Appendix C (ii): Detailed Savings Proposals 2019/20 – 2020/21

This appendix contains the detailed budget templates for each of the savings proposals that are to be taken forward by way of this Cabinet report.

Community Wellbeing		
Index	**Description**	**Page no.**
CWB001	Additional efficiencies made through public health re-commissioning	6 - 7
CWB002	Recommission Children's Centres and Health Visiting as a single contract	8 – 10
CWB003	Cease untargeted smoking cessation. Retain only a service for mental health service users and pregnant women	11 - 12
CWB007	Proportion of the increase in License income to fund corporate overhead charge	13 - 15
CWB008	Reduction in the cost of the Single Homelessness Team and supporting people budget, by using New Burdens and Flexible Homelessness Support Grant	16 - 17
CWB009*	Increased acquisition of private sector accommodation through I4B to meet demand from homeless households and thereby avoiding cost of future TA provision	18 - 20
CWB010	Increased income generation through an investment in Private Sector accommodation by First Wave, let at market rates	21 - 24
CWB012	Additional efficiencies within the service	25 - 26
CWB013	Increasing NAIL provision to support more users, but also developing provision to support higher need users and support some users who would have gone into nursing care	27 - 28
CWB014	Continuing Health Care – Continue to challenge decisions regarding CHC assessments at every point of referral	29 - 30
CWB015	Review of homecare and placement packages, re-commissioning day care	31 - 33
CWB016	Review of homecare and placement packages, re-commissioning day care	34 - 35
CWB017	Review of homecare and placement packages, re-commissioning day care	36 - 38
CWB018	Review of homecare and placement packages, re-commissioning day care	39 - 40
CWB021	Proposed to introduce a Reasonable Rents policy	41 - 43

Regeneration & Environment		
Index	**Description**	**Page no.**
R&E001	The LED Street Lighting CMS provides the Council with the ability to adjust LED lighting output to create additional savings (£100k) by further reducing both energy costs and carbon emissions	44 - 45
R&E002A	Review of litter picking services	46 - 47
R&E002B	Review of litter picking services	48 – 49
R&E003*	A review of spend by the parks service to remove off-contract spend	50 - 51
R&E004*	The generation of additional income by the Building Control team. £100k is adjusting the budget to match current workload, with the remainder to come from out-of-borough associate work	52 - 53
R&E005	This saving would be generated through a combination of efficiencies, rationalising staffing and the generation of additional income from a combination of external grant funding and fee income.	54 – 55
R&E006*	The saving comes from the expansion of litter patrol activity - income is generated through additional fines	56 – 57
R&E007*	Additional income generated by the Planning Enforcement team	58 – 59
R&E008	Potential increase in revenue arising from increased activity in Wembley	60 – 61
R&E009	Increased income from a 20% uplift in Planning Fees - this is a Central Government initiative	62 – 63
R&E010A	General efficiencies within the service	64 - 65
R&E018	Review of staffing model in Regeneration & Environment	66 – 67
R&E022A	Stop Met Patrol Plus funding	68 – 70

Children & Young People		
Index	**Description**	**Page no.**
CYP001	Work within amended regulations to fund some statutory education functions from DSG. Requires annual approval from Schools Forum	71 – 73
CYP002*	Ensure care leavers access Housing Benefit when entitled, to reduce interim support from Children's services	74 – 75
CYP003*	Reduce placement costs through the West London Alliance (WLA) Dynamic Purchasing System and use of block contracts	76 – 77
CYP004	Develop a shared fostering service with other WLA boroughs, resulting in staffing efficiencies	78 – 80

CYP005	Transform the site to an educational setting with community activities. End delivery of council run youth services from Roundwood, creating a different model of community and voluntary provision.	81 – 83
CYP006	Reduce support levels to early years providers. Efficiency measures across Early Help including restructure of the Education Welfare Service.	84 – 85
CYP007	A reduction of 5 FTE from non-case holding staff and management posts, primarily by smarter use of technology	86 – 87
CYP008	Develop family hubs from children's centres	88 – 90
CYP009A	Recommissioning of contracted service and targeted projects	91 – 92

Performance, Policy and Partnerships

Index	Description	Page no.
PPP001	Proposed to reduce grants provided to three voluntary sector bodies	93 – 94
PPP002	It is proposed to delete one policy officer from the Strategy and Partnerships department. Overall, the work undertaken by the team would need to be prioritised to focus on statutory requirements and strategic objectives, and lower-priority areas reduced as appropriate.	95 – 97
PPP003	It is proposed to restructure the Communications function in 2020/21 which is likely to result in reductions in staff and the level of support offered by corporate communications.	98 – 99
PPP005	It is proposed to reduce the overall management of the service by aligning specialism across the department. This will include looking at how policy, scrutiny, performance, transformation and communications interrelate. Overall, the work undertaken by the department would need to be prioritised to focus on statutory requirements and strategic objectives, and lower-priority areas reduced as appropriate	100 – 102
PPP007	This saving represents reducing scrutiny committees from three to two. In 2017 a third scrutiny committee was established to give a focus on BHP coming back to the Council's control. It is expected that by 2019 the scrutiny of housing could revert back to the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	103 - 105
PPP008*	This saving can be generated by not providing catering and refreshment services at member meetings	106 – 107

PPP009*	Following a review of translation service usage across the Council it has been found that utilisation can be improved while reducing costs by approximately 12%. This includes better use of skype/conference call capabilities facilitated by the new telephony contract	108 – 109
PPP011*	Restructure and re-grading of the Executive Support Team. In order to ensure all Departments are supported appropriately, team members will be cross trained to enable them to cover all required areas, which will enhance continuity during times of absence	110 - 111
PPP012*	Review of support to political groups	112 – 113
Resources		
Index	**Description**	**Page no.**
RES001	Savings to recognise the impact of the Impower demand management review, income generation and bringing more work in house which will lead to less spend on external legal counsel	114 – 115
RES002	Savings to be achieved following a review of insurance provision and risk management	116 – 117
RES003/4	Service modernisation- more digital services and demand management revised operating model for managing access for all services, streamlining of structures following return of Council Tax in house.	118 – 120
RES005	Service modernisation- more digital services and demand management revised operating model for managing access for all services, streamlining of structures following return of Council Tax in house.	121 – 122
RES006	Savings in relation to hosting One Oracle (£150k) and income from other boroughs within the One Oracle partnership (£120)	123 – 124
RES007	Income from selling IT Services to another Council/external companies and/or another partner within the current shared service model (£330k). Income from selling IT services to Air France (£74k)	125 - 126
RES008	Savings from reductions in print volumes (10%) and removing the option for colour printing	127 – 128
RES009*	Staff savings as result of consolidation of application support teams within the shared service	129 – 130
RES010	Savings to be delivered from within the Resources directorate budget and other smaller budget items	131 – 132
RES011	Review and simplification of Council Tax Support Scheme	133 – 137

RES012	It is proposed to review all existing leases and other income raised with a view to generating additional income	138 - 139

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB001
Service(s):	Public Health
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Savings Proposals:	Savings to be delivered over the lifetime of a new contract following service redesign and re procurement of substance misuse

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	4,100
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	NA commissioned service

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	100	150
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	NA commissioned service	NA commissioned service

Proposed savings

Substance misuse services were redesigned and re-procured during 17/18 with a lead provider and a new service model being put in place from 1/4/18 resulting in savings over the life of the contract

How would this affect users of this service?

Service users were closely involved in the redesign of the service and in the evaluation of tenders. A change in lead provider has been unsettling for some users but they have been kept informed and involved and close attention paid to maintaining outcomes

Following a period of transition we expect service user experience and outcomes to be improved

Key milestones

The work to achieve these savings has been carried out

Key consultations

None required – as contract is in place to deliver savings

Key risks and mitigations

Close contract management to ensure new service model is implemented faithfully and to maintain high performance

These savings are within a ring fenced grant.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	N
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	NO
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Melanie Smith

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB002
Service(s):	Public health
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Savings Proposals:	Recommission public health 0-19 service with children's centres contract to realise efficiencies

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	0-19 service: £5,900 Children's Centres contract £3,000
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	NA commissioned services

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	nil	500
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	nil	NA commissioned services

Proposed savings

A fundamental redesign of the current public health 0-19 service and the Children's Centre services, leading to a joint CYP / PH re-commissioning of a new service which achieves public health and CYP outcomes

The current Children's Centres contract with Barnados ends in March 2020. The current 0-19 public health service contract also ends in March 2020 (although 1+1 extensions are available which would yield an additional £150k over two years if this saving proposal is not progressed)

Note: should the CYP saving CYP010 be progressed, it would not be possible to achieve the full saving as the overall contract would be reduced. The two proposals are interdependent and this one would need to be reduced if CYP010 is progressed.

How would this affect users of this service?

This would need to be explored during market engagement, but the aim would be to bring together these services in a more holistic Family Hub model to improve the service, and the assumption is that the saving would be made through reducing management costs and overheads, to minimise any impact.

Key milestones

Market engagement should take place concurrently with the budget consultation. Procurement of the new combined early years and public health 0-19 service would need to commence in early 19/20

Key consultations

Consultation with the CCG who fund the clinical nursing service in special schools which is part of the 0-19 service

Consultation with local maternity units who provide services from children's centres would be required

Consultation with schools on the future of the school nursing service would be required. Current levels of school nursing are low and further efficiencies are likely to be unpopular.

Engagement with parents will be undertaken in order to assess the potential impact of changes

Key risks and mitigations

Significant efficiencies (15%) were made when the 0-19 service was redesigned and recommissioned.

The additional proposed savings have not been tested with the market. However commencing soft market engagement during budget consultation will help to understand the readiness of the market to provide a new combined early years and public health service.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N

People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes as part of service redesign
EIA to be completed by:	Marie Mcloughlin and CYP nominee
Deadline:	Second half of 19/20

Lead officer for this proposal:	Melanie Smith

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB003
Service(s):	Public Health
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Savings Proposals:	Cease untargeted smoking cessation. Retain only a service for mental health service users and pregnant women

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	500
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	NA commissioned service

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	125	125
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	NA commissioned service	NA commissioned service

Proposed savings

Smoking cessation services currently commissioned from GPs and community pharmacies would be decommissioned. A service would be retained for pregnant women and mental health service users only

How would this affect users of this service?

In 17/18, 1143 smokers were supported to quit by public health commissioned services. Smokers who wish to quit would lose access to free nicotine replacement therapy and to face to face support.

NRT would still be available to purchase or on prescription (charges may be payable). On line and telephone support would be available.

Key milestones

Six month's notice would need to be given to GPs and Community Pharmacies.

If this is delayed until the budget is set in February 2019, the potential savings slip and full year effect is only seen in 20/21.

Key consultations

Public consultation would be required

Consultation with PHE, CCG, LMC and LPC

Key risks and mitigations

Opposition from GPs due to potential increased consultations and prescription costs for nicotine replacement therapy. However quitters would still result in cost savings to the NHS

Strong opposition from community pharmacies who would lose income (42 pharmacies received between £50 and £19,000 income from the service in 17/18)

Precedents have been set: Harrow and Havering have discontinued smoking cessation services, Ealing has recently consulted on plans to do so.

The Council would remain part of the London Smoking Cessation Transformation Programme which is testing on line, digital and telephone support. It should be noted the programme has produced very small numbers of quits to date but it has undoubted potential

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes. In order to inform mitigation of the potential disproportionate impact on pregnant, BAME and disabled smokers
EIA to be completed by:	John Licorish
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Melanie Smith

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB007
Service(s):	Private Housing Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Savings Proposals:	Increased income through the introduction of new and extended services these being; • Extending Selective Licensing to other parts of the Borough • Civil Penalties issued against landlords who are in breach of certain Housing Act related offences.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	380
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	46

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed Saving/income generated:	100	70
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

The proposal consists of two main parts:

1 – Civil Penalties – Legislation allows the Council to carry out civil prosecution of landlords, which have erstwhile been carried out by the Courts. The fines resulting from such cases would therefore be paid directly to the Council. Whilst the legislative framework clearly states that this income should only be used to fund more private rented sector enforcement activity an element can be used to fund the services supporting this function. It is estimated that by 2019/20, fines in the region of £600,000 per year will be issued.
Based on this estimated income, we can achieve a reduction of £100,000 in GF allocation.

2 – Extending Selective Licencing – Commencing from June 2018, the Council extended selective licensing to 5 additional wards in the borough. This will generate extra income for the Council. Although the income can only be used to fund licensing

activities, as staffing increase will be required to meet the extra demand, it can help fund increases in overheads.

The estimated income from the extended service is £2.5M over five years. From this, a contribution of £70,000 per year (£350,000 over five years) can be made to fund overheads.

The Council will be resubmitting applications to MHCLG, which if approved, will bring more wards in over the next year. Should this happen, the contribution will increase accordingly.

How would this affect users of this service?

No services will be reduced, in fact to the contrary, additional income will be invested to additional resources targeting improvements in the Private Rented Sector.

Key milestones

A further application to MHCLG for selective licensing in more wards. We anticipate that if we are successful additional wards would come on stream in April 2019.

Key consultations

Further public consultation will need to be undertaken in order to make an application to MHCLG.

Key risks and mitigations

- Further application unsuccessful.
- Low levels of applications.
- High levels of appeals of Civil Penalty Notices

Legal Comments

Civil penalties under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 have already been introduced by the Cabinet. How much money that is retrieved in fines will depend on how many landlords commit breaches and how many successful prosecutions take place, which will leave them liable to pay civil penalties.

PHS will carry out further research regarding which additional wards in the borough to extend selective licensing and then carry out the necessary consultation. It is not clear which wards where the extension of selective licensing will be sought but the Cabinet will make a decision after consultation and the decision will need to be approved by the Secretary of State. An EIA would need to be carried out during the consultation process. This would be beneficial for tenants though this could have an adverse impact on landlords, some of whom could have protected characteristics.

The costs of licensing fees will need to be in a two stage process following the Gaskin v Richmond judicial review challenge – one to cover the costs of processing the application and one to cover the costs of the scheme (if the application for a

licence is successful). Any increase in fees would need to be justified to cover the costs of administering the selective licensing scheme.

As for what fees can cover, under section 87(7) of the Housing Act 2004, it can cover all costs incurred by the Council in carrying out its functions under Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004 in relation to selective licensing and all costs incurred by the Council in carrying out their functions under Chapter 1 of Part 4 (i.e. interim and final management orders) in relation to houses that come within the selective licensing regimes.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Hakeem Osinaike

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB008
Service(s):	Single Homelessness
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Savings Proposals:	Reduction in the cost of the Single Homelessness Team and supporting people budget, by using New Burdens money to fund posts in the Single Homelessness Team (Flexible Homelessness Support Grant)

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	873
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	19

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	400	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

The Housing Related Support (Supporting People) budget funds posts in what was the Start Plus service, within the Care & Support Team. This team has recently been restructured, to create the Single Homelessness Team, in response to the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017.

The Government have announced new burdens money, with a national pot of £61m, which will be distributed to Local Authorities over the next two years. Brent will receive approximately £1m funding over the next two years.

This proposal offers this fund to make a reduction in the cost of the Singles Homelessness Team by up to £400k.

How would this affect users of this service?

Service users will not be affected as this proposal only concerns how the Single Homelessness Team is funded rather than a reduction of the team, which will have no direct impact on service delivery.

The key question to clarify is whether the proposed changes and savings will hinder the Council in complying with its statutory duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017. However, by using available government funding to support the team, the Council will continue to meet its statutory obligations.

Key milestones
n/a

Key consultations
n/a

Key risks and mitigations

- The New Burdens money is only guaranteed for the next two years, and will be reviewed after year 1. The funding may be reduced or cease all together in future years, so need to be mindful of the impact this will have on the future budget.
- There is a potential funding gap for the homelessness service from 2020/21 and some of the various grants being received from the government are being banked to reduce that gap. Using some of the fund to pay for this team now, could create a further gap in the future.
- It should be noted that any cut to the Housing Related Support (Supporting People) budget will have an impact on the service provided to single homeless households, at a time when we are forecasting an increase in demand with the implementation of the Homeless Reduction Act 2017.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	n/a
Particular ethnic groups	n/a
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	n/a
People of particular sexual orientation/s	n/a
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	n/a
People in particular age groups	n/a
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	n/a
Marriage / civil partnership	n/a

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Hakeem Osinaike

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB009
Service(s):	TA Reform
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Savings Proposals:	Increased acquisition of private sector accommodation through I4B to meet demand from homeless households and thereby avoiding cost of future Temporary Accommodation (TA) provision, especially when South Kilburn TA units are no longer available.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	1,753
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	12

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	0	600
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

The Housing Needs service is currently making use of units on the South Kilburn (SK) Regeneration site, as Temporary Accommodation (TA) to accommodate homeless households. This is an effective use of this stock while units are waiting to be redeveloped, as it not only avoids having to pay for TA units to accommodate homeless households, it also generates an income to the GF in excess of £1m through rent charged to offset TA costs. However the number of units that will be available on the SK site for use as TA will diminish over the next 5 years, as the redevelopment programme is concluded by 2024.

I4B is already acquiring 300 units on the private market to help meet the demand from homeless households. It is proposed that this investment is doubled to acquire a further 300 units, to mitigate the impact of the loss of TA provision on the SK site, and so avoid the cost of having to accommodate homeless households in TA

How would this affect users of this service?

Due to the lack of supply of social housing the Council is using the power to meet new demand from homeless households with accommodation in the Private Rented Sector (PRS). However, there is an insufficient supply of PRS accommodation that is affordable in Brent.

Increasing the supply of affordable PRS accommodation for homeless families will result in a decrease in the use of Temporary Accommodation, and so will have a positive impact on service users.

There are no Public Sector Equality issues involved. There would need to be a careful assessment and management of the risks involved – especially the need for the Council to borrow and to avoid market saturation.

Key milestones

- Properties Acquired
- Refurbishment
- Letting in accordance with the Council's Placement Policy

Key consultations

None

Key risks and mitigations

- Significant borrowing will be required to achieve the investment needed in street purchases
- Possible market saturation

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Hakeem Osinaike

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB010
Service(s):	First Wave Housing
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Savings Proposals:	Increased income generation through an investment in 50 units of Private Sector accommodation by First Wave, let at market rates

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	0
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	0

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:		£250
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

First Wave, as a Registered Provider and an arms-length wholly owned company of the Council, is able to invest in market rent properties. We are exploring what level of investment is required for this and how much income it will generate. The additional income can be used to offset General Fund costs and is based on an initial loan arrangement fee in year one and interest from a small number of units and then annual on lending income to the Council from interest on 50 units. The First Wave Board and business plan would need to agree the investment and consider the business risks to the company.

How would this affect users of this service?

There would be no effect on users of the current service. The service would be a new service and provided to customers able to rent from the private market. The introduction of this service is to create a surplus to support other activities of the Council and more affordable housing.

Key milestones

- Full business case complete 30th November.
- Loan agreement agreed circa £17,500,000 (average £350 per unit) creating a set up fee for the council of £175,000 and an annual loan interest income from 2020 of £52,500 based on 6.0% loan rate.
- 10 private market rented units purchased by April 2019 and 50 units by April 2020.
- 10 private rented units let by June 2019 and 50 units let June 2020.

Key consultations

- First Wave Board of Directors
- i4B Programme Manager – Chris Brown

Key risks and mitigations

- Significant borrowing will be required to achieve the investment needed following the acquisition of street properties for market rent and the standards will need to be higher than those of social or PRS/i4B properties in order to attract market renter at market rents.
- Properties acquired will need to be in locations able to attract a market rent 20% higher than Local Housing Allowance rents. This is challenging with an assumed average purchase price of £350k per unit.
- Market rent customers currently have significant choice in Brent due to significant volumes of market rental accommodation becoming available in particular, Wembley Park, Wembley High Street, Alperton and South Kilburn. In addition a number of development companies are changing their financial model from sales to rent to manage market changes and uncertainty.
- First Wave Housing currently has a Loan agreement with LB Brent at a market rate of circa 6.0%. LB Brent is able to benefit from a loan arrangement fee circa 1% of the loan.
- Through the loan arrangement LB Brent is able to make a surplus through 'on lending' to First Wave Housing.
- Although the council would financially benefit as a lender it is unproven that First Wave Housing would be able to sustain the borrowing and deliver services without subsidising the product from its other income.
- A full business case would be required to the First Wave Board to evidence the ability of First Wave Housing to repay the loan and manage this new product provide the service required to tenants. A detailed finance model will be required to take into account key variables including;

    - The Yield (margin following deduction of costs)(Net Yield) – This very much depends on :
        - Interest rate – to avoid failing state aid rules and to generate a surplus to LB Brent the loan agreement would need to set interest rates circa 6%. As the loan set up fee and annual interest are critical aspect interest. First Wave Housing current loan agreement is circa 6% although it purchased its stock ten

years ago at a lower market price. In contrast i4B has a preferential loan as it provides sub market rented accommodation and affordable housing products.

- There is a real risk of over inflating the local market currently buying (£60m) 150 Brent properties for PRS, £25m of properties for NAIL, we want to request the purchase of another 100 I4B PRS properties next year. In reality we would need block purchases at a good price
- Availability of suitable properties – A restriction on the PRS programme at the moment is the availability of suitable properties on the market to buy. This scarcity will be exaggerated for the purchase of properties suitable for market rent as location and quality is critical if the product is to achieve rents circa Local Housing Allowance plus 20%.
- The additional cost of refurbishing properties to a standard expected by market rental customers.
- Housing management, works and repair costs – I4B and First Wave would be able to amend their services to deliver.

- As First Wave Housing is an established business with fewer risks than i4B housing an exploration of the relative merits of this product being placed with First Wave Housing or i4B. i4B explored market renting during the development of its 2018/2019 business plan but removed the product from its final proposals.
- Rent levels – assume rates 20% higher than Local Housing Allowance.
- Surpluses will lag purchases so no quick revenue win.
- Corporation tax may consume 20% of the surplus before dividend is paid although as First Wave is a settled business the expenditure may act to limit the requirement to pay corporation tax.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	*N/A*

Lead officer for this proposal:	Hakeem Osinaike

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB012
Service(s):	Supporting People
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Farah

Savings Proposals:	Supported Living and Housing Related Support – to challenge and renegotiate the current highest costing Supported Living places. To analyse void costs and ensure people who no longer require SP are moved on to PRS or into permanent accommodation based care solution.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**4,353**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	250	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

The proposal is to review and renegotiate the highest cost supported living placements, whilst also reviewing the through put of people in housing related support funded services. The current intention for HRS accommodation is that it provides a step-down option to support people to live independently in the community, however, in some cases this is not happening. We will review people who have been living in HRS funded accommodation for over 3 years and identify move on plans to support them into other forms of accommodation. This will allow us to reduce the overall amount of HRS required.

How would this affect users of this service?

Some individuals who have been living in HRS funded accommodation may be settled and resistant to moving on. Individual plans will be produced in consultation with residents regarding their longer term housing solution, and no resident will be evicted without a housing alternative in place.

Key milestones

Identification of highest cost placements.
Agreed negotiation strategy for negotiating the cost of placements
Identification and review of people who have been in HRS accommodation for over 3 years.
Development of a prioritised list for move on.
Work with housing colleagues to identify alternative housing solutions.
Support individuals to implement alternative housing (and if required) support plans.

Key consultations

Individual consultation will be required with identified individuals, and with their families.

Key risks and mitigations

Risks involve unwillingness of long term residents to move on. Risk will be mitigated through individual consultation and review of individual needs and then working with housing colleagues to identify alternative housing options.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Martin Crick

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB013
Service(s):	NAIL
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Farah

Savings Proposals:	Increasing NAIL provision to support more users, but also developing provision to support higher need users and support some users who would have gone into nursing care.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**11,000**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	0	2,000
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

Despite successful demand management within ASC, the number of people requiring and who are eligible for services is increasing. Therefore we are proposing increasing the number of NAIL units we develop to help mitigate the cost pressure of this demand, but also developing specialist provision to cater for people who might otherwise have needed nursing care.

How would this affect users of this service?

Outcomes for individuals in residential and nursing care and poor – lower life expectancy and poorer quality of life. Individuals who are supported in their own accommodation and who remain in the community have much better outcomes, therefore the impact on service users will be positive.

Key milestones

Identification of additional sites suitable for building or converting into 40+ unit extra care facilities. An additional 59 units of high support NAIL will be required to achieve the savings target.

Once identified, the process for designing, building and managing the construction process will need to be followed, alongside the commissioning of a care provider, identification of suitable individuals to move and individual reviews for all of the identified people.

Key consultations

Individual consultation will be required with identified individuals, and with their families. Depending on the sites located, consultation with neighbours or the community through the planning process may be required.

Key risks and mitigations

Risk involve time delays and unexpected cost when developing provisions. NAIL has been running successfully for 2 years and there has been a lot of useful learning in this time that helps us to mitigate these risks. This includes the use of the HCIB board to monitor the progress of projects with a cross council board who can progress issues if required, stronger relationships between different departments within the Council and stronger project management tools and resources.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB014
Service(s):	CHC
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Farah

Savings Proposals:	Continuing Health Care (CHC) – Continue to challenge decisions regarding CHC assessments at every point of referral.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£ (5,515)**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	400	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

Robust challenge during CHC assessment process where cost should be met by health. Health are continuing to fund a full time CHC/Adult Social Care (ASC) post to ensure we have specialist input into assessments and the ability to challenge. Agreed changes to procedure, including ceasing funding placement awaiting a CHC assessment or decision on a without prejudice basis, and ceasing paying the total placement cost and recharging the CCG.

How would this affect users of this service?

Where the process results in CHC funding or an increase in CHC funding for an individual, this is a positive outcome for the person as it means less or none of their package is chargeable, and ensures closer health oversight as appropriate. Where placements are not funded on a without prejudice basis, the impact is likely to be that individuals will wait longer for placements to be agreed. However, this can be mitigated through robust challenge of the CCG around timescales.

Key milestones

Changes to the CHC process have already been implemented, including the Council stopping funding placements on a without prejudice basis and paying the full cost of the placement then recharging the CCG.

The process for challenging CHC decisions and assessment is also in place, and is being continuously delivered.

Key consultations

None required.

Key risks and mitigations

Risk that health are reject challenges or do not accept liability for costs.

Risks is mitigated through ongoing partnership working with health and continuing dialogue when challenging.

A further risk is that costs saved through robust challenge are offset by the transfer of costs/packages that have previously been fully CHC funded by health to social care. Currently, social care are not involved in these assessment and have no say where CHC is reduced from fully funded to joint funded. Further work is needed to identify these costs. Mitigation will be through discussion and agreement of a joint process with health for packages where costs are being transferred, and discussion of a joint CHC team.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Duncan-Turnbull

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB015
Service(s):	Homecare
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Farah

Savings Proposals:	Recommissioning homecare packages above Brent's average rate

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**19,600**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	380	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

Brent has set a sustainable hourly rate for homecare, both through using market intelligence and through developing a local cost model. For 2018/19, the average hourly rate for all home care providers was £15.04.

However, we do have some providers who receive more than £15.04. The proposal is to negotiate/re-commission all providers so that Brent pays a single hourly rate for all home care packages.

In 17/18 there was approx. £380k of spend that is above the Brent average hourly rate.

How would this affect users of this service?

If providers were not willing to renegotiate their rate, then we would potentially consider moving the service that an individual receives to a provider who would accept the hourly rate. This could be disruptive for some service users who have formed a relationship with their carer. This could be mitigated by offering those individuals a direct payment so they could employ their own carer directly, but many individuals may not want to take up this option.

Key milestones

- Identify packages funded above the hourly rate, arrange for individual reviews.
- Arrange price negotiation discussions with relevant providers
- Determine whether package of care could be moved to another agency if provider will not accept new rate.
- Offer DPs to individuals who do not wish for their package of care to be moved.

Key consultations

Individual consultation with service users and their families regarding changing care provider if required.

Key risks and mitigations

Capacity in the homecare market is challenging, and despite our local hourly rate being sustainable for the borough, surrounding borough are willing to pay a higher hourly rate to the same providers.

Brent's average hourly rate in 17/18 was £14.51. This is comparable to Harrow, but less than some of our other WLA neighbours.
It should also be noted that although our hourly rate in 18/19 has increased to £15.04 due to an increase in the National Living Wage,

It is also worth noting that some of the packages where costs are above our average rates are specialist packages where clients have very complex or challenging needs (for example, one package is delivered by a specialist deafblind provider, and several are packages for children with complex needs in the transitions team). Similarly, complexity and acuity of people requiring home care is increasing, and some packages are higher cost due to the risk or acuity of the service user, which can include people who are very difficult to place or who have very challenging behaviour.

Risk will be mitigated by accepting a certain percentage of packages are outliers and will therefore be exempt from re-negotiation. Further mitigation includes extensive market engagement to ensure that there is enough capacity to mitigate against provider refusing to negotiate or accept our average price.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N

People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB016
Service(s):	Placement Review
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Farah

Savings Proposals:	Continuing robust challenge of individual package costs based on evidence as part of annual placement reviews.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**18,000**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	350	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

There are currently over 180 placement care packages, which cost the Council over £1000 a week.
A number of these packages will be reviewed as part of the NAIL programme, and the person will move to supported living or extra care accommodation where that is appropriate. However, for those people where a move to supported living or extra care is not appropriate, the Council needs to ensure that the rate paid is value for money. This saving proposal is focused on those placements and negotiating the price of these placements down to ensure they are value for money.

How would this affect users of this service?

Negotiation of price of placement will have no impact on service users.

Key milestones

The Residential and Nursing Commissioning Team are set up to review placements on an annual basis. They have a clear annual work programme, which includes priority allocation of cases above £1,000 per week.

Key consultations

None required.

Key risks and mitigations

Risk that with the move of less complex packages into NAIL provision, the people left in placements are higher acuity and therefore the scope to reduce costs of packages will be less.

Risks are mitigated through robust examination of all provider costs and challenge, as well as development of Supplier Relationship Manager posts in the Commissioning Team to support market development and improve relationships with providers.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB017
Service(s):	Day Care Price Negotiation
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Farah

Savings Proposals:	Re-negotiating the price of all external day care provision.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**2,700**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	270	250
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

Current externally commissioned day care in Brent is commissioned according to an old fashioned and out of date model. The majority of provision is expensive, building based and does not offer choice and control to service users. Additionally, there is an over provision of traditional day care in Brent, meaning that providers are not transforming their services, and often wish to increase their costs to the council to make up for low take up of their services. Prices for very similar services are variable, and some providers charge extra to the council for transport and meals, while some providers including this in their price.

The commissioning service intends to work with providers to re-negotiate the price of commissioned day care services, to reflect the offer available to Brent service users and to ensure that there is consistency of offer and of pricing Given that existing provision is out dated, we want to work with providers to agree a fairer price based on the existing model of support. We also believe that it should be possible to re-negotiate transport costs that account for a significant proportion of spend on day care services.

Separately, the Commissioning service is working with providers to redesign day care services into a new model that supports more choice and control and promotes less building based provision.

How would this affect users of this service?

The proposal is not to cut services or to reduce the amount of provision that individuals receive, but rather to re-negotiate price with providers. This will have no impact on the people receiving the service.

Key milestones

- Data collection and analysis of price of day care provision
- Market engagement with providers to present proposals and agree new charges for care
- Implementation of new prices for care in order to achieve savings proposal

Key consultations

Discussions on service costs will happen with providers on a case by case basis, but consultation will not be required under this savings proposal. Similarly, there will not be a requirement to consult with service users, as there are no plans to change or withdraw services under this proposal.

Key risks and mitigations

There is a risk that providers will not accept a price re-negotiation and withdraw services. This is a limited risk for some providers, as the majority (if not all) of their business comes from the local authority. We also have an excess of capacity in the market meaning we can ask providers to be more competitive in their pricing.

We will also engage with providers ahead of changes we want to make to the day care model in Brent and use the engagement work that we'll do to start conversations on new models of care. We want to do this with providers who are committed to working in Brent, but who accept that changes are required to the way services are provided.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N

People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB018
Service(s):	Prevention Contracts
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Farah, Cllr Hirani

Savings Proposals:	Non statutory ASC services will be specified with public health to include a stronger focus on prevention and health promotion.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**200**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	200	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

A number of contracts have been identified that have the potential to contribute to public health outcomes through support for preventative services. These services will be re-specified and recommissioned through the PH grant.

How would this affect users of this service?

The services will be recommissioned to deliver broader outcomes, ASC required outcomes and public health outcomes, so the impact on service users should be positive. This is a re-commissioning proposal with an administrative change in budgets and so if there is an impact in services it will be positive.

Key milestones

1. Identify services which could be re-specified and recommissioned to increase their public health impact.
2. Agree Public Health funding suitability with DPH and Finance
3. Re-specify and undertake procurement.
4. Finance to amend budget coding.

Key consultations

None required.

Key risks and mitigations

There is a risk that changes to the use of PH grants will mean the identified contracts cannot be funded. Risk will be mitigated by ensuring that only preventative and PH contracts are identified.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CWB021
Service(s):	Housing Association Landlords Scheme (HALS)
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Savings Proposals:	Reductions to £1.6m growth in 2019/20 in line with projected conversion of Temporary Accommodation (Housing Association Lease Schemes (HALS) tenants) to reasonable rents.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£4,400**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**n/a**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	300	300
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

The council is currently spending £70 p/w per family on the HALS scheme, totalling £4.4m pa.

However, many landlords are handing back their HALS leases because they can make more rent in the private market. This means that families in Temporary Accommodation are made homeless, need to move, and the Council needs to find accommodation for them again.

Therefore, the council will cease working with RPs to procure units of temporary accommodation in the private rented sector accommodation under the HALS scheme. Instead, the Council will work with the same RPs to offer a more competitive 'Reasonable Rent' to secure accommodation which can be used to end the main homelessness duty through a nominations agreement with the RPs.

The future funding of the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant (FHSG) is becoming increasingly uncertain beyond 2019/20, which will have a significant financial impact on all forms of "TA accommodation". So the Reasonable Rents scheme would only form part of the financial mitigation required to manage the ongoing funding requirement for TA.

There is a budget growth bid of £1.6m for 2019/20 due to pressures from the increased HALS management fees. The savings in this report are proposing to start recouping the £1.6m growth bid over three years as existing HALS units are converted to Reasonable Rents when they become void.

How would this affect users of this service?

The Reasonable Rent model will mean increased supply of accommodation in Brent by converting a HALS property to a Reasonable Rent property if the landlord won't renew as HALS, rather than losing it, as well as bringing new landlords in. This means more families could stay in Brent, and fewer families would need to move to poor quality and expensive out of borough TA.

Key milestones

Amend the Council's Allocation Scheme to include making offers of short life leased accommodation under Part 6 of the Housing Act 1996 to homelessness households who have been accepted under homelessness legislation.

Key consultations

Consultation with key stakeholders regarding proposed amendments to the Council's Allocation Scheme.

Key risks and mitigations

- Projected conversion rates can be slower than anticipated as new tenants will be placed on reasonable rents when a property becomes void.
- Reasonable Rents are untested and there is a risk that the Rent Officer could give an adverse decision.
- There could be a range of different Rent levels that the Rent Officer feel are "Reasonable". A possible (pessimistic) scenario could that the Reasonable Rents were not fully funded and only funded under UC to the level of LHA + £50pw, in which case the council could theoretically incur additional estimated costs of £0.9m pa.
- However, in this scenario the Council would mitigate the pressure and adjust its policy in the light of Rent Officer determinations. This would affect which properties are switched to reasonable rents and towards procurement of new properties in the north of the borough.

Legal Comments

An EIA would need to be completed during consultation period of amending allocations scheme, specifically regarding the proposal to make offers of short life accommodation under the allocations scheme to homeless household applicants. Homeless applicants would be treated differently from other applicants on the allocations scheme as other applicants would not be provided with offers of short life accommodation. An EIA would be required to clarify if there are any potential

adverse impacts on persons with protected characteristics as a result of this proposal to make short life offers of accommodation to homeless persons (as opposed to other applicants for housing under the Council's allocations scheme).

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

We are about to start public consultation on the Allocation Scheme review, part of which will determine the introduction of the reasonable rents scheme. The outcome of the consultation will be a proposed revised allocation scheme to Cabinet. The report to Cabinet will include an EIA on the whole scheme, which of course includes Reasonable rents.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Laurence Coaker
Deadline:	*February 2019*

Lead officer for this proposal:	Hakeem Osinaike

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E001
Service(s):	Environmental Improvement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Sheth

Savings Proposals:	Further Street Lighting Efficiencies

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£250k**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**N/A**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:		£100k
	FTE	**FTE**
Proposed staffing reduction	N/A	N/A

Budget Implications

An additional £0.1m p.a. could be saved through a further rigorous review of lighting levels at a highly localised level across the borough.

How would this affect users of this service?

Some users may notice lower lighting levels than expected at certain locations, especially given that previous reductions have been made. Any impact must not be sufficient to affect lighting levels required for road safety, or to meet expectations of community safety.

Key milestones

Complete review and implement detailed Lighting Plan – 2019

Key consultations

N/A. Resident and visitor feedback on lighting levels could be acted on quickly.

Key risks and mitigations

Some users will likely notice lower lighting levels than expected at certain locations. Should the lighting level not be acceptable at a specific location the CMS does allow corrective adjustments to be made rapidly.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E002A
Service(s):	Environmental Improvement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Sheth

Savings Proposals:	Remove Litter Picking on Zone 5 Roads

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£ 6m**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£180K	-
	FTE	**FTE**
Proposed staffing reduction	N/A	N/A

Budget Implications

An £180k full year saving of contract operational costs. The process required to obtain agreement and to develop an operational plan means there is no opportunity to bring forward savings to this financial year.

How would this affect users of this service?

This would see residential roads cleansed less often.

Key milestones

- Negotiation with Veolia – Sep 2018
- Decision – Late 2018 / Early 2019
- Communications – Jan – March 2019

Key consultations

- Veolia
- Residents
- Businesses

Key risks and mitigations

- Negative impact on cleansing standards
- Negative impact on Customer Satisfaction
- Direct impact on KOT's
- Hinder ability to achieve KOTs and performance targets.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E002B
Service(s):	Environmental Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Sheth

Savings Proposals:	Remove Litter Bins in Zone 5

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£6m**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**N/A**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£70K	-
	FTE	**FTE**
Proposed staffing reduction	N/A	N/A

Budget Implications

A full year £70k saving of contract operational costs. The process required to obtain agreement and to develop an operational plan means there is no opportunity to bring forward savings to this financial year.

How would this affect users of this service?

There would be fewer bins available to residents seeking to dispose of litter.

Key milestones

- Negotiation with Veolia – Sep 2018
- Decision – Late 2018 / Early 2019
- Communications – Jan – March 2019
- Removal of bins – March 2019

Key consultations

- Veolia
- Residents
- Businesses

Key risks and mitigations

- Negative impact on cleansing standards
- Negative impact on Customer Satisfaction
- Direct impact on KOT's
- Hinder ability to achieve KOTs and performance targets.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E003
Service(s):	Environmental Improvement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Sheth

Savings Proposals:	Reduce parks infrastructure spend to leave resource for reactive works only.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	£310k
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**N/A**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£200k	
	FTE	**FTE**
Proposed staffing reduction	N/A	N/A

Budget Implications

£200k could be removed from the Parks maintenance revenue budget on the basis this would leave sufficient resource for reactive repairs.

How would this affect users of this service?

This should not affect parks users.

Key milestones

Has been introduced early in 2018/19.

Key consultations

None required.

Key risks and mitigations

Separate capital improvement proposals are being considered that will improve the infrastructure of our parks and so mitigate the impact of a reduced reactive maintenance budget.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E004
Service(s):	Regeneration – Building Control
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Tatler

Savings Proposals:	Brent Building Control continues to show a good track record in competitively winning major projects through partnership schemes. Unless there is a major economic downturn we expect to improve our income position by focussing on discretionary services. A flexible 'associates' resourcing model is being implemented to allow the service to operate effectively on projects across the London and south east region. The proposed savings comprise fees earned due to increase in volume of work and providing additional services through associates.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	(413)
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	16.8

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	176	35
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

The generation of additional income by the Building Control team. £100k is adjusting the budget to match current workload, with the remainder to come from out-of-borough associate work.

How would this affect users of this service?

No significant impact expected.

Key milestones

In implementation

Key consultations

None

Key risks and mitigations

Down turn in the economy - keep close monitor / develop further partnerships
Unexpected government policies affecting Building Control resulting from Grenfell

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	None
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Aktar Choudhury

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E005
Service(s):	Regeneration - Employment, Skills and Enterprise
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Agha, Cllr Tatler

Savings Proposals:	A combination of staff reductions and additional income to generate the savings. Income projections will depend on securing external funding and sponsorships and further increasing take up on some courses within START.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	335
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	48.97 (Does not include Tutors)

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	380	-
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction		

Proposed savings

This saving would be generated through a combination of efficiencies, primarily rationalisation of staffing in management positions and more efficient delivery of Brent Start courses and income from fees and external grants.

Cost Centre	**Source of saving**	**Amount £'000**
B08161 – Brent Start/ ESFA	Efficiencies	(87)
	Income from fees and grant	(50)
B08095	Efficiencies	(223)
	Income from grant	(20)
	Total	(380)

How would this affect users of this service?

The main implication of the staffing reductions will be further capacity limitations of undertaking developmental work and potential servicing of strategic work.

Key milestones

Staff Consultation

Key consultations

Affected staff

Key risks and mitigations

START service provides an income stream for other council departments- service changes could impact on other department income streams.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	N
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Matt Dibben

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E006
Service(s):	Environmental Improvement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Sheth

Savings Proposals:	Expand Litter Patrol Activity

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£250k**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**N/A**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£200K	-
	FTE	**FTE**
Proposed staffing reduction	N/A	N/A

Budget Implications

This proposal would provide additional litter enforcement capacity in order to improve the condition of the public realm. Increased deployment would see more litter hot-spots targeted for improvement and would provide £200k additional litter fines per annum. There is opportunity to bring savings forward as the proposal is simply an expansion of existing operational arrangements.

How would this affect users of this service?

This proposal would see additional enforcement officers deployed on Brent streets and this will create an overall improvement in the condition of the public realm.

Key milestones

Recruitment from October 2018

Key consultations

None required because this would be a simple expansion of existing arrangements.

Key risks and mitigations

The main risk is that the revenue from enforcement fails to cover operational costs to the extent that is forecast. Mitigation would be a carefully managed and intelligence-led operation that is likely to be most effective in countering waste and litter offences.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E007
Service(s):	Regeneration – Planning Enforcement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Miller

Savings Proposals: (Appendix A)	Planning Enforcement has consistently recovered proceeds of crime act (POCA) monies through planning related investigations and prosecutions. This track record provides sufficient confidence to offer up the equivalent of circa 1.5 posts, to be funded from POCA proceeds.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	402
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	9

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	60	-
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

Use of POCA receipts to fund 1.5 posts. Savings can be brought forward to 18/19.

How would this affect users of this service?

No impact

Key milestones

In implementation

Key consultations

None

Key risks and mitigations

High dependency on other council support POCA work including strong support from Legal. Need to ensure resources are maintained within Legal.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	None
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Tim Rolt

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E008
Service(s):	Regeneration - Licensing
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Miller

Savings Proposals:	A potential increase in revenue arising from increased activity in Wembley. Improvement works on Olympic Way should be largely complete by 2020. The improvements should result in an increase in the number of events at Wembley and with it an increase in the workload for the Licensing service.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	(154)
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	7

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:		50
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction		

Proposed savings

Income from additional licensing arising from increased activity in Wembley after 2020. The additional income cannot be generated until Olympic Way works are complete.

How would this affect users of this service?

No impact

Key milestones

Completion of Olympic Way

Key consultations

None

Key risks and mitigations

Delay in completing Olympic Way - Work closely with Quintain to ensure works progress to plan.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	None
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	None
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Alice Lester

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E009
Service(s):	Regeneration – Planning – Development Control
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Tatler

Savings Proposals:	Increased income arising from 20% increase on planning application fees (except prior approvals) and expected rise in planning applications from increased housing targets

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	46
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	37.14

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	350	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction		

Proposed savings

Increased income from a 20% uplift in Planning Fees - this is a Central Government initiative. Also expected rise in the number of planning applications arising from increased housing targets.

How would this affect users of this service?

Small developers and residents will be affected by the increased fees.

Key milestones

London Plan adoption – setting new targets for homes.

Key consultations

None

Key risks and mitigations

Downturn in development activity.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	None
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	None
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Alice Lester

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E010A
Service(s):	Neighbourhood Management
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Sheth

Savings Proposals:	Revision of Opening Hours at the Re-use and Recycling Centre at Abbey Road

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£440K**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**N/A**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£60k	-
	FTE	**FTE**
Proposed staffing reduction	N/A	N/A

Budget Implications

£60k will be saved by reducing opening hours.

How would this affect users of this service?

The site is currently open 7 days a week from 8am till 4pm.

This proposal would seek to revise and reduce those opening hours, making the site still available at busy times but closing the site at times when visitor numbers are known to be low.

The site would therefore no longer be available to residents for the disposal of waste items at certain times which are now currently available.

Key milestones

- Agreement on approach with WLWA – October 2018
- Cabinet Decision Autumn 2018
- Communications Programme Jan – March 2019
- Revised Operating Hours – April 2019

Key consultations

- All users of the site, WLWA, neighbouring boroughs

Key risks and mitigations

A consequence of reduced operating hours may mean the site is less accessible to some users. This may lead to an increase in the dumping of waste. Customer satisfaction may be impacted in that some customers may have become used to visiting the site at certain times that may no longer be available. That may be a considerable inconvenience depending on individual circumstances. The site is currently marketed as a free alternative to the green bin service for the disposal of garden waste. Reduced operating hours may compromise that offer for some customers, depending on their circumstances.

Any revision of hours should retain access at busy times and ensure closure only applies to periods when visitor numbers are likely to be low.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E018
Service(s):	Environmental Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllrs Sheth, Miller and Tatler

Savings Proposals:	Staffing and Structures – Removal of circa 40 FTE – VR Offer and Compulsory.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£4m**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**N/A**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£1,524K	450
	FTE	**FTE**
Proposed staffing reduction	N/A	N/A

Budget Implications

An annual £1,974k saving of staff salary costs. Some offset may be due with respect to redundancy, severance and the cost of service redesign and possible re-evaluation of other posts. There is potential for savings to be brought into this financial year, depending on vacancies that arise.

How would this affect users of this service?

This would be a 'downsizing' exercise that will make teams leaner and would require a remodelling of structures to mitigate the impact on service delivery.

Key milestones

Managing change consultations as appropriate and also vacancies held and removed throughout the year.

Key consultations

Affected staff as and when required.

Key risks and mitigations

The opportunity could be limited to voluntary redundancy applications that are agreed. Further mitigation of the impact on staff could be through holding and removing vacant posts. Initial investigation of likely interest in VR suggests no compulsory redundancies are likely to be necessary.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte

Budget Options Information

Reference:	R&E022A
Service(s):	Community Protection
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Miller

Savings Proposals:	Stop Met Patrol Plus provision from April 2020

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	400k
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	12

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:		400
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction		12

Proposed savings

The 12 Met Patrol Plus officers known as the 'Partnership Tasking Team' (PTT) for year 17/18 have recorded over 4000 responses related to the Safer Brent Partnership priorities; namely, Anti-Social Behaviour, Gangs, Serious Violence, Domestic and Sexual Abuse, Child Sexual Exploitation, Offender Management and Hate Crime.

Such responses have included various outcomes:
1900 disruptions, over 200 arrests, over 100 weapon sweeps and 200 PSPO/CPN/FPN warnings and fines being issues. As well as enforcement the PTT have also lead positive Police engagement in our community, more than 120 times.

This resource and related responses as outlined above is additional asset to current borough Police resource. It is proposed to stop Met Patrol Plus service from April 2020.

This option is to remove the service altogether from 2020 thus saving £400k.

This will heavily reduce outcomes and responses.

How would this affect users of this service?

Impact on staff – Removed multi-faceted asset and resource to task/deploy on a proactive and more importantly reactive response. Our PTT are multifaceted police officers, as they have a specific understanding and knowledge base focused to our needs which can also be flexible. This would normally not be the case for any other borough Police officer.

Increased time liaising/advocating/waiting for borough Police to ensure Safer Brent Partnership priorities targeted.

No authority over Police tasking.

Impact of residents – reduced Police presence on the streets.

The PTT generally react to complaints made to the council, so residents can clearly see the response to their complaints which is always positive.

Reduced community engagement form specialist Police officers, offering a different dynamic to Policing for residents.

Key milestones

Formally give notice to the Metropolitan Police Service to end/change the contract in September 2019.

Key consultations

Not applicable as the Met Police would still provide a Policing service, albeit not targeted specifically in the areas that the Council and Safer Brent Partnership would like.

Key risks and mitigations

This service is over and above the existing borough Police provision. Borough Police have reduced numbers and focus the asset they do have on MOPAC priorities and more general targeted outcomes.

We will have reduced/zero Police asset to task/deploy and focus on our priorities based on the requests/needs of our residents.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N

People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	*N/A*

Lead officer for this proposal:	Amar Dave

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP001
Service(s):	School Effectiveness (Coordinating)
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Agha

Savings Proposals:	DSG to make appropriate contribution to the services that support schools and the priority projects agreed by Schools Forum.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**N/A**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**N/A**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	250	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	

Proposed savings

- Work within the amended regulations to fund some statutory education functions (former ESG retained duties) from the Dedicated Schools Grant. This requires annual approval from the Schools Forum.
- The £250k would be a contribution from the DSG towards the cost of the responsibilities held for all schools. These responsibilities fall under 3 headings;
    - Statutory and regulatory duties (including planning for the education offer as a whole, financial responsibilities for the DSG, internal audit duties, Director of Children's Services)
    - Education Welfare (including statutory duties to promote the educational welfare of children and young people)
    - Asset Management (including general landlord duties for all buildings owned by the LA including those leased to Academies).
- There are approximately 60,000 3 to 19 year olds in maintained and academy settings in the borough. The proposed contribution equates to a cost of £4 per capita.
- 27 of the other London Boroughs make a contribution from DSG towards these retained duties. The average contribution in 2017/18 is £500K. It is recognised in Brent that school funding will be constrained as the national

funding formula is implemented, and a lower than average contribution is proposed.
- Nationally the average contribution to these retained duties by each Local Authority is benchmarked at £16 per head.

How would this affect users of this service?

The users of this service are the schools in the borough and implementing this arrangement would help secure and protect the current delivery levels of services.

Key milestones

- School Forum decision in December 2018.

Key consultations

- Schools will be consulted through Schools Forum on the detail of these proposals to secure approval of the use of these funds. A detailed business case would need to be presented, highlighting the benefits of the services provided, and benchmarking against local and leading authorities.

Key risks and mitigations

- Individual schools experience a lack of impact from these funded services. This risk will be mitigated through regular communication with schools regarding service delivery as part of Council business as usual activity.
- Consultation with Schools Forum on an annual basis leaves annual risk and uncertainty on the service level available. It is proposed to mitigate this risk by submitting Forum decision papers to ask Forum for a decision in principle for a 2 year period.
- Future changes to school funding by national government would remain a risk to this proposal. This risk will be mitigated by regular review of announcements from central Government by the Finance Team and actions being taken in response to any future announcements through Schools Forum to set a balanced DSG budget

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No

People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Brian Grady

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP002
Service(s):	Forward Planning, Performance and Partnerships
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	Maximising the benefits claimed by care leavers

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**(50)** **Income budget**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	150	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	

Proposed savings

- Building on the current savings in the leaving care budget that have resulted from joined up working across the Council to improve the rate of take up of Housing Benefit support.
- Saving equates to a projected increase in benefits take up for a further 50 care leavers.

How would this affect users of this service?

- There should be minimal impact on service users. This saving action is to ensure maximum benefits, particularly housing benefits, are claimed to support users rather than utilise the existing Placements' budget.
- This will assist care leavers in their preparation for independence by moving them into mainstream, universal support.

Key milestones

- Monthly finance and data reporting on progress of benefits take up from October 2018 to Heads of Service and Operational Directors.
- Semi-independent accommodation providers for care leavers will be monitored against support to care leavers to enable improved benefit take up rates within their monthly reports to the Council from December 2018.

Key consultations

- None.

Key risks and mitigations

- Case complexity and structural issues with out of borough providers prevent rapid progress being achieved. Mitigated by enhancing the existing model, the established links with internal Council services (e.g. Housing Benefit) and connections with neighbouring authorities. Regular and consistent training for Personal Advisors on welfare benefits entitlements will ensure young people are able to claim the appropriate support.
- Any changes in welfare regulations will require adjustments to current systems. This will be mitigated by the using the lead in time to any changes to make adjustments to systems.
- Increased complexity/value of claims (rollout of Universal credit). This will be mitigated by utilising training for Personal Advisors and ensuring a joined up approach continues to be effective between the Leaving Care and Housing Benefit teams in the Council.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Onder Beter and Shirley Parks

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP003
Service(s):	Forward Planning, Performance and Partnerships
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	Placement commissioning across West London Alliance.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**16,000**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**0**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	150	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	

Proposed savings

- Building on the cross LA joint work with the West London Alliance (WLA) to realise further savings and specific benefits from proposed new projects.
- Fully engage and implement the WLA dynamic purchasing system to reduce unit cost of spot purchased fostering and children's home placements, through increased competition.
- Agreeing block contracts for children's home places leading to cost-volume discounts on prices for the largest suppliers.

How would this affect users of this service?

- This will provide looked after children and care leavers with greater sufficiency of accommodation either within or closer to Brent.
- It will enable more effective quality assurance of provision through a block contracting approach.

Key milestones

- Foster care provider engagement November 2018
- Agree children's home demand subject to market test December 2018
- Market test children's home block contract options January 2019

Key consultations

- None.

Key risks and mitigations

- Market supply versus demand. There is a risk that there will not be sufficient capacity to meet demand. Incentives through DPS and block contracts should help mitigate this risk.
- When utilising block contracts the authority takes on more financial risk which is currently held by the supplier (e.g. management of voids). This is mitigated by demand for places being commissioned by several boroughs.
- Agreement by several boroughs may take additional time, due to complexity of approvals processes and this may dilute original aims resulting in slippage and unrealised savings. This risk will be mitigated by strong project governance and borough project representation with appropriate delegated responsibility.
- Legal challenge from suppliers to proposed schemes. This risk will be mitigated by regular provider dialogue and legal consultation as the process develops.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Shirley Parks

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP004
Service(s):	Looked After Children & Permanency
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	West London Shared Fostering Service

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**500**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**8**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:		100
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction		2

Proposed savings

- To work with other West London authorities to implement a shared fostering service from April 2020.
- Savings to be realised through staff efficiencies, with £100K broadly equivalent to a 2 FTE reduction.

How would this affect users of this service?

- Aim to increase the sufficiency and quality of placements with outcomes being more children remaining closer to home in stable settings.
- The Shared Service would provide greater capacity across boroughs to deliver commissioned services to foster carers which would improve their skills to work with children and young people.

Key milestones

- To take forward discussions with other West London boroughs through Strategic and Operational Directors by December 2018.
- To confirm agreement in principle to proceed by March 2019 with planning to take place during 2019/20.

Key consultations

- Shared service to be agreed with up to 3 other authorities.
- Children and young people in care and care leavers.
- Foster Carers support group.
- Looked After Children and Permanency staff.

Key risks and mitigations

- Agreeing scope and scale of the model as well as the implementation timescale with up to 3 other authorities could lead to delays. In mitigation there is a strong appetite for delivering a new service from at least two other WLA authorities. There are established strong working relationships in this field and an opportunity to learn from and build upon the current work on adoption regionalisation.
- Foster carers may be dissatisfied with plans. This will be mitigated by including foster carers in early discussions about proposals and involving them in the planning of any new shared service.
- Front loading of time/resource required to deliver a new service. The Government is keen to see innovation in this area following their response to the 2018 Fostering Stocktake and it is anticipated there will be a call for proposals to deliver services differently. A bid will be made should such a call for proposals be made to support with capacity. If this does not occur then the local authorities will plan to create a shared resource to support implementation.
- No certainty that more households will be recruited. A new organisation solely focused on fostering will be able to focus more resource on marketing and recruitment activity than currently happens – based on the greater success generally achieved by Independent Fostering Agencies.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Yes
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No

People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Onder Beter
Deadline:	*30.11.18*

Lead officer for this proposal:	Onder Beter

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP005
Service(s):	Inclusion
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	Create new alternative education provision with wrap around youth services from the Roundwood site

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**360**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**2**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	250	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	2	

Proposed savings

- Transform the site to an educational setting with community activities. End delivery of council run youth services from Roundwood, creating a different model of community and voluntary provision.
- Other savings would be realised from the Council not being responsible for the building running and maintenance costs and ending service delivery.
- The focus will primarily be to create a different model of provision, supporting the community and voluntary sector to deliver services from the Roundwood site and focusing on a borough-wide co-ordinating role that publicises and provides regular updates about services available to children and young people across the borough.

How would this affect users of this service?

- Current provision of services delivered from the site will change to a different delivery model (see below). It is likely there will be a different mix of services that should enhance the current arrangements.

Key milestones

- Cabinet decision for alternative use of Roundwood site to be made by April 2019.
- Relevant human resources processes to have been completed with affected staff by April 2019.

Key consultations

- With young people who use the Roundwood Centre.
- With affected staff.

Key risks and mitigations

- Site to be used for an Alternative Provision educational setting with evening and weekend activities being provided by the voluntary sector.
- Work with voluntary sector (Young Brent Foundation) to ensure Youth Offer is comprehensive, updated and pulls in charitable funding
- The focus of youth services will primarily be on the statutory duty to deliver the Youth Offer and enhancing partnership working with voluntary sector, supported by a new contract from April 2019 to deliver targeted employment support and training for young people
- There could be community concerns about the future arrangements. However the transformation of the Roundwood site to an educational setting with a wrap-around activity offer will mitigate community concerns.
- There is potential for central government clawback of Myplace funding if the site is not used for ongoing youth provision. Risk is mitigated by similar sites in other authorities being used for different but related purposes where clawback has not occurred.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes

EIA to be completed by:	Sarah Miller
Deadline:	January 2019

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sarah Miller

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP006
Service(s):	Early Help
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	Reduction in Early Help Services.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£5.3m (Gen Fund)**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**124**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	250	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	2	

Proposed savings

- Correct budget alignments through a 5% charge to the DSG for the administration of NEG 3 and 4 payments.
- Reduce the size of the learning and development budget for early years suppliers and by ensuring that income is maximised through charging appropriately.
- To ensure all non-statutory work within the Educational Welfare Service is charged appropriately. To reduce number of posts by one within that service.
- To consider other efficiency and service redesign opportunities within the Early Help service that would contribute to the proposed saving.

How would this affect users of this service?

- Childminders and nurseries delivering the Early Years Foundation Stage will be charged appropriately for training and development provided by the Council.
- It is not anticipated that there will be other impact upon users of these services.

Key milestones

- Implementation of new charging and budget arrangements within identified teams within the Early Help service to be in place by April 2019.

Key consultations

- With those key stakeholders who will be most affected by service reductions – such as childminders and nurseries within the borough.
- With affected staff as part of Council human resources consultation processes.

Key risks and mitigations

- Quality of local provision as measured by Ofsted declines. This is mitigated through ensuring charging is applied equitably and continues to fund high quality training for providers. The potential to join up Early Years services within the existing Setting and School Effectiveness and the Forward Planning, Performance and Partnership services is explored.

- Nurseries and childminders negative reaction to service changes. Mitigation in implementing the learning from recent Customer Services reconfiguration that provides a greater focus on a digital offer of support to childcare settings.

- Challenge to secure and maintain sufficient place provision to meet the 30 hour entitlement.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	
Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue Gates

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP007
Service(s):	CYP Department
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	Reduce CYP non-case holding staff by 5 FTE – supported by digital strategies

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**n/a**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**Posts across the CYP department**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	250	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	5	

Proposed savings

- Reduction of management administrative support (2FTE) across the service through better use of digital technology for managing FOIs and core management support tasks.
- 1FTE performance post reduction through data quality project with changes to social work IT system - reduces the analyst capacity needed to cleanse data and manage statutory returns.
- 1FTE performance team reduction by digitally automating Troubled Families data capture and payment by results submissions.
- Commissioning capacity reduced by 1FTE through implementation of new digital placement sourcing system with WLA in 2019 – reduced process costs and the joining of LA commissioning and CCG commissioning teams together.

How would this affect users of this service?

Key milestones

- Digital solutions tested November 2018
- Relevant human resources processes to have been completed with affected staff by March 2019
- New Digital solutions to be online by April 1st 2019

Key consultations

- Employee consultation.

Key risks and mitigations

- Reduced commissioning capacity may impact on sourcing placements and negotiating contract costs.
- Commissioning risks mitigated by bringing together commissioning staff in Inclusion and Early Help within the Commissioning and Resources Team.
- Reduced performance management capacity may impact on FOI management, statutory return submissions and performance management support for frontline teams.
- Performance risks mitigated by bringing performance staff from Early Help together with Performance Team.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	
Lead officer for this proposal:	Shirley Parks

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP008
Service(s):	Early Help
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	Develop family hubs from children's centres

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**3,031**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:		1,491
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction		

Proposed savings

- To redesign Brent's Children's Centres through the creation of a Family Hub model. The aims and objectives of the Family Hubs will closely align with the agreed Outcome Based Reviews that considered children on the edge of care and involved in gang activity. The objectives will be closely aligned to key Public Health outcomes related to children and their families.
- This proposal covers the current Barnardo's contract for 14 children's centres (£2.544m) and 3 council run children's centres (£0.490m). There are 17 children's centres in total.
- The proposal would reduce total number of Children's Centres from 17 to 8 (leaving 2 in each cluster and two council run children's centres).

How would this affect users of this service?

- Families currently accessing Children's Centres will still be able to access services through the Family Hubs.
- Families affected will be informed at all stages of development, ensuring they are aware of their nearest Family Hub and what services they will still be able to access.

Key milestones

- New service design to be agreed by summer 2019.
- Planning for service implementation to take place during 2019/20.
- New model to be fully operational before the end of the current Children's Centre contract in October 2020.

Key consultations

- Families using children's centres.
- Barnardo's and the Fawood/Curzon partnership.

Key risks and mitigations

- Disproportionate impact on most vulnerable families. The risk is mitigated by the creation of family hubs that will widen the age range of support available to families who require support and target the hubs in the areas of the borough that have the greatest level of need.
- Early intervention outcomes worsen for children. The risk is mitigated by ensuring the design of the new family hub model uses research findings to make best use of available resources and that these are broadened to cover school age children. This will allow greater reach of new targeted services into families than is currently possible with the existing model.
- Public reaction following service redesign. This will be mitigated by ensuring effective consultation and engagement with local communities and engaging them in the design and delivery process.
- Quality of work provided to families from the new model deteriorates due to lack of investment. This risk is mitigated by moving to a targeted model, focusing the available resource on those families who most require support

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Sue Gates
Deadline:	*January 2019*

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue Gates

Budget Options Information

Reference:	CYP009A
Service(s):	Inclusion
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Patel

Savings Proposals:	Reduction in Connexions Service

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**1,000**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**7.5**

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	£100	
Proposed staffing reduction		

Proposed savings

- The Connexions budget for 2018/19 totals £c1m, and is made up of a £400K commissioned information and advice and support service for young people, including vulnerable adolescents to access employment education and training provided by Prospects, an in-house team (£250k) working with children with SEND, Looked After Children, children known to the Youth Offending Service and Troubled Families and also children attending Brent's Pupil Referral Unit or other Alternative Provision with the balance spent on specialist projects for targeted priority groups.
- The provision exceeds the statutory minimum requirement, which is to track and monitor engagement and outcomes for vulnerable groups.
- Proposal CYP009A would seek to realise savings through the commissioning of a new contract for information, advice and support when the current contract ends in March 2019.

How would this affect users of this service?

- There would be no reduction in service for young people. Efficiencies would be found within the recommissioning process.

Key milestones

- The new service specification is in place to commence from April 2019.
- Employee consultation is concluded by March 2019.

Key consultations

- Employee consultation.

Key risks and mitigations

- There are likely TUPE issues to be considered.
- There is demographic growth in the cohort of young people in the borough which will proportionally increase demand for services.
- Mitigation through joined up working with other Council departments (e.g. Employment and Skills).

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sarah Miller

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP001
Service(s):	Partnership & Engagement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Policy Proposals:	A review of the following grants provided to voluntary sector bodies and charities is proposed to take place to ensure value for money/stronger focus on service delivery and shift focus on these bodies becoming more sustainable and self-sufficient in the long term. CAB generalist contract - £35,000 Year 1 - £ 0 Year 2 - £35,000 Specialist Advice Contract - £18,000 Year 1 - £0 Year 2 - £18,000 Brent Advice Partnership Funding - £127,000 Year 1 - £62,000 Year 2 - £65,000 Voluntary & Community Sector Support - £80,000 Year 1 – £40,000 Year 2 - £40,000 Total Savings: £260,000 Year 1 : £102,000 Year 2 : £158,000

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	2,796
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	21

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£102	£158
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

How would this affect users of this service?

- Advice service 5% savings are contractual – no change to service
- Voluntary sector infrastructure fund – savings per annum based on experience of underspends and for future projects increased / improved partnership working – should be little negative impact to service users
- Reduce the voluntary & community sector assistance budget by £40k per year. Future service will be based on the outcomes as the sector needs review and an improved delivery methodology. Links will be made with the London hub model currently in the modelling stage to provide additional support to the sector.
- Reduce Brent Advice Fund (BAF) – fund has underspent in 2016/7 and 2017/18.

Key consultations

- Voluntary and community sector needs review
- Grants and projects review recommendations

Key risks and mitigations

- Reputational due to reduction in 'grant funding' – dialogue at early stage with sector and promotion of support available
- Voluntary and community sector funding based on the sector needs review outcomes
- Improve partnerships and delivery model for projects

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	
Lead officer for this proposal:	Pascoe Sawyers

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP002
Service(s):	Strategy & Partnerships
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Butt

Policy Proposals:	Delete one Senior Policy Officer

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	2,796
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	21

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	60	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	1	0

How would this affect users of this service?

The primary customers of the service are internal, i.e. the leadership of the council (political and managerial), other departments, and the scrutiny committees (which are a statutory requirement). This would therefore reduce the capacity available to support these customers.

The team does have some external customers, including partners, the Multi-faith Forum, marginalised groups (through the delivery of the Stronger Communities Strategy or its successor), Syrian refugees (who are placed through the work of the team) and the public (through delivery of the Local Democracy Week programme). This would therefore reduce the capacity available to support these as well.

Overall, the work undertaken by the team would need to be prioritised to focus on statutory requirements and strategic objectives, and lower-priority areas reduced as appropriate.

Key milestones

- Business case (for HR Director and Chief Finance Officer, defining the purpose or business objective(s), a clear proposal, and taking account of the existing establishment and the extent to which this would need to be changed)

- consider ways of avoiding redundancy (including natural wastage, deleting a vacant post, recruitment restriction, freezing a post which may offer the prospect of redeployment and give “at risk” staff first consideration, voluntary reduction in hours, and applications for voluntary redundancy)
- Consult Human Resources prior to implementing job-matching, ring-fencing or redundancy selection procedures
- Carry out consultation with staff and recognised trade unions (15-30 calendar days), along with proportional Equality Analysis as part of this
- Assimilation or competitive assimilation
- Redeployment (depending on if redundancy required)
- Redundancy notice (depending on if redundancy required)

Key consultations

As above, must carry out consultation with staff and recognised trade unions (15-30 calendar days), along with proportional Equality Analysis as part of this. Consultation must include the:

- Reasons for the contemplated dismissals;
- Numbers and types of jobs of those who may be dismissed;
- Total number of people employed in those jobs at the establishment in question;
- Proposed method of selecting those who may be dismissed;
- The proposed method of carrying out the dismissals and the period over which they will take place.

Key risks and mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Reduced capacity to respond to policy activity	• Prioritise activity undertaken by team, and explore reducing or ceasing lower-priority activity • Explore options for transferring activities • Manage expectations accordingly
Reduced capacity to support scrutiny task groups	• Offer support for fewer task groups per committee each year • Explore options for support for task groups from within relevant services • Manage member expectations
Uncertainty and lower morale within team	• Clear and regular communication about process, including support and advice required under Managing Change policy

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Pascoe Sawyers

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP003
Service(s):	Communications
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Butt

Policy Proposals:	It is proposed to restructure the Communications function in 2020/21 which is likely to result in further reductions in staff and the level of support offered by corporate communications. NB: The service has recently (October 2018) implemented a significant restructure which is set to deliver savings of around £170,000 predominantly by reducing the number of staff in communications. This proposal is separate and in addition to this restructure.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	685
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	17.8

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	0	100
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	2-3

How would this affect users of this service?

Internal departments would need to accept a reduced service level from corporate communications who are already focused on core business following the recent downsizing of the team. Client departments wishing to deliver more communications than the corporate communications team has capacity to deliver directly will need to deliver communications themselves, but with oversight and advice from the corporate communications team, or find one off budgets for short term project support.

Key milestones

Review the commercial income target in January 2019 to explore whether any of the above savings can realistically be achieved by generating more income or whether it all needs to come from the communications salaries budget (as there are no materials budgets held in corporate communications).

Key consultations

Consultation with communications team 2019/20

Key risks and mitigations

The council's ability to affect positive behaviour, boost and protect the council's reputation, manage demand, boost income and communicate effectively with a diverse range of audiences will be further eroded. Client departments will need to accept a reduced level of service from corporate communications and/or accept a higher degree of self-service than at present.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No (unless brought forward to 19/20)
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Rob Mansfield

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP005
Service(s):	PPP Redesign
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan / Cllr Butt

Policy Proposals:	Looking at an overall reduction in cost of the service by aligning specialism across the department. This will include looking how the Policy, Performance and Partnerships (PPP) departmental teams interrelate.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	9900
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	94

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	450	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	9	0

How would this affect users of this service?

The primary customers of the service are the leadership of the council (political and managerial), other departments, and the scrutiny committees (which are a statutory requirement). This would therefore reduce the capacity available to support these customers.

The department does have external customers, including National and local media, Government departments, statutory partners, the Multi-faith Forum, marginalised groups e.g. Syrian refugees (who are placed through the work of the team) and the public as the team supports the Community Hub programme. This would therefore reduce the capacity available to support these as well.

Overall, the work undertaken by the department would need to be prioritised to focus on statutory requirements and strategic objectives, and lower-priority areas reduced as appropriate.

Key milestones

- Business case (for HR Director and Chief Finance Officer, defining the purpose or business objective(s), a clear proposal, and taking account of the existing establishment and the extent to which this would need to be changed)
- consider ways of avoiding redundancy (including natural wastage, deleting a vacant post, recruitment restriction, freezing a post which may offer the prospect of redeployment and give "at risk" staff first consideration, voluntary reduction in hours, and applications for voluntary redundancy)
- Consult Human Resources prior to implementing job-matching, ring-fencing or redundancy selection procedures
- Carry out consultation with staff and recognised trade unions (15-30 calendar days), along with proportional Equality Analysis as part of this
- Assimilation or competitive assimilation
- Redeployment (depending on if redundancy required)
- Redundancy notice (depending on if redundancy required)
- Implementation April 2019

Key consultations

As above, must carry out consultation with staff and recognised trade unions (15-30 calendar days), along with proportional Equality Analysis as part of this. Consultation must include the:

- Reasons for the contemplated dismissals;
- Numbers and types of jobs of those who may be dismissed;
- Total number of people employed in those jobs at the establishment in question;
- Proposed method of selecting those who may be dismissed;
- The proposed method of carrying out the dismissals and the period over which they will take place.

Key risks and mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Reduced capacity to respond to PPP activities	• Prioritise activity undertaken by department, and explore reducing or ceasing lower-priority activity • Explore options for transferring activities • Manage expectations accordingly
Uncertainty and lower morale within team	• Clear and regular communication about process, including support and advice required under Managing Change policy

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Peter Gadsdon

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP007
Service(s):	Strategy and Partnerships
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Butt

Policy Proposals:	Reduction of Scrutiny Committees from 3 to 2 Deletion of 1 FTE Policy and Scrutiny Officer

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	2,796
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	21

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£60	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	1	0

How would this affect users of this service?

The primary customers of the service are internal, i.e. the leadership of the council (political and managerial), other departments, and the scrutiny committees (which are a statutory requirement). This would therefore reduce the capacity available to support these customers.

The team does have some external customers, including partners, the Multi-faith Forum, marginalised groups (through the delivery of the Stronger Communities Strategy or its successor), Syrian refugees (who are placed through the work of the team) and the public (through delivery of the Local Democracy Week programme). This would therefore reduce the capacity available to support these as well.

Overall, the work undertaken by the team would need to be prioritised to focus on statutory requirements and strategic objectives, and lower-priority areas reduced as appropriate.

Key milestones

- Business case (for HR Director and Chief Finance Officer, defining the purpose or business objective(s), a clear proposal, and taking account of the existing establishment and the extent to which this would need to be changed)
- consider ways of avoiding redundancy (including natural wastage, deleting a vacant post, recruitment restriction, freezing a post which may offer the prospect of redeployment and give "at risk" staff first consideration, voluntary reduction in hours, and applications for voluntary redundancy)
- Consult Human Resources prior to implementing job-matching, ring-fencing or redundancy selection procedures
- Carry out consultation with staff and recognised trade unions (15-30 calendar days), along with proportional Equality Analysis as part of this
- Assimilation or competitive assimilation
- Redeployment (depending on if redundancy required)
- Redundancy notice (depending on if redundancy required)

Key consultations

As above, must carry out consultation with staff and recognised trade unions (15-30 calendar days), along with proportional Equality Analysis as part of this. Consultation must include the:

- Reasons for the contemplated dismissals;
- Numbers and types of jobs of those who may be dismissed;
- Total number of people employed in those jobs at the establishment in question;
- Proposed method of selecting those who may be dismissed;
- The proposed method of carrying out the dismissals and the period over which they will take place.

Key risks and mitigations

The reduction in a Scrutiny Officer will mean less flexibility in providing support resources to the remaining 2 committees. However each of the Committees will still have the support of a Scrutiny officer.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N

People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Pascoe Sawyers

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP008
Service(s):	Executive and Member Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Muhammed Butt, Leader of the Council

Policy Proposals:	Saving of £38k by ceasing refreshments provided to Councillors all Committee meetings

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	3,119
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	31

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	38	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

How would this affect users of this service?

It is proposed to cease providing catering/refreshments to all committee meetings.

Key milestones

Catering provision was scaled back in May 2014 but continued for Councillor meetings. This proposals ceases all catering and/or refreshments at those meetings.

Implementation followed the May 2018 local elections.

Key consultations

None.

Key risks and mitigations

This may impact on attendance levels at meetings and also at Member Learning and Development sessions. Many Members attend meetings after work and do not have time to eat in advance of meetings. This may lead to a request to start meetings later placing pressure on staff.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Tom Cattermole

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP009
Service(s):	Executive and Member Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Butt

Policy Proposals:	Executive Support Team, reduction in overall corporate translation budget of £28,000

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	3,119
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	31

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£000's	£000's
Budget implications:	Current budget: £235 Proposed budget: £207 Saving: of £28	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

How would this affect users of this service?

Following a review of translation service usage across the Council it has been found that utilisation can be improved while reducing costs by approximately 12%. This includes better use of skype/conference call capabilities facilitated by the new telephony contract.

Key milestones

It is proposed to implement changes to working practices from April 1 2018. However, savings will not be fully realised until the 19/20 financial year.

Key consultations

The changes outlined above will require significant changes to ways of working in the Children and Young People and Community Wellbeing Departments. Training and staff communications and engagement will be required as will close monitoring of spend.

Key risks and mitigations

Making use of Skype etc. should not only reduce the cost of interpreting but will enable officers to access an interpreter quickly.

By using the technology available we will eliminate the need for the client to attend a second meeting with an interpreter, who would need to be booked and travel to the meeting. This will save time as well as ensuring clients who need an interpreter are fully supported.

An additional risk will be that staff simply choose not to adopt new ways of working; it is proposed that a Change Manager works on this project to fully support the successful implementation.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Tom Cattermole

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP011
Service(s):	Executive and Member Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Butt

Policy Proposals:	Restructure and re-grading of Executive Support Team 7.66 FTE scale 6 officers reduce to 6 FTE (5 SO1 & 1 Scale 4)

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	3,119
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	31

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	Current budget: £477k Proposed budget: £431k Saving: £45k	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	1.5 (positions not currently filled)	0

How would this affect users of this service?

The agreed proposal is to reduce the amount of scale 6 FTE from 7.66 to 6 FTE (5 at SO1 & 1 at scale 4). In order to ensure all Departments are supported appropriately, team members are cross trained to enable them to cover all required areas. This will encourage continuity during time of absence. We have started this process and so far it is working well, we will be advertising for the scale 4 post in November, to start in January 2018. This scale 4 post will assist officers with designated tasks.

Key milestones

Implemented September 1, 2018.

Key consultations

Staff were consulted appropriately according to the managing change policy.

Key risks and mitigations

To be managed operationally.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Tom Cattermole

Budget Options Information

Reference:	PPP012
Service(s):	Executive and Member Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Muhammed Butt, Leader of the Council

Policy Proposals:	Executive and Member Services, Proposed staffing changes in political offices

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	3,119
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	31

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	Review of support to political groups as a result of local elections - £37k	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	1	0

How would this affect users of this service?

Following the local elections in May 2018, support to political groups will be reviewed. There are currently 2.5 posts supporting political groups.

Key milestones

May 2018

Key consultations

Manage change through the Managing Change Procedure;

Key risks and mitigations

None

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Tom Cattermole

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES001
Service(s):	Resources- Legal Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Policy Proposals:	Demand Management and income generation: Realising the impact of the Impower demand management review and income generation through raising new and existing fees and charges.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	3,183
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	50.5

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	50	50
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0.4

How would this affect users of this service and what are the key risks and mitigations?

- Reduce support for contract and procurement activity – no longer routinely provide advice on contracts which do not require formal tendering in accordance with the council's standing orders.

  This might (subject to detailed consideration) enable the deletion of a 0.4 post or enable the undertaking in house of work that would otherwise be placed externally with more expensive providers. This would mean increased risk for the council in respect of these contracts and shift work to managers and/or the procurement team. Legal Services will provide a suite of basic contract and advice documents to support this.

- Increase in charges for work charged to 3rd parties (s106, s278, residential property work) and establish new 3rd party charges for some commercial property areas.

- Other Demand Management project savings.

This is very uncertain. Reductions in demand are likely to be spread thinly across many posts undertaking different types of legal work. The effect is likely to be increased resilience rather than an ability to delete specific posts. There may be a reduction in spend on external counsel's fees due to increased in-house capacity.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	In the event that a .4 post is deleted, an equality assessment will be undertaken in accordance with the council's Organisational Change policy.
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Debra Norman

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES002
Service(s):	Resources - Insurance
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Policy Proposals:	Savings to be achieved following a review of insurance provision

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	2,302
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	0

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	100	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

How would this affect users of this service and what are the key risks and mitigations?

The Insurance budget, held corporately, pays for the insurance contract with Zurich, legal fees and compensation claims. It also generates income by recharging maintained schools.

It is envisaged that through better risk management and claims handling will lead to lower premia in respect of the insurance contract with Zurich and less need to hold large insurance reserves. In addition, proposals are being developed to bring legal work in house that is currently placed with expensive external firms. This should lead to a reduction in the overall cost of legal fees.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N

People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Conrad Hall

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES003 & RES004
Service(s):	Customer Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Policy Proposals:	RES003: Further staff savings through demand management, in particular channel shift enabled via the digital strategy (for example webchat, reduced phone service, digital by default). RES004: Review of Customer Access arrangements across all services and the development of a new operating model to better respond to the needs of digitally enabled services.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	11,688
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	263.15

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	275	225
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	6	5

Proposed Savings

Further staff savings through demand management, in particular channel shift enabled via the digital strategy (for example webchat, reduced phone service, digital by default). In addition, a review of the Council's current operating model for managing contacts with a view to streamlining these to better meet the need for increasing digital assistance and improved confidence in using self service facilities.

These savings are dependent on further automation of processes and agreement of a revised operating model for customer access.

How would this affect users of this service?

Further development of the current strategy to accelerate channel shift by limiting access to face to face appointments but concurrently providing better support to those who require digital assistance and streamlining arrangements for supporting vulnerable residents. Service users will be better supported to use digital channels and should benefit from improvements to current self service facilities.

Key milestones

Feb – Mar 2019: Development of revised Access offer

April – Sept 2019: Consultation on new access offer and proposed Target Operating model to support this.

April 2020: New access offer goes live alongside new operating model

(Please note these milestones are subject to change while the scope and timescales of the various projects are established)

Key consultations

Members
Customers
Voluntary groups

Key risks and mitigations

Note that savings are profiled over two years - £275K in 2019/20 and £225K in 2020/21.

Brent Customer Services underwent a significant restructure in 2017/18 to deliver savings of £1.25m predicated on implementation of a new service model that was aimed at accelerating channel shift. Staffing resources reduced by circa 30 FTEs and a large number of staff were affected by changes to their role and grade changes.

Universal credit implementation commences in November 2018 and this will see the start of the migration of working age HB claims to the DWP.

The changes implemented in 2018 have resulted in some service disruption, backlogs of work and increased staff turnover which require attention and dedicated action to mitigate. In implementing further changes, the service will be mindful of these impacts and build in appropriate mitigation to support staff and customers. The service needs to stabilise from the previous changes which it is doing and we will apply the learning from this to the further phases proposed.

The Council Tax service is transitioning back to Brent on the 1 May 2019. This service has been outsourced since 1995 and as such the transition needs to be managed very carefully to prevent disruption to service delivery and Council Tax collection performance. There is a risk that the transition will result in disruption to Council Tax collection and will require significant focus to mitigate this as far as is possible.

It is recognised that these changes represent a transformation of the customer services operating model and we will make the necessary investment to ensure this is successful and delivers the savings.

Other risks and mitigations are:

Some customers unable to utilise digital offer –

- Officers available to help with self-service
- Expansion of Community Hibs to support vulnerable residents
- Promotion of IT skills courses
- Appointments available for the most vulnerable

- Customers experience of self service is poor discouraging use of this Continued improvement and promotion of the Council's digital offer
- Feedback on current self service facilities is used to improve this
- Residents are involved in the design and testing of new self service facilities

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	Y
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	Y
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Y
Marriage / civil partnership	Y

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	David Oates
Deadline:	*September 2018*

Lead officer for this proposal:	Margaret Read

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES005
Service(s):	Customer Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Policy Proposals:	Staff rationalisation following transfer of Council Tax to in house provision following expiry of Capita contract in May 2019.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	11,688
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	263.15

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:		200
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	5

Proposed saving

Staff rationalisation following transition of service to in house provision in 2019.

How would this affect users of this service?

Reductions will require acceleration of channel shift and thus less resident access to resolve enquiries by phone or face to face. See RES003 & RES004

Key milestones

Restructure of service
- Consultation Nov 2019
- Consultation closes Dec 2019
- Full Implementation by March 2020

Key consultations

Staff affected

Key risks and mitigations

Risks

Consideration has been given to bringing forward this saving of £200K from 2020/21 to 2019/20 however this is not recommended as this would place the Council Tax service at significant risk of becoming destabilised and a consequential risk of reduction to Council Tax collection. The Council Tax service has been outsourced since 1995 and significant efforts will be required to integrate this back to in house provision, harmonise staffing, develop staff, redesign processes and develop the system expertise within Digital services.

Decline in Council Tax collection

Backlogs of work arise

Decline in resident satisfaction with service

Mitigation

Reduction in contacts prior to restructure by channel shift

Review of processes to streamline and automate where possible.

Improve customer journey when using on line facilities and act on feedback provided.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	no
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	
Lead officer for this proposal:	Margaret Read

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES006
Service(s):	Resources- Digital Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Policy Proposals:	Savings to be generated in relation to hosting One Oracle (£150k) through a reduction in payment to the external hosting company. In addition, income will be generated from other boroughs (£120k) in the One Oracle partnership by providing hosting and archiving services.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	4,693
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	78

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	270	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

How would this affect users of this service?

There will be more users but significantly more resources to provide support, therefore there should not be an impact on Brent users.

Key milestones

July 2018 - End of Capgemini service and start up for Brent hosting

Key risks and mitigations

Key risks have been managed as part of the transition project to host One Oracle within Brent.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Prod Sarigianis

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES007
Service(s):	Resources- Digital Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Policy Proposals:	Income from selling IT Services to another Council/external companies and/or another partner within the current shared service model (£330k). Income from selling IT services to Air France (£74k).

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	4,693
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	78

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	74	326
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

Provision of IT services to organisations outside the existing shared service; selling the services as opposed to expanding the shared service. Any income achieved has to be shared with the shared service partners, the proposed amount is what we estimate can be achieved for Brent.

How would this affect users of this service?

We would be looking to increase capacity accordingly to be able to deliver the service without any adverse effects to existing users

Key milestones

Existing service has to be stabilised by September 2018 and has to remain stable for a minimum of 6 months before we can progress any discussions with other organisations.

Key risks and mitigations

Agreement has to be sought by the Shared Service Management Board and the Shared Service Joint Committee.
The Management Board and/or Joint Committee do not have confidence on the service's ability to take on additional work. No partner is identified/secured.

In order to mitigate these risks we will be looking to stabilise the service, improve staff perception of ICT, and ensure the shared service overall receives wide range quality publicity.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Prod Sarigianis

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES008
Service(s):	Resources- Digital Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Policy Proposals:	Savings from reductions in print volumes (10%) and removing the option for colour printing.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	4,693
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	78

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	100	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

How would this affect users of this service?

Reduced ability to print in colour may cause inconvenience and frustration to some users.

Key risks and mitigations

The key risk is that print volumes do not reduce. It is proposed to target high cost/volume departments to consider alternative options, for example wider use of IPads, laptops and other digital solutions.

It is also proposed to work with the Transformation team to implement behavioural changes to help reduce print volumes.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N

Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Prod Sarigianis

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES009
Service(s):	Resources- Digital Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Policy Proposals:	Staff savings as result of consolidation of application support teams within the shared service.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	4,693
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	78

	2019/20	2020/21
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	100	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	2	0

How would this affect users of this service?

Should be no adverse impact on service users

Key Milestones

Restructure modelling and staff consultation to be begin in late 2018.

Key risks and mitigations

Staff, union and political resistance could result in the proposal being delayed. Early consultation is proposed with staff to ensure the option is fully understood.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N

People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Prod Sarigianis

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES010
Service(s):	Resources
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Policy Proposals:	General efficiencies across the entire Resources department

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	£1,300
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	200	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction		

Proposed savings

General efficiencies within the Resources directorate budget.

How would this affect users of this service and what are the key risks and mitigations?

No major impact is expected as a number of small budget items will be reduced.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N

People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Althea Loderick

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES011
Service(s):	Brent Customer Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Policy Proposals:	Review and simplification of Council Tax Support Scheme.

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s):	c£26.7m
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	N/A

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	0	£3.3m
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	0	0

Proposed savings

Review and simplification of Council Tax Support Scheme. The £3.3m saving is based on a reduction to Brent's share of expenditure, and equates to £3.96M gross saving including the GLA element, from a forecast spend of £26.7M in 2018/19 (14.8% gross saving).

How would this affect users of this service?

The revised savings options proposed would reduce annual expenditure within the local CTS scheme by £3.96m. As pensioners are protected by a prescribed national scheme, this means the impact of any reduction falls only on the working age CTS population. Thus the 14.8% cut is in reality a 25% cut in the expenditure for working-age claimants.

The options for reducing expenditure can be achieved either by applying reductions across all working age claimants; across specific sections of the caseload (i.e. exempting certain claimants, as in the current scheme); or by tightening eligibility criteria so that fewer claimants qualify.

The savings can be achieved via any scheme design, though other advantages such as simplification and transparency cannot easily be achieved merely by minor variations to the current scheme, therefore a completely new scheme mechanism is currently the favoured option.

Indicative impacts of the cuts are shown below, based on modelling via variations to the ***current*** scheme design.

(It should be noted that increasing the "minimum claimant contribution" is not the only mechanism which could be used to achieve the reduction in expenditure, but regardless of the mechanism used, the average impact on claimants would be to the extents quoted.)

£3.3M net saving (£3.96M gross)

i. Additional 19% claimant contribution for all working age claimants. Current exempt ("vulnerable") claimants pay 19%; non-exempt claimants pay 39%;

Or:

ii. Current exempt claimants remain protected; additional 31% claimant contribution for all non-exempt working age; i.e. Non-exempt claimants pay minimum 51% of Council Tax liability.

Or:

iii. Introduce mechanisms to taper off entitlement more steeply as income rises, therefore making the saving from reduced caseload volumes, rather than the rebates that the remaining claimants receive.

The above options all represent extremes which are unlikely to exactly represent the eventual scheme design, which will be more nuanced, with many aspects – in particular those claimants treated as "exempt" - under review and likely to be changed. However they illustrate the difficulty in maintaining the current size of caseload while attempting to protect the most financially vulnerable. The new scheme is therefore most likely to incorporate option (iii) to either fully or partially meet the saving while allowing the scheme still to protect the most financially vulnerable within it.

Key milestones

For implementation of a revised scheme in April 2020:-

October 2018	Project set-up
Nov 2018 - April 2019	Determine draft scheme proposals and liaise with software supplier regarding technical viability; detailed financial and impact modelling

May 2019	Reports to CMT and PCG
May 2019	Commence consultation with GLA (one week required)
June 2019	Publish draft CTS scheme and commence public consultation with wider stakeholders
September 2019	Close public consultation
September 2019	Evaluate consultation findings
October 2019	Reports to CMT and PCG
December 2019	Full Council report to formally set the new scheme. (NB statutory deadline for setting the scheme is 11 March 2020, but December is favoured in order to allow time for implementation and publicity etc.
Jan – Mar 2020	Publicity, system testing, staff training etc.
1 April 2020	New scheme commences
31 March 2021	Transitional protection (if any) expires

Key consultations

GLA
Benefits claimants
Council Taxpayers
Voluntary sector partners
Registered Social Landlords
Members and local MP's

Key risks and mitigations

The Council must be able to show that meaningful consideration has been given to meeting the saving from alternative measures, e.g. increasing Council Tax, cutting other services, etc., and why it is proposing to meet the saving by changing the CTS scheme. If it cannot show this, it leaves itself open to significant legal challenge.

- Ensure that consultation includes meaningful consideration of the of alternative funding methods to meet the saving
- Ensure that Cabinet and Full Council reports explore the alternative funding methods in sufficient detail and evidence that that Members have actively considered these

Financial hardship for residents –

- the scheme will be designed to protect the most vulnerable, but will necessarily will overall be harsher than the current scheme
- consideration of a discretionary hardship fund within the scheme
- consideration of transitional protection for the most impacted claimants

Council Tax collection decreases –
- review Council Tax collection processes to enable greater engagement with CTS claimants before enforcement action commences

Scheme is not agreed by Full Council by the deadline –
- robust project management

IT systems unable to provide the desired solution (on time) –
- early engagement with IT providers and strong project management

Scheme is subject to legal challenge –
- robust scheme modelling
- engagement with stakeholders
- sufficient time taken over drafting the formal scheme with Legal Services input

Revised scheme does not deliver sufficient savings and / or further cuts required in following year –
- model alternative schemes including one providing a larger cut
- design a scheme with further changes for Year 2 built into it

Equality impact screening

The proposed scheme has not ben designed yet and there are several options, so it is not possible to be precise at this stage, however one of the design principles is to build a scheme that is equitable and proportionate across protected groups (and other claimants), so specific impacts will be tested in due course and any inequities reviewed accordingly. That said, there is a *potential* risk of a disproportionate impact in certain groups, in particular disabled people, ethnic groups and (possibly) gender. There is considered to be a much lower risk in the other protected groups, as no potential scheme designs will feature these factors explicitly, and the chance of an unintended consequence is thought to be low – although all aspects will be considered in the EIA.

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?	Y
EIA to be completed by:	David Oates
Deadline:	*May 2019*

Lead officer for this proposal:	Margaret Read

Budget Options Information

Reference:	RES012
Service(s):	Property and Assets
Lead Member(s):	Cllr McLennan

Savings Proposals:	*To review all existing leases and opportunities in the commercial portfolio with a view to increasing income.* *To reduce costs/increase income through the introduction of energy saving measures in the corporate portfolio.* *To review budget expenditure and re-prioritise spend.*

Financial and Staffing Information

2018/19	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	**£5,349,665**
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	**37**

	2019/20	**2020/21**
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:		200
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	-	-

Proposed savings

To review all existing leases and opportunities in the commercial portfolio with a view to increasing income.

To reduce costs/increase income through the introduction of energy saving measures in the corporate portfolio.

To review budget expenditure and re-prioritise spend.

How would this affect users of this service?

There would be limited impact on users of the services (other than initial works required)

Re-prioritisation of spend may mean a reduction in quality – this would have to be agreed and would be a last resort in most cases.

Key milestones

Capital Budget approval (invest to save potentially through Salix fund for energy reduction projects)

Key consultations

N/A

Key risks and mitigations

Impact or proposed reduction in RHI (Renewable Heat Incentive) will reduce the opportunity for income (e.g. solar projects may need delivery by early 2019).

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Oliver Judges