

## Savings and Income Proposals - Update 22-02-18

Document updated 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018 to summarise a number of amendments (described below) that align the Proposals for Change with the savings in Appendix B of the report to Policy Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January.

Changes made do not alter the value of the savings agreed in Appendix B and included in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Ref:	Proposal	Change
All	All	Consistent use of £'000's in section 13.a of proposals.
CSS1-C	Reduction/Elimination of cheque payments	Added values into savings table as included in Appendix B.
CSS4-C	Corporate approach to reducing fraud	Amended values to reflect latest position as included in Appendix B and moved project costs to 13.b to reflect funding intention
CSS7-C	Increase Court fees for Council Tax Recovery	Amended values to reflect latest position as included in Appendix B.
CSS13-C	IT Contract Savings	Proposal for Change included in pack
CSS14-C	Further Corporate Procurement Savings	Note added to explain split of saving between this proposal and DACHS3-C
CSS16-C	Increasing minimum contribution to 35% for Council Tax Support Scheme	Amended values to reflect latest position as included in Appendix B.
DACHS7-C	Increased usage of Direct Payments	Amended values to reflect latest position as included in Appendix B.
DENS17-C	A further saving to reduce Bed and Breakfast expenditure	Amended profile to reflect latest position as included in Appendix B.
DENS22-C	Further initiative to increase income from commercial property acquisitions	Amended values to reflect latest position as included in Appendix B.

## Proposals for Change

<b>Corporate Support Services (CSS)</b>	
CSS1-C Reduction/Elimination of Cheque Payments	5
CSS2-C Communications Income Generation Sponsorship	9
CSS4-C Corporate approach to Reducing Fraud	12
CSS5-C Generate Income through Investment by Expanding Joint Legal Team	19
CSS7-C Increase Court Fees for Council Tax Recovery	22
CSS13-C IT contract savings costs	26
CSS14-C Further Corporate Procurement contracts savings	29
CSS16-C Increasing Minimum Contribution to 35% for Council Tax Support Scheme	34
<b>Directorate of Adult Care and Health Services (DACHS)</b>	
DACHS1-C Changes to Adult Social Care Fees & Charges	48
DACHS2-C Changes to the Adult Social Care Front Door	53
DACHS3-C Reducing Adult Social Care contracts spend	58
DACHS5-C Increased usage of Assistive Technology and Equipment	63
DACHS7-C Increased usage of Direct Payments	68
<b>Directorate of Children, Education and Early Help Services (DCEEHS)</b>	
DCEEHS1-C Increase income target with Education Welfare Officer to taper reduction in revenue spend	74
DCEEHS2-C Review of Continuing Health Care (CHC) funding for children	78
DCEEHS3-C Position edge of care services as 'wraparound' adolescent service in order to prevent adolescent Looked After Children (LAC)	82
DCEEHS4-C Increase Reading Borough Council foster carers	86
DCEEHS5-C Increase capacity of local 'under 20 mile' placements for Looked After Children (LAC)	90
DCEEHS6-C Designate specialist foster carers for emergency provision	94
DCEEHS8-C Increase income target with targeted and specialist youth to taper reduction in revenue spend	98
DCEEHS9-C Revise under 5 offer to make best use of early years and children's centre provision	102
DCEEHS10-C Design and implement a Reading supported lodging scheme either in house or with a local provider to reduce costs of supported	107
DCEEHS12-C Introduction of Charging policy for Section 20 cases	111
DCEEHS13-C Review all post order payments	114
DCEEHS14-C Review all direct payment and short break provision	118
DCEEHS15-C Review of school transport provision	122
<b>Directorate of Environment and Neighbourhood Services (DENS)</b>	
DENS2-C – Parks and Open Spaces Invest to Save	127
DENS3-C – Increase Green Waste collection charges	131
DENS7-C – Increase on-street pay & display charges	134
DENS8-C – Increased income from Greenwave Bus service	138
DENS10-C – Revise existing access restriction Beresford Road junction with Portman Road and convert into bus gate	141
DENS11-C – Introduce further areas of pay and display in the town centre, and other local centres	145

DENS12-C – Capitalise Highways Operatives Salaries	149
DENS13-C – Introduce a 24 hours a day, 7 days a week charge for all Town Centre Pay & Display	152
DENS15-C – Adjustments to Base Assumptions	156
DENS17-C – Reducing Bed and Breakfast expenditure	159
DENS18-C – Transfer of void council housing properties to Homes for Reading Ltd	164
DENS19-C – Charge time for work related to investment purchases	168
DENS20-C – Capitalisation of salaries	171
DENS21-C – Fees from s106 viability appraisals	174
DENS22-C – Increased income from commercial acquisitions	177
DENS23-C – Planning fee income	180

# Corporate Support Services

# Proposal for Change: Customer Services

## Reduction / Elimination of Cheque Payments

Corporate Plan Priority: Remaining financially viable to deliver service priorities

Directorate: Corporate Support      Delivery Unit Ref: CSS1-C  
 Head of Service: Zoe Hanim

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>1</sup>
<p>Reduction / elimination of taking cheques as payment for services. CIPFA analysis undertaken in 2016/17 estimated that it costs the local authority £12 to process each cheque; this works out as approximately £358k per year (based on receipt of 29,857 cheques).</p> <p>Reading is one of the few local authorities who still accept cheque payments, and we are now in a position to offer a number of other payment options. The current process for receipt and processing of cheque payments is complicated and involves several hand-offs between teams. It is likely that the majority of the processing cost comes from this manual processing, but this will require further investigation.</p>

## 2a. Confidence level

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

60 %

Explanation:

Further work needs to be done to establish precisely where the saving will come from (e.g. staff costs, courier costs, PO boxes, banking fees etc) - until this is done cannot be fully confident on delivery of savings. Current savings estimate does not take into account costs of differing methods of payment.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?

