential part of my role as evidenced this past week when a drunk driver hit my car rendering it unsafe to drive – I was forced to take annual leave whilst waiting for a courtesy car as it would have been impractical and impossible for me to travel to my appointments on public transport. Which were 10am Timperley village, 11.40am Stretford, office in Daveyhulme, 3pm Sale then 5pm Hale. The amount of time I would have wasted on this day using public transport for a job which in my opinion clearly requires me to have a car would have been more costly due to the hours of downtime wasted, which with my vehicle I am able to utilize by nipping into the office to complete relevant administration. If using public transport was an option for my role I would anticipate a surge in TOIL as administration tasks would be being completed at home or an evening. Given the above, it seems ridiculous to suggest that we do not be paid as essential car users.

- Removing the Essential Car User Allowance (which I do not receive) from the lowest paid again must mean staff will be worse off financially, otherwise this wouldn't have been considered as a cost saving measure. By its very name this allowance should only be given if a car is essential for that person to do their job on a daily/regular basis and, as well as the Casual Car Allowance, hasn't keep pace with the cost of living and especially the cost of petrol.
- The criteria shouldn't have a cut-off at scp 28 should be open to everyone.
- Some staff don't bother to put in mileage claims however when they lose the allowance they will which will be an increased cost.
- If staff don't receive the allowance they won't use their car for work and they will be in breach of contract.

Reducing the Sick Pay Scheme

- Good terms and conditions send a message to the workforce. This change sends a clear message to staff. As we get older we could be ill and it is vital we stay in good health and stick to our current terms and conditions. We need a robust sickness procedure. £250K is a drop in the ocean and is causing distress and anger. It is not economically viable and I will not accept it. Making a decision could be open to grievances. I don't want a decision about my health to be made by my line manager.
- The booklet quotes that for the year ending June 2013, the Council paid out in the region of £1.4m in sick pay. It is unclear what % of claimants spent more than 3 months off sick and, therefore, what would be the actual saving of reducing the sick pay to 3 full and 3 half months? The estimate for overall saving in relation to this proposal, offered in the conclusion, is £250 K, which would suggest that very little of the £1.4m was in fact spent on those staff with serious health conditions. It is appreciated that exceptional circumstances may be accepted to extend the benefit, but these will be agreed on an individual basis; it would be helpful if guidelines were published for consultation to assist in this process. Without these guidelines and the apparently relatively small saving to be made against the overall cost to the Council for sick benefit, the message that this proposal sends out to people who will often be the most vulnerable, is very worrying and therefore ought to be reconsidered or, at least, guidelines for the exceptional circumstances ought to be made available for comment.

- View that it is poor to be targeting sick pay for reduction and don't feel valued by the Council and worth fighting for.
- My comments relate specifically to the proposal to reduce the long term sickness pay from 6 months full pay to three months full pay. I note that there has been little opposition to this proposal to date, presumably because most of us never believe that serious illness will happen to us.

The council's long term strategy in promoting "an outward facing mixed economy business model" represents an intention to test the market to see whether the private sector will take over service provision for less or the same money, in as many areas as possible.

Unless there is a radical change of thinking within the council therefore, in a few years' time, the make-up of the council and its services may well be unrecognisable. Clearly this particular proposed change in terms and conditions will make Trafford services more saleable in the open market.

It is misleading staff therefore to suggest that this proposed change to their terms and conditions can be mitigated by a discretionary policy to look at exceptional cases where extensions will be considered beyond a six month period to sick pay. Such a policy will not be enforceable upon private and third sector organisations who take over the running of council services.

The council has not put forward a proper business case to support its assertion that this proposed change in terms and conditions will make a significant saving in real terms. Even if the council is able to provide proper evidence that significant savings can be achieved by this proposal, there has been no analysis of how weak management in Trafford may have contributed towards the current situation and how improvements in the rate of long term sickness could be ameliorated.

I was flabbergasted to read the comment in the consultation paper that a reduced period of sickness pay might encourage employees to seek help sooner to return to work. Surely there is a joint responsibility on staff AND managers to ensure that help is sought in that regard at as early a stage as possible?! It is my experience, having been employed by Trafford for the last 25 years that managers are rarely proactive when it comes to managing long term sick leave. In 2006 I was on sick leave for 6 weeks, having been driven to my wits end by a lack of staffing and overwork; after 3 weeks, my GP suggested that I should press HR for support in returning to work. When I contacted HR they didn't even know that I had been signed off. When I did return to work, there was no account taken of whether I was fit to return and as I recall, my GP had not consented to my return (as he should have done) but nobody at Trafford even noticed.

The current proposals increase the likelihood that people with health issues will return to work before they are ready to do so, and that could be counter-productive not just for the individuals concerned but for their colleagues who may be placed in the impossible position of trying to support colleagues who should not even be back in the workforce. The current proposal is also unfair to the less well paid. Someone who earns £26k per annum, for example, could expect to be paid out 3 plus 3 totalling £9,750 in sick pay; whilst if the chief executive were on the same sick leave, she would get £60,000 in sick pay!! As I understand it that was precisely the position Trafford found itself in in relation to the last chief executive, and it is THAT level of

system abuse that has caused budgetary problems, not individuals suffering from cancer, or social workers who have been driven to their wits end by overwork and unrealistic expectations.

Most people would agree that those earning larger salaries have enough disposable income to save for a rainy day themselves, whilst the rest of us do not.

My proposal is that the current terms and conditions should remain unchanged at 6 plus 6, save that there should be a cap on the salary level at which the local authority should pay out. A cap of £ 38,500 would cover most employees and although anyone who earns over that amount would still be eligible for 6 months pay, they should not be eligible at their rate of salary but at a maximum of £ 38,500. This would affect a minimal number of employees at the council, but may well achieve the same level of savings.

- The reduction of the sick pay I feel again is targeting the lower end of the workforce as we are the ones that if anything is going to happen it will be the ones that visit and deal with the clients that we visit rather than the senior managers. We can't afford to lose our Sick Pay if we are unfortunate to fall ill long term as again, with the low cost of most of our wages, many of us use this to pay the bills that we have, as an employee of the Council for 18 years I have had very little sickness and no long term, in fact as a manager I have helped reduce the sickness levels within Katharine Lowe House over the years.
- The changes to sick pay are potentially likely to impact on older staff members who have on-going illnesses or certain disabilities. This seems unfair.
- We should only pay statutory sick pay during the first 6 months of employment (during the probationary period) after which it would be on a sliding scale based on length of service (up to the proposed maximum of 3 & 3).
- The proposal is a departure from nationally negotiated local government terms and conditions and is probably in my view the most fundamental change proposed. I appreciate that some savings will be made, but would comment that the severity of the measure is disproportionate to the likely level of savings; and give the available information, the figure provided for estimated savings appears to be inflated. I was at a consultation meeting earlier this week when in response to an enquiry from another attendee, it was stated that Trafford had a 'large number' of employees on long term sickness absence.

Figures obtained as a result of a colleagues' freedom of information request, however, show that only 0.36% of the workforce in 2012/13 were absent over six months; and only 1.92% of the workforce took over three months sickness absence in the same year. The percentages have been reduced significantly during the last three years, presumably by robust absence management, which will continue. This amounted in 2012/13 to 64 people taking more than three months sickness absence, and only 20 six months and over.

With regard to the projected figure of £250,000 savings a year in reducing sick leave entitlement; if figures for sickness absence remain at the 2012/13 level (and I can see no reason why they will not); it is difficult to see how this figure can be achieved, particularly if deductions for statutory sick pay entitlement have been applied. In the FOI response, the figure has been described as "a cautious estimate" I believe it can

better be characterised as guesswork, and that the savings to be gained from removing a nationally negotiated term of our employment contracts are not proportionate to the somewhat drastic measures being proposed.

This proposal will, in particular, have a major impact on particular groups within the workforce, particularly those with long term medical conditions and the older officers within the workforce, who are more likely to have lengthy periods of sickness absence as a result of serious conditions. The negative impact on wider workforce morale is incalculable.

Finally, the proposal includes the provision for an exemption which will mean that sick pay can be extended for employees who have a serious health condition. It is, however, entirely unclear from the consultation materials how this discretion will be exercised. There appears to be no mechanism proposed to review a decision; and some kind of appeal or review process would, in my view, make the process fairer and more acceptable.

- The proposed sick pay proposals are mean-spirited and the case to justify its introduction is exaggerated. There are “only” 20 staff with over 6 months long-term sickness and if this issue had been properly managed in the past it would not have become a problem. There was some cynicism about whether the real purpose was to make the staff more attractive to the private sector if they were TUPE'd. Staff who already had been TUPE'd were better protected as they had transferred when they were entitled to 6 months full pay and six months half pay.
- I am concerned that the changes in sick pay will unfairly penalise staff with health problems. Having an operation can entail a long recovery time and staff may have to come back to work early in order to pay their bills. It is another potential source of stress for staff who are off work due to stress related conditions.
- If you are seriously ill you then you deserve 6 months full pay or if not you should be back in work. All cases might be exceptional.
- Felt that work force is ageing – RTW process is good. Staff have worked here for many years – LTS has impact on family – feels proposal to restrict sick pay is cruel. Where exceptions are considered it needs to be looked at on individual circumstances / needs instead of general. Drop from 6 – 3 months sick pay could ruin professional & personal circumstances – gone are the days that people swing the lead – equity needs to be in there. Concern about the impact on disabled people.
- Concern about the discretionary element of extension of sick pay – will there be a criteria?
- STS will also impact on when sick pay reduces/expires – it's dishonest/underhand that the Council has communicated this based on LTS absence cases only. What will the transition arrangements be for staff on LTS when this is introduced? View that it is poor to be targeting sick pay for reduction and don't feel valued by the Council and worth fighting for.
- Has the impact on the workforce been considered? Is there support for managers to enforce the policy? There are discrepancies about how the policy is applied – not everyone is taken through all stages of the policy.

- This proposal is seen as unnecessary as it targets those who are genuinely unwell. Rather than reducing pay entitlement, appropriate steps should be taken to crack down on extended absence that is not genuine. However if this proposal were to be introduced, provision to extend the payment of sick pay beyond the contractual entitlement in exceptional circumstances is noted and welcomed.
- I'd like to propose that a year on year analysis is carried out and I'm asking for a commitment that this proposal is introduced on a temporary basis and reviewed after 12 months. There's no give and take, staff work very hard, extra hours in the evening etc, trying to support vulnerable families. Where's the commitment to staff wellbeing other than a tokenistic Health and Wellbeing event? We're just told this is the way things are – it's not good enough for me. People are going to be forced back into work too early and pass on infections to other staff and vulnerable groups.
- You should be looking after staff for business delivery reasons.
- My proposal is that sick pay is capped for those in the 40% tax bracket so that we aren't paying people to pay the tax man. Savings made could be used to lessen the impact on the lowest paid members of staff.
- Reduction in sick pay again will affect the most vulnerable at a time of greatest need plus the lowest paid are the least likely to have savings and there is a proven link between poverty and health.
- Should consider not paying sick pay during the first 3 days of a period of sickness absence.

Unpaid Leave

- Concerns regarding unpaid leave as this will create further difficulty in covering shifts with trained and experienced staff.
- It may be difficult as a service to cover annual leave allowance and maintain weekly targets if we had enforced unpaid leave. We are a small team of 4 therapists with specific case load requirements.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that this is unpaid leave will be deducted from the salary over a 12 month period to reduce the impact on staff salaries, and that it is not a permanent change to conditions, there is no commitment to remove its mandatory status after the initial 2 year period.
- This proposal is accepted as a fair way of making cost savings for the short term rather than making cuts to jobs. However it should be born in mind that this proposal may be more unpalatable for two types of employees:
 - Those who are on salaries that are closer to the living wage, thus a percentage reduction is felt more keenly as it takes them closer to the poverty line; and
 - Those in services which have been stretched to the point where staff are unable to take their annual leave entitlement, are accruing substantial flexi time on a weekly basis, and are paying for consultancy time to help support the service. In this instance the employees may well end up taking the pay cut

but simply losing those additional days leave along with their regular leave to ensure the service continues to be delivered.

- As a small team we would struggle to cover cases for any more additional leave as well as covering out on-call service which is 24/7 throughout the year. The only way this could possibly be manageable is if all the team took this off at the same time and the service was closed, bar on-call or over Christmas period.
- Proposed 3 day Compulsory Unpaid Leave - Due to the nature of our service our children have to have support due to their complex needs. Therefore the cost of agency staff to cover for those taking unpaid leave would be a higher cost and prevents the continuity and highly specialised care they receive. I feel it is important to highlight that our team is funded through the High Needs Block, Designated Service Group and therefore this would not impact upon the Council's savings.
- I feel that as staff that work and get paid term time only, to be enforced to take 3 extra days annual leave would have a detrimental effect on the level of service we would be able to deliver for the vulnerable children we support. We would have to take these extra days within the school term and this would impact on these children with statements, and on the budget to provide additional cover in employing additional staff to cover these days.
- I do not think that implementation of 3 days annual unpaid leave will work in all circumstances. I work for the Sensory Impairment Support Service and work term-time only to support pupils with a visual impairment. If all staff need to take unpaid leave the pupils will be left without the support they need to enable them to access the curriculum and take a full part in school life.
- In response to the consultation around staff terms and conditions, from a manager's point of view, there are some foreseen difficulties with allowing staff to have so much time off in connection with the unpaid leave. For example, if a member of staff has 30 days as standard annual leave plus an optional 13 days flexi leave plus a potential 3 days unpaid leave, there is a possibility that a member of staff will have up to 46 days off in any one annual leave year. As a result, this approximates to nearly one day per week. Whilst I accept that these proposals are to mitigate against the risk of an otherwise high level of job losses, is this a manageable prospect for teams to fulfil their roles and responsibilities? Do we see agency staff being used to fill these resource gaps and thereby create additional costs in any event? Is encouragement of flexible working an alternative suggestion?
- At the information session we heard from Councillor Anstee that the savings required were a combination of cash savings and increased service demand. We know that service demand is increasing, for example with rapid rises in requests for Children's and adult social care, which is being tackled by a reduced workforce. As such, it clearly does not make 'business sense' to reduce the amount of time staff are in work.

An additional 3 days leave will put increase pressure on the service and staff, reducing the quality of delivery and accessibility for residents, and in some cases increasing overtime payments to cover the extra leave.

Only a few years ago we were given an additional 3 days leave, so in a short space of time we will be moving from 27 days to 33, an increase of 6 days, which when

multiplied across the council must have a significant impact on our ability to deliver services.

To support the Council to meet its service demands, I would reduce my leave down to 27 days (whilst retaining the same level of pay). I understand that this does not offer the cash savings, but if Cllr Anstee is to be believed, this is not the only driving factor.

- I am employed by Cleaning Services as a cleaning supervisor. A couple of years ago the college went into lengthy negotiations with my manager to find ways to reduce the cost of the cleaning contract because the college was experiencing financial difficulties. As a consequence of these cut backs four members of staff left or were re-deployed, another two of us including myself had to reduce our contracted hours by 6.5 and 5 hours respectively and the greater part of the college is currently being cleaned every other day and to work term time only.

We are just managing to fulfil our contract and if any member of my cleaning team is absent for any reason I have to prioritise and instruct my team to concentrate on critical areas like toilets and just do the basics in the classrooms and offices. The staff and myself cannot take the three days unpaid leave during school holidays as we work term time only and if we are given permission to take the time of during the school year it would mean that we would lose another 36 working shifts or the equivalent of one member of the cleaning staff being absent for over seven weeks.

I am also employed in a fulltime capacity as the site manager at the college and it is my duty to make sure that contractors fulfil their contractual obligations and if these shifts are not covered I would be in the unenviable position of having to inform my main employer the Head Teacher that cleaning services my second employer are not providing their contractual hours and would advise that we ask for a credit for the short fall in hours.

I have no issue with this. It is one of the unfortunate drawbacks of being employed by two organisations at the same place of work, but feel very strongly that once again people at Trafford have not thought this through and any savings made would either have to be paid in overtime, the council losing the revenue by crediting the customer and areas of the college not being cleaned while the staff are on unpaid leave.

- The other points around unpaid leave I don't have an issue with. I feel that this is going to happen anyway.
- The reduction in working hours as a consequence of compulsory unpaid leave will lessen the capacity of the service to deliver services and this will potentially have a negative financial effect e.g. if the capacity of the service to assess more in house foster carers is reduced then this will contribute to a higher dependence on high cost agency foster placements and if residential staff have to take unpaid leave then we will be dependent on high cost agency workers to cover their absence. Can consideration be given to exemptions so that compulsory leave is not implemented on service sectors where there will either be a consequential financial cost or a serious effect on the quality of service delivery?
- I welcome additional leave, but recognise that this will not be welcomed by all, and is effectively a pay cut. A voluntary scheme would have been preferable, and I do not

believe that this has been given sufficient consideration. This additional leave will also impact on service delivery; as it can already be a struggle to provide cover for existing holiday entitlements.

- As a small team we would struggle to cover cases for any more additional leave as well as covering out on-call service which is 24/7 throughout the year. The only way this could possibly be manageable is if all the team took this off at the same time and the service was closed, bar on-call or over Christmas period.
- It will create problems if everyone wants to buy more leave. Not enough staff to cover the work as it is without having more staff on leave. Concern about salary reduction as a result of unpaid leave. View that the Council should have looked at the savings which could be achieved if staff were allowed to request unpaid leave rather than the introduction of 3 days for all.
- It will create problems if everyone wants to buy more leave. Not enough staff to cover the work as it is without having more staff on leave. Concern about salary reduction as a result of unpaid leave.
- There are a number of staff who carry over leave year after year because they do not get the opportunity to use up leave, this is because of the nature of the role and the fact that they accrue TOIL for working out of hours etc., therefore they need to use this up too. Additional time off will create a further burden for staff.
- There will be increased pressure on staff – fewer staff in work, it doesn't make business sense.
- We had an extra 3 days leave with single status and now have an extra 3 days unpaid, that's 6 extra days in total, it has a big impact on service.
- Proposal – reduce annual leave to 27 days and allow staff to buy unpaid leave but do not introduce mandatory unpaid leave.
- It all feels unfair, some staff get additional responsibility payments and some don't. Some staff are rewarded for extra work and some aren't its unfair.
- This will not improve the level of service to local residents.
- If staff are given a choice of whether to take unpaid leave or not we may save more.
- We could use reserves to manage the risk – try it out for a year and monitor the position before introducing unpaid leave on a mandatory basis.
- The burden of unpaid leave could rest with senior staff (they should have 8 days unpaid leave) to reduce the impact on the lowest paid staff.
- Obviously in an ideal world none of the proposals is desirable; but I think to a degree we have to accept the seriousness of the budget position, and that this will in some respects have to affect everybody. I do, however, have a particular, specific concern, which I feel would give rise to a grossly inequitable situation, but one which could be easily avoided, and at comparatively minimal cost. I would be very interested to know, in considering the overall "acceptability" of the proposals, if the Council would be prepared to provide for the exceptional circumstances I have in mind.

I have already expressed significant general concerns regarding the mandatory unpaid leave proposal, primarily in respect of its implications for service delivery and increasing workloads, particularly amongst those staff who already “go the extra mile” to ensure that the work (which never decreases, extra days’ leave notwithstanding) actually gets done. I have, however, no doubt that this general proposal will be implemented. It is a particular, specific issue which I have in mind. The main burden of taking on increasing workload pressures tends to be assumed by those who are more conscientious, and therefore already more overworked (and more unlikely to apply for additional discretionary leave), than others. It is only natural that this will continue if the proposals are adopted. Some of the people concerned are in a position where they are – already – unable to take, and therefore losing, their current **paid** leave allocation. If this group of people end up – as they are likely to - being the ones who cover for other colleagues whilst those colleagues are taking – as they are likely to – their additional says’ leave (and now up to 10), this gives rise to a grossly inequitable and undesirable situation. Already overworked officers will take on even more of others’ work; they will themselves be allocated 3 further (and unpaid) days’ leave, which they will be even less likely to be able to take, and they will, in addition, have pay deducted. This is adding injury to injury. People in this situation will be penalised **twice** – by already giving the Council “free” work (by losing paid leave), and then by being given leave days which they also can’t take, and having salary deducted regardless.

This point could be quite simply be addressed by making a small and limited exception to the proposal, whereby in cases where staff are carrying forward – or losing – PAID leave in a particular year, they will correspondingly **not** be subject to the additional deduction in relation to the additional “unpaid” allocation. (I note here that leave carry-forward is a legitimate element of the Council’s current procedures, already requires management authorisation, and is subject to it being in the interests of service delivery; so is a restricted area, and already subject to significant controls.)

In summary, I feel it would be grossly unjust for any salary deduction to apply to those staff who, because of existing workload / legitimate operational requirements, are unable to take their PAID leave allocation; and that this should be provided for as an exception in any scheme implemented. I would be grateful if this could be taken into account in developing the proposals; and, if it is possible for a “Council” view on this to be provided, I would, of course, be interested.

- The 3 days mandatory unpaid leave is a major concern as not only is it a pay cut (following a pay freeze when the cost of living is increasing in many areas and so will hit the lowest paid the hardest) it will lead to a similar reduction in the overall number of hours worked by full-time staff. Therefore this measure will further affect the delivery of services. Based on what has happened over recent years, were in general staff’s work has increase significantly as staff are expected to provide the same services and more but with less staff year on year. This will inevitably lead to even heavier workloads than now, which in turn will lead to more stress and could result in even more experienced, previously loyal and dedicated staff leaving the Authority. Also this situation will lead to more reliance on consultants (which is happening already) and so won’t lead to all the expected savings.

If staff are not being paid then to also impose restrictions on when unpaid leave can be taken for operational reason (which is unavoidable and will in turn affect when paid leave can be taken) could lead to resentment. This will at least impact on moral,

which over recent times has been the lowest I've seen in over 20 years of working at Trafford, and could manifest itself in other ways.

Introduction of a Living Wage

- This proposal is fair and acceptable.
- This proposal is welcomed, however there should be a commitment to continue to increase this with inflation year on year, given the relatively small cost to the Council and the positive impact that it would have on the staff in question.
- The idea of a "Living Wage" for the lowest earners is a good idea but any pay rise will probably be more than negated by other proposals if they are introduced. Therefore this could be looked on as a just way to try to lessen the impact of other measures with the cost being met by cutting the money given to other Trafford employees. The more cynical may even think that Trafford Council could then even benefit from any kudos that this measure may bring either as a matter of course or by highlighting this fact.

Reduce Overtime Rate

- Concerns regarding reduction in overtime as this will create further difficulty in covering shifts with trained and experienced staff.
- As a service we provide a 24/7 on-call service to our families throughout the year and therefore are regularly working overtime when called by families, in order to provide families with appropriate support. We can be called at any time of the day, night, Christmas and can be responding to calls repeatedly and for lengthy periods. We are paid time and a half for being work ready at any time of the day, night in order to respond appropriately to family's needs. This aims to prevent out of home placement, ed, police response.
- This proposal is fair and acceptable.
- Concern about impact on service delivery.
- Extra work that is already done isn't recognised, believe in public service.
- Impact on morale should be considered.
- As part of my role for one week in every four, I am required to be work ready for 7 days a week 24hrs a day to cover the on call support service we offer to families in treatment. For which we receive a nominal payment. Due to this work readiness and often the time of night that I am claiming overtime for generally between 9pm-8am and the unsociable hours I believe we should be paid time and half. When the on call phone rings we are dealing with high end familial conflict, child protection concerns relating to missing children, intoxication or violence which requires a depth of experience in coaching parents to develop their own skills of conflict resolution and increase their responsibility over their children's behaviour. Whereby saving money and resources as other professionals or emergency services are not being called out. MST is proven to save local authorities money by preventing children from entering custody or the care system by having highly experienced and skilled staff to facilitate these interventions. It is my belief our approach to flexible working, being work ready

and managing high levels of familial conflict at unsocial able hours should be recognized by being paid at time and half on these occasions.

Remove Relocation Allowance

- This proposal is fair and acceptable.
- It is important to note that people often consider the location of their job before they apply for it to assess the transport costs to/from that location. Also people may make decisions to move close to current places of work, to reduce travel costs and time. Therefore where a change in location is imposed on staff this can affect people, particularly those on lower incomes. It is not fair to say that those working for Trafford should be expected to work anywhere within the Borough. Therefore consideration should be given to reducing the time limit from 4 to 2 years for the payment, and possibly paying only those on the lower pay scales. Taking such an approach would still result in a saving for the Council but would have less of an impact on the most vulnerable staff.