Residents and businesses will have an avenue of payment removed from them - we will need to ensure that other options are accessible for all. A decision will need to be made with regards to whether the option is removed fully or phased out gradually.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?

This will result in a higher volume of electronic and telephone payments which will need to be factored in to the overall potential saving.

## 5. Impact on staff

Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)

There is likely to be an impact on staff but this is not yet fully worked through.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	TBC
The number of posts that might be lost is:	TBC

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change**

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

Support from finance to work through costings, project management support to deliver change, cooperation and collaboration from services to transition and implement new methods.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones**

To include key decision points and governance meetings

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]

**8. Risks and Opportunities**

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)  
What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

Risk of non-compliance will result in savings not being realised. Potential vehicle to also reduce mail (separate Customer Contact Strategic Saving) - will need to ensure savings are not double counted.

Removing a channel of contact may prove contentious and thus result in an increase in complaints - this will need to be monitored carefully and mitigated wherever possible through effective comms.

**9. Dependencies**

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

Dependent on other payment channels being able to absorb extra volume.

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment**

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

Not anticipated, although as we do not collect demographic information on cheque payees this cannot be confirmed.

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:**

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

No need to consult, but wide communications would be recommended in order to receive positive reception.

## 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

None aware of.

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>2</sup>

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No		No		
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£ 50	£	-£	£ 50
2019/20	£ 50	£	-£	£ 50
2020/21	£ 50	£	-£	£ 50
Total	£ 150	£	-£	£ 150

Need to scope work to establish extent of savings. CIPFA analysis suggests c.£357k but unclear how figure reached.

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>2</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.



# Proposal for Change: Communications Income Generation/ Sponsorship

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Directorate: CSS

Delivery Unit Ref:  
CSS2-C

Head of Service:  
D Daniels/O Mortali

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>3</sup>

*Insert details of the proposal*

We will seek to generate £15,000 income (2018/19) from:

- event sponsorship and selling advertising within event publications/e-publications/email bulletins

We have had initial discussions with the Council's Business Development Manager, and will work with him to develop proposals, and make further contacts.

We will seek to increase this by £5,000 to £20,000 for 2019/20

### 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

50 %

*Explanation:*

This would be the first time that we will have sought sponsorship against an income target, so confidence level set accordingly.

<b>3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:</b>
<i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?</i>
n/a

<b>4. Impact on other services we provide</b>
<i>Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?</i>
n/a

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>	
<i>Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)</i>	
n/a	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	
The number of posts that might be lost is:	

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
<i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i>
Support from Business Development Manager.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b>
<i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i>
No risks. Collaborative working with Business Development Manager

<b>9. Dependencies</b>
<i>Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.</i>
N/a

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b>
<i>Is the equality duty relevant?</i>
N/a

### 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?

n/a

### 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

n/a

### 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>4</sup>

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No N/a

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date) N/a

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£15	-£	£15
2019/20	£	£ 5	-£	£ 5
Total	£	£ 20	-£	£ 20

### 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>4</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Corporate Approach to Reducing Fraud

Single Person Discount reduction through proactive data matching.

Expansion of Fraud Team to maximise income through fraud prevention

Corporate Plan Priority: Financial

Directorate: Corporate Resources

Delivery Unit Ref:

CSS4-C

Head of Service: Paul Harrington/Kirsty Anderson

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>5</sup>

It is proposed to increase resources in the Councils Anti-Fraud and CTAX teams to detect and review potential savings where customers maybe in receipt of exemptions and or discounts against their Council Tax liability that has the net effect of reducing the overall amount of Council Tax customers are liable to pay.

It has been a number of years since we carried out a full review of our Single person discount scheme. The (Income & Assessment) Service have previously carried out smaller targeted reviews using external providers and paid for this review service on results achieved. However, this has, despite assurances from external providers that it wouldn't, led to the need of extra resource from our own officers to complete and action the findings. Each result will need detailed checking, cross matching against existing records and a possible visit to establish accurate circumstances.

There are approx. 21,000 customers receiving a 25% reduction (Single Persons Discount) on their Council Tax. This equates to on average £375 per customer per year and a value of approximately (£7.9m).

Following the most recent exercise in 2015, 906 cases were identified, that had the discount removed with no reclaim during in the process of the review. It was estimated at the time that the review raised additional revenue of around £539,302 and nationally, similar cases lead to the removal of 5% of SPD cases.

A recent scoping report (received Nov 2017) undertaken by Call Credit at the request of the Audit & Investigations Team , matched 21,106 address records against tracing and occupier lookup databases to determine the strength of residency for all individuals in a household with the borough. This revealed high priority RED (889) and Amber (2,088) households. This in total equates to 4.21% of the CTAX database, and whilst this falls close to the average of 5%, it could also indicate that the CTAX database is relatively clean (accurate).

Risk rating	Outcome	Cases	Percentage
VERY HIGH RISK	RED	200	0.95%
HIGH RISK	RED	689	3.26%
MEDIUM RISK	AMBER	2,088	9.89%
LOW RISK	GREEN	846	4.01%
NULL	GREEN	17,,283	81.89%
TOTAL		21,106	100.00%

Based on the above very high/high risk cases and using an average discount of £375, additional revenue could be in the region of £333,375 (889 x £375), if all high risk cases were to come to fruition (unlikely). In addition, cases may arise from those classified as a medium risk (likely).

However, we plan on excluding CTRS cases on the initial exercise, which make up approximately 41% of the total amount of SPDs. Hence it would be more prudent to opt for a target of £196,500 (889-365 (41%) x £375).

If we can prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the SPD discount has been wrongly applied, based on false declarations for a number of years and that the householder has the ability to pay, we will look to recover backdated monies through either civil or criminal means and/or impose civil penalties.

It is our intention that in the first year of this new regime, we will in the first instance carry out this review in a one hit approach in order that we achieve the maximum saving as any discounts removed will be removed for the whole financial year achieving the maximum income.

It is then the intention to move this activity to review all discounts and exemptions on a monthly basis in order to maximise future savings/income.

We will make use of our e-review module within the Academy system in order to reduce postage and printing costs, where we hold up to date email addresses. Customers will be required to complete and confirm their circumstances via an electronic link on our Council Tax on line portal. This will support the Councils current direction of travel to digitalise services, encourage self -service to reduce costs and drive efficiencies.

In addition, it is proposed to carry out review work and visits alongside the Council Property Inspector and Empty Homes Officer to maximise any potential new homes bonus that could be due to the Authority for future years. This year this exercise was carried out by a local authority partner who identified 89 properties that were no longer empty and had been brought back in to use. Although this does not generate additional income within the Council Tax database receipts it does attract a bonus from central government. This rate is currently under review and we will be notified following the autumn statement as to what bonus will be applied going forward or if the scheme will be continued. Hence, this has not been factored into the potential income target, until there is more certainty, but we envisage the target could be in the region of £70k per annum.

Having reviewed the level of activity that would be needed to be carried out to provide this service, additional resource will be needed. Although the current resource in the investigations team will increase from three to four from the 1<sup>st</sup> April, this resource is already earmarked for other areas given the level of referrals currently being received (see business case July 2017). It will also require an administrative resource to check records against information held on Academy and other Council systems.

For this exercise we anticipate needing:

1x Fraud Investigator - 1 year Fixed Term contract, with option to extend to 2 years.	£40,000*
2 x Apprentices	£28,500
1 x Review Billing Officer	£25,000*
Printing / Postage / Credit Agency	£10,000
IT Set up £850 Lap top and Licences x4	£3,400
Total estimated costs	£106, 900

\*including on costs

The Reviewing Officer and Apprentices would report to the Council Tax Billing Team leader with a dotted line of responsibility to the Fraud Manager in Audit. The Fraud Investigator would report to the Fraud Manager. It would be our intention to provide full training to all four officers to ensure we are able to maximise the use of the apprenticeship levy.

In addition to staffing costs, there will be additional running costs to consider ICT, postage, credit agency search fees (credit matching tends to be cheaper the higher the volume), which will range between £1.10p to 0.50p per search. These will need to be confirmed in due course.

**2a. Confidence level**

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

70 %

*Explanation:*

Previous experience and exercises have provided good results.

**3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:**

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

We have 70,000 plus accounts; a review of accounts could potentially impact any of those currently in receipt of an exemption or discount

**4. Impact on other services we provide**

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

Increase in enquiries to our Call Centre and Customer Hub. Possible impact on legal services if there is enough evidence to consider prosecution.

**5. Impact on staff**

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

1x Fraud Investigator - 1 year Fixed Term contract, with option to extend to 2 years.	£40,000*
2 x Apprentices	£28,500
1 x Review Billing Officer	£25,000*
Printing / Postage / Credit Agency	£10,000
IT Set up £850 Lap top and Licences x4	£3,400
Total estimated costs	£106, 900

\*including on costs

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]
Recruit Staff with Learning / Development design Apprentice approach identify providers	Jan/Feb
Recruit Investigator / Council Tax Review Officer	Jan/Feb 18
Appoint Staff	Mar/April 18

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? opportunities for collaborative working?*

Risks are that if we regularly review entitlement to discounts and exemptions it could lead to diminishing returns as the base because more accurate and up to date, customer behaviour changes and they report changes more regularly and we can no longer identify income opportunities and or savings.

The activity of this team will also support previous proposals regarding the introduction of civil penalties to fine customers for non-declaration of changes.

We are dependent of resources remaining stable over the next 12-24 months

Further opportunities in Year 2 could be explored in that there are a series of other discounts we could review including disabled relief and students as well as continuing with SPD's and empty homes bonus. Therefore the potential for future income generation exists.



## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

We are very much dependent on obtaining the required staff with the appropriate skill sets, especially at the 'fraud officer' level. Also if staff were to leave whether new or existing staff this will impact on the deliverability of the project.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here*

N/A

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here*

Guidance on Website with instructions and information regarding review activity.

## 12. Legal Implications

None

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>6</sup>

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£196*		£196
2019/20	£	£**		£
2020/21				
Total	£	£ 196	-£	£ 196

\*Doesn't include new homes bonus

\*\*this is currently a best guesstimate. Targets can be better informed after year 1.

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£ 107
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£ 107
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£107
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£ 107

<sup>6</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

2019/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
	TOTAL	214

# Proposal for Change: Joint Legal Team

## Generate income through investment by expanding Joint Legal Team

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate: CSS  
Head of Service: Chris Brooks

Delivery Unit Ref: CSS5-C

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>1</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>Expand service to existing clients and look for business from councils outside Berkshire.</p> <p>It is intended that we will win increased work from the following clients in relation to social educational needs advise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RBWM SEN</li> <li>• Wokingham SEN</li> <li>• Slough SEN</li> </ul> <p>The £85K income is roughly 1133 extra hours at £75/hour combined over the three clients.</p> <p>The £35K extra expenditure is salary and on costs.</p>

<b>2a. Confidence level</b>		
<i>Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.</i>		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>90</td> <td>%</td> </tr> </table>	90	%
90	%	
<i>Explanation</i>		

<b>3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:</b>
<i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?</i>
No

<b>4. Impact on other services we provide</b>
<i>Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?</i>
No

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>				
<i>Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)</i>				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>The number of FTE that might be lost is:</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The number of posts that might be lost is:</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0	The number of posts that might be lost is:	0
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0			
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0			

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
<i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i>
None

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
<i>Review additional income 2018-19</i>	April 2019
<i>Review additional income 2019-20</i>	April 2020
<i>Review additional income 2020-21</i>	April 2021

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b>
<i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? opportunities for collaborative working?</i>
Doing a good job with one client can cause word-of-mouth recommendations to prospective new clients. We have recently been approached by the NHS through this kind of recommendation.

<b>9. Dependencies</b>
<i>Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.</i>

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here

No impact

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here

Not required

## 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

None

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>8</sup>

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£85	-£35	£50
2019/20	£			
2020/21				
Total	£	£85	-£35	£50

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£ 0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£0
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£ 0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£0
2019/21	Capital Costs	-£ 0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>8</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Income Generation / Cost Recovery

## Increase court fees for Council Tax recovery

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate: Corporate Resources

Delivery Unit Ref:

CSS7-C

Head of Service: Zoe Hanim

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>9</sup>

Increase current court summons cost by £6, from £108 (£68 summons £40 Liability Order) to £114 (£74 Summons £40 Liability Order).

We have not reviewed our current court costs for 2 years.

Summons costs act as a deterrent for customers and encourage payment on time.

Customers are only summonsed if they have failed to keep to their instalment plan or paid on reminder. Where possible our aim is to avoid issuing a customer, however without a summons to the magistrates court where we are then able to gain a liability order, we would be unable to secure our right to use other methods of recovery such as attachment of earnings, attachments of benefits or the use of enforcement agents.

The summons process gives the Local Authority the power to commence other recovery activities and is extremely important to ensuring that the Council Tax due to Reading Borough Council is secured and paid, in order that the Council can continue to fund essential services to the residents of

Reading.

Whilst in recent years we have seen the number of summons reduce, we are now starting to see an increase, this has an additional cost to the authority as the cost of printing, postage and staff costs increase.

We have introduced text messaging to try reminding customers they have missed payments in order to try and reduce summons but the trend is still upwards this year.

We believe a £6.00 increase is achievable without adversely impacting our customer base.

Year	Value of accounts summoned	Number
14/15	£6,673,404.49	10983
15/16	£6,779,884.47	10971
16/17	£6,699,923.28	9614
17/18	£5,846,949.08	7486 to date

We can see that at this point this year we have already summoned to the value of £5,846,949.08, for 7486 accounts as opposed to the value of £5,374,462.76 for 6951 accounts this is a rise of around 10%, 5-6% real rise after allowing for the tax increase this year.

If we were to raise summons cost on the 1<sup>st</sup> April we have estimated that this would generate an additional income of £57,000.

This is a conservative estimate based on last year's actuals allowing for withdrawal of costs due to customer care and for non- collection.

Current Costs Berkshire:

Authority	CTAX Summons	CTAX Liability Order	CTAX Total
RBWM	70.00	40.00	<b>110.00</b>
Slough	62.00	46.00	<b>108.00</b>
Wokingham	55.00	55.00	<b>110.00</b>
West Berkshire	58.00	50.00	<b>108.00</b>
Bracknell Forest	0.00	99.00	<b>99.00</b>
Reading	68.00	40.00	<b>108.00</b>

## 2a. Confidence level

90 %

*Explanation:*

Once an account is summonsed the costs remain collectable.

The only caveat to this proposal is that in order to charge the increase Reading Magistrates Courts have to agree the fee increase. They could refuse our request. Although this has yet to happen. More recently the Magistrates have asked us to provide a calculation to justify our costs, which we are in the process of pre-paring with colleagues in Finance.

### 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

Those customers who have not paid will see a rise in the cost of non-payment. Those customers who do pay will not have to bear the cost of the extra activity of staff and costs associated with the recovery as this is met through the summons charges.

### 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

There may be a rise in the number of enquiries to the Call Centre or Web enquiries as a result of the increase in cost.

### 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

### 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

None

### 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Calculate Spreadsheet to Justify Costs	Nov 17
CMT Approval	Nov 17
Member Approval	Dec 17
Present to Magistrates Liability Hearing	Jan 18
Amend Parameters in IT system	Feb 18

### 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? opportunities for collaborative working?*

Magistrates Refuse to agree the fee increase proposed



## 9. Dependencies

Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.

None

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here

N/A

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here

N/A

## 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

Approval at Magistrates Court required for the fee increase proposed

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>10</sup>

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£57	-£	£
2019/20	£	£	-£	£
2020/21				
Total	£	£57	-£	£

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£0
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£0
2019/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>10</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Customer Services

## IT Contract Savings

Corporate Plan Priority:  
 Directorate: Corporate Support  
 Head of Service: Zoe Hanim

Delivery Unit Ref: CSS13-c

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
✓	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>11</sup>

Negotiated changes to the ICT Managed Services Contract to achieve a headline contract saving.

Detailed discussion with the Service Provider linked to the decision to extend the term of the current contract identified areas of the service where a cost saving can be delivered and/or requirements have changed over time so that the contract might now be varied in return for a cost reduction without significant adverse impacts.

The level of saving proposed is expected to be delivered primarily through a reduction in web development costs and through agreeing a reduced number of pre-paid integration days available through the contract.

### 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

60 %

Explanation:

<b>3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:</b>
No direct impact expected.

<b>4. Impact on other services we provide</b>
No direct impact expected.

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>	
The proposed change will not impact on Reading Borough Council employed staff.	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
None.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
Agree changes and document in Change Control Notice with supplier	01 <sup>st</sup> April 2018

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b>
There is a risk that integration requirements outstrip reduced provision. Available resources will need to be carefully managed, prioritised and allocated accordingly. Where there is a compelling business case to do so additional days could be purchased.

<b>9. Dependencies</b>
Changes will need to be agreed with the supplier.

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b>
Equality duty considered, equality impact assessment not required

<b>11. Consultation and Communications</b> <i>Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here</i>
<b>plans:</b>
There is no requirement for wider consultation.

<b>12. Legal Implications</b>
Contract changes will need to be implemented as a Change Control to the managed services agreement.

13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>12</sup>				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£60	£	-£	£60
2019/20	£	£	-£	£
2020/21				
Total	£60	£	-£	£60

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>12</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Procurement

## Further Corporate Procurement Contracts Savings

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate: CSS

Delivery Unit Ref:

CSS14-C (CSS39-A)

Head of Service:

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>13</sup>

Identification of savings to be achieved from external contract spend over and above those that have already been built into the budget. The Council has engaged V4 Services Ltd. to work with the corporate procurement team to identify savings opportunities on a risk and reward basis. The project is targeted to identify and deliver £2.5m savings over the next 2 years to stretch the existing budget savings target already agreed of £700,000. This represents an additional £2.3m savings from all of the Council's directorates.

## 2a. Confidence level

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

90 %

*Explanation:*

Although the initial desktop review carried out by V4S has verified the £3m target as achievable, the detailed business cases have not yet been developed to support the top line figure. The priority in the early stage of the project will be to provide immediate cash savings where they can be delivered quickly and to develop evidence based business cases to increase the confidence level, and potentially increase the total amount of saving that can be delivered.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

This will depend on the individual business cases developed. Some of the proposals may have an impact on services delivered to residents, reductions in spending with existing suppliers or differences in service levels or goods purchased to support staff in their day-to-day work. Each separate proposal will require the impact to be assessed on a case by case basis.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

This will depend on the individual business cases developed. Each separate proposal will require the impact to be assessed on a case by case basis.

## 5. Impact on staff

This workstream will not have a direct impact on staffing levels as it is focussing on spend with external providers.

Some of the opportunities identified may affect the balance of in-house and external service delivery and may lead to increases in staffing should the opportunities suggest bringing existing externally provided services in-house. On the other hand, some current in-house services may be more efficiently provided through externalisation and that could lead to a reduction in posts.

Each separate proposal will require the impact to be assessed on a case by case basis.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:   
The number of posts that might be lost is:

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

The bulk of the resources required will be available from our external service provider, V4S. The procurement team is likely to provide support of between 1 & 2 fte to this work over the next two years which has been accounted for. Individual savings proposals will identify service based resources where capacity is available

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

	[Date]
Phase 1 Opportunity Analysis	January 2018
Phase 2 milestones to be derived from the phase 1 opportunity analysis	February 2018

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)  
What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

Risks - lack of engagement from budget holders/ service teams to engage in new ways of procurement or contract management. Some initiatives may require changes to existing contracts that are regulated by the Public Contracts regulations and are therefore potentially challengeable if not managed appropriately.

Lack of ongoing contract and supplier management can result in savings potential of new contract arrangements not being realised.

Opportunities - knowledge transfer from external support to both procurement and service based staff to build stronger control systems to leave a legacy of better systems and governance.

There is a possibility that the opportunity analysis may identify more than £3m savings

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

As the project is aimed at opportunity analysis across all directorates there is a clear risk that savings may be double counted, or not compatible with other service based development plans. This project will be governed by the Procurement Governance Board with representatives of all directorates closely involved. There may also be some implications of the Children's company creation requiring engagement with the emerging company decision making structures.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

It is likely that at least some of the proposals will require an EIA, but the overall project does not.

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

Initially internal stakeholders will need to be involved in the opportunity analysis. As savings proposals are developed, wider engagement may be required.

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

It is likely that at least some of the proposals will have legal implications, but the initial phase of the project does not. As opportunities are identified, each will require appropriate decisions to implement, and new contracts will need to be procured in line with Contracts Procedure Rules and the Public Contracts Regulations.

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>14</sup>

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No

NO

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

31 January 2018

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2017/18	£ 500	£	-£	£ 500
2018/19	£ 900	£	-£	£ 900
2019/20	£ 900	£	-£	£ 900
Total	£ 2,300	£	-£	£ 2,300*

\*This is the total additional savings to be made from procurement. £1.2m of this is already allocated and included in DACHS3-C, with the remaining £1.1m remaining to be allocated and included here.

<sup>14</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.



13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£ 50
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£100
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£100
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
	TOTAL	-£250

# Proposal for Change: Council Tax Support Scheme

## Increase minimum contribution to 35% for Council Tax Support Scheme

Corporate Plan Priority: Financial

Directorate: Corporate Resources

Delivery Unit Ref:  
CSS16-C (CSS 05b)

Head of Service: Zoe Hanim

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>15</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>In 2013/14 the government abolished council tax benefit and local authorities were required to introduce local schemes. Overall funding was cut by 10% and there was a proviso that pensioners would be protected and made no worse off. The local scheme we introduced was designed to cost the Council the same as when we received Revenue Support Grant (RSG) which meant requiring a contribution of 15% from residents assessed as eligible for support. RSG has subsequently been significantly cut, such that nationally it is now estimated that LCTS is only funded by RSG at 40-50% of 2013/14 levels. We increased the minimum contribution to 20% for the 2016 /17 year and restricted the support to a Band D to continue to offset the reduction of grant funding.</p> <p>For the 2017/18 financial year with continued budget pressures, and having to find further income streams, we introduced further changes to the scheme which included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working age benefit claimants would face a 25% minimum contribution</li> <li>• Introduced new higher rates of non-dependant deductions within the</li> </ul>

scheme to £7.50 non- working/ low income and £12.50 for working

- Removed the earned income disregards in line with the changes in Universal Credit within the scheme.

We have now reviewed all levels of current exemptions and discounts and have taken them down to their minimum or removed.

Therefore the only remaining option for future savings is to re-visit the minimum contribution to our CTSS Scheme, and consider other elements within the scheme once more; such as non-dependant charges ( they contribute to the overall household income for families or units to meet their overall housing costs) and capital levels.

We therefore propose for 2018/19 that we consider raising the minimum contribution to 35% for all working age customers; and consider introducing a £3000 capital limit, current limit £6,000. This would preclude any working age customers that currently hold capital or investments over £3,000 from being eligible to claim Council Tax Support.

In addition we propose an increase to non-dependant charges for the lowest non-dependent deduction rate from £7.50 per week to £10 per week and increase the highest non-dependant deduction rate from £12.50 to £15 per week.

We profiled our current caseload as at 08.11.17 the caseload of customers receiving Council Tax support stands at 9454 consisting of 3737 pensionable age customers and 5760 working age.

Based on our spending on Council Tax Support at the end of October 17 of £8,390,643.77 we have modelled the above changes through our working age caseload and have calculated the following potential savings against the current cost of the scheme:

35% Minimum Contribution	£683,842
Capital Reduction to £3k	£71,666
Low non-dep deduction to £10 per week	£63,438
High non-dep deduction to £15 per week	£27,579
<b>Total Potential Saving</b>	<b>£845,552</b>

For our present 25% scheme we have assumed 84% collection

For a higher % scheme, we need to assume a lower collection rate, so we have applied a range of collection outcomes until we are able to validate other LA's collection rates where they have introduced higher minimum percentages'. We have written to other LA's and are awaiting their response.

## Revised Potential Savings

Total Potential Savings	£845,525
- 50% Capital saving	35,833
- 50% Non Dep Saving	9,101
<b>Reduced Saving Total</b>	<b>£800, 590</b>
Collection Rate 84%	£564, 896
Collection Rate 80%	£512,377
Collection Rate 70%	£450,332

There are currently 19 Local Authorities with a minimum contribution to their CTRS Scheme of 30% or above:

### Local Authority Minimum Contribution

South Tyneside	30%	Hyndburn	30%
Barnsley	30%	Wakefield	30%
Stoke-on-Trent	30%	Derby	30%
Walsall	30%	South Holland	30%
Peterborough	30%	Kettering	45%
Northampton	35%	Castle Point	30%
Medway	35%	London Borough of Harrow	30%
Wandsworth	30%	London Borough of Lewisham	33%
Surrey Heath	30%	West Berkshire	30%
Gosport	30%		

In addition to the monetary changes to the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2018/19, we would also propose to make some administrative easements to our potential Universal Credit Customers claiming Council Tax support from Dec 17.

These changes are for easement for customers as well as for staff time and resource.

We are considering not ending a customer's Council Tax Support claim when we receive notification from the DWP that a customer has moved over to Universal Credit therefore we are instructed to end their claim. Instead we will leave their CTRS claim open for 2 months and invite them to confirm their income and capital levels as we will no longer have access to the DWP's customer Information System to verify their income. If the customer does not respond we will end their claim after the 2 month period back to their Universal start date. We believe that this gives them the opportunity to confirm their income in a reasonable time.

Alternatively we could just end their claim once moved on to UC. We would then ask them to complete a new application. As there is no provision in our scheme for backdating if they fail to apply this could leave to arrears and

breaks in their entitlement.

In addition as we will receive notifications from the DWP every month regarding CTSS customers on UC there is a requirement that we will have to recalculate their award each month. This generates a huge amount of re-assessment for our staff as well as generating new bills and letters each month at a further to the authority. The experience shared from other go live full Universal Credit (UC) digital service sites this year has demonstrated that the amount of notifications we are likely to receive is in excess of a hundred per week.

We would like to consider where a case is not in payment as the have failed to make a new claim or verify their income within two months; to not recalculate and award CTSS. This will save on resources and administration costs.

## 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

70 %

*Explanation:*

There is a risk of customers having to contribute 35% minimum not being able to afford the change on top of other Welfare Reform Changes or overall increases to the cost of living.

The Capital increase is not a high risk as we have identified they already have savings up to and including £6,000, therefore they can meet this new liability from existing savings.

There is a low level risk that non-dependents choose not to continue living with parents or others adults to avoid the increase; however this is unlikely given that this still presents very affordable shared living costs against the average costs of self- contained accommodation.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

For households of working age where the customer is not on passported benefits which means they are working or in receipt of work related benefits, these customers would be affected by the proposed changes, there are currently 5760 households this would affect out of 70,000 +

Pensioners will be not be affected by any of these changes.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

There may be increased contact to Customer Services from those customers at year end that would be expecting to continue to receive help that will no

longer qualify.

Advice agencies may receive more enquiries as a result of the changes. There may be an increase in the number of customers we refer to our Personal Budgeting Officers in Housing that have been put in place to mitigate the impact of Universal Credit within the council

#### 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

#### 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

Resource support for the consultation exercise from colleagues in the web team and policy team

#### 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Consultation Commences	28/11
Consultation Results / Close	31/12
Report for Policy by	5/01/18
Policy Committee for Approval	23/01/18
Write Scheme by	31/01/18
Submit to DCLG	31/01/18
Amend Parameters in IT system	01/03/18
Training for staff	01/03/18
Implement Scheme	01/04/18

#### 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? opportunities for collaborative working?*

Overall Collection may be impacted but % collection rate has been factored in Reputation

#### 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

No other changes in legislation on Welfare Reform prior to April 18 that subsequently remove opportunity for these changes

#### 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here*

The Equality Impact Assessment is currently being updated to take into

account the results from the consultation response.  
Please refer to the initial management response in section 4 of appendix 1.

### 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here*

Consultation exercise was carried out from the 28th November 2017 to the 1st January 2018. Details provided in Appendix 1

Will emailed CTSS Customers where we hold email address  
emailed Council Tax customers where we hold email address  
Published consultation Questionnaire on the web

### 12. Legal Implications

Council Tax Reduction Schemes (Prescribed Requirements) (England)  
(Amendment) Regulations 2016

### 13.a Financial implications - net change budget in each year<sup>16</sup>

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£ 565	£	-£	£ 565
2019/20	-£335	£	-£	-£335
2020/21				
Total	£ 230	£	-£	£ 230

### 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0</b>

<sup>16</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

## Appendix one

### Council Tax Support Consultation Response, and review of Equality Impact Considerations for 18/19 Scheme

#### 1. Name of Proposal for Change

Increase minimum contribution to 35%, reduce capital limit to £3,000, Increase non-dependant charges, and make universal credit easements to the administration of the scheme.

#### 2. Management Response

The consultation exercise was carried out from the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2017 to the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018.

29,715 direct emails were sent to Council Tax Payers which included the web link to the consultation portal on line.

111 Partner and Voluntary Organisations were also emailed direct with the link attached.

985 responses were received, 966 indicated they were residents (98.07%) 11 indicated they were businesses (1.12%) 6 indicated they were voluntary sector (0.61%) 8 indicated they worked for a charity (0.81%) 25 indicated they were landlords (2.54%) 12 said they were "others" (1.22%)

108 responders were currently in receipt of Council Tax Support (10.96%)

The consultation link advised stakeholders of the proposed changes and invited the agreement / disagreement or alternative suggestions.

Please see below the results from each proposal:

**Proposal one - Reducing the maximum level of support for working age customers from 75% to 65 %**

We currently require all working age recipients of Council Tax Support to make a minimum payment of 25% towards their council tax.

We are proposing that the minimum payment will increase to 35% from 01/04/18.

**The results were:**

642	65.18%	Agreed
335	34.01%	Disagreed
8	0.81%	Did not answer



The main focus of the 289 comments received on this proposal were that whilst the majority of customers agreed with the proposal they had concerns that the reduction in support would affect those households with the lowest incomes in the borough. It was also recognised that these changes effect working age customers who are also seeing rises in all aspects of their lives, whilst in the context of pay increases, zero hour contracts are not keeping in line with the increase overall in Council Tax on a year by year basis. A number of responders felt it may push families in to further debt. There were a significant number of responders who felt that they would like to see an increase to Council Tax for those people in higher banded properties to help those on lower incomes.

### **Proposal two - Limiting applicants for Council Tax Support to having a maximum capital limit of £3000**

Currently when a customer makes an application to Council Tax Support we ask for confirmation of their capital along with any partner's capital, if applicable.

If the capital exceeds £6,000 then the claimant is automatically not entitled to Council Tax Support.

We are proposing to reduce this capital limit to £3,000.

Of those that responded

623 Agreed	63.25%
354 Disagreed	35.94%
8 Not Answered	0.81%

There were 294 comments on this proposal; the main themes were £3,000 wasn't a lot of savings to leave a family if there was an emergency, such as a new boiler or heating system. Some customers felt this only gave customers a couple of months cushion if they found themselves in hardship. Other's felt if they had savings they shouldn't receive support at all.

There were other comments regarding why reduce to £3,000 why not £4,500 or £5,000. DWP benefits have a cut of at £6,000 for working age why do we not keep as is, and comments such as "Why are we penalising those customers who have savings or save for rainy days?"

### **Proposal three - Introduction of 2 new levels of Non-Dependant deductions (based on income)**

Under the current CTRS Scheme there are 2 levels of Non-Dependant deductions for any persons aged over 18 who normally live with them, or for whom they do not receive Child Benefit, subject to certain exclusions.

The current non-dependant deductions are:

A non-dependant deduction of £7.50 per week applies for non-dependants who are not engaged in remunerative work (working less than 16 hours per week) and/or have gross earnings less than £196.95 per week

A non-dependant deduction of £12.50 per week applies for any non-dependants engaged in remunerative work (16 hours or more) with gross weekly earnings of £196.95 per week and above

We proposed to introduce an increase to the non-dependant deduction rates as the following:

A non-dependant deduction of £10.00 per week applied for non-dependants who are not engaged in remunerative work (working less than 16 hours per week) and/or have gross earnings less than £196.95 per week

A non-dependant deduction of £15.00 per week applies for any non-dependants engaged in remunerative work (16 hours or more) with gross weekly earnings of £196.95 per week and above

746	Agreed	75.74%
206	Disagreed	20.91%
33	Not Answered	3.35%

There were 150 comments left; the comments were very wide ranging from some customers believing it would push families in to further debt, whilst others felt that working age adults should proportionally contribute to the overall household costs and therefore it was fair.

Some felt increasing the charge for those not in remunerative work was unfair and suggested that the increase was only applied to those in work.

#### **Proposal 4, 5 and 6 Dealt with Customers Moving on to Universal Credit.**

##### **Proposal 4**

We are considering not cancelling a customer's Council Tax Support claim when we receive notification that a customer has moved over to Universal Credit. Instead we propose that we will leave the Council Tax Support claim open for 2 months and invite the customer to confirm their income and capital levels. If the customer does not respond within 2 months we will end their Council Tax Support from the Universal Credit award date. We believe that this will allow customers the opportunity to confirm their income within a reasonable time frame.

832	Agreed	84.47%
35	Disagreed	13.71%
18	Not Answered	1.83%

There were 142 comments left in regards to this proposal; customers recognised that there were currently issues with how the DWP Universal Credit is administered and the delays that are happening with award notices. Whilst the majority felt that 2 months should be adequate, they felt that the Council should offer more practical support and communication to encourage customers to claim this support, to ensure those that are entitled remain entitled to this help. A number of customers suggested that this could be extended to 3 months.

### **Proposal five - Customers moving onto Universal Credit**

End Council Tax Support from the date a customer's Universal Credit commences and invite the customer to make a new claim with the Council.

620	Agreed	62.94%
345	Disagreed	35.03%
20	Not Answered	2.03%

Whilst the majority of responders agreed it was a good idea to end a customer's entitlement to Council Tax Support on an award of Universal Credit and invite a new claim, they didn't appreciate by reading through the comments it was an either or option, in relation to the previous question. That said the comments left made it clear customers should be given every opportunity to claim Council Tax Support and they did not want them to lose out on this help, they felt strongly there should be an in built grace period to allow a customer to make a new claim. As there is no backdating in our current scheme customers would be given a 4 week period to reclaim as is the current rules.

### **Proposal six - Administrative easement for customers in receipt of Universal Credit**

Universal Credit full service went live in Reading on the 6th December 2017.

From this date we proposed that when we received notifications from the DWP every month regarding some Council Tax Support customers on Universal Credit that were not receiving Council Tax Support as the customer had failed to make a new claim or verify their income within the two months in proposal 4, that we would disregard the notification. This would save on resources and administration costs.

802	Agreed	81.42%
155	Disagreed	15.74%

28 Not Answered 2.84%

There were 140 comments on this proposal and whilst the majority of people agreed with this proposal; there were some responders who worried that some customers might miss out. However there were many comments referring to the responsibility of the customer to ensure they inform the Council of changes that could affect their entitlement to help and put the burden of claiming support if needed back to the customer to save cost for the authority.

#### **Our response to the Consultation**

The proposal does not impact on disproportionately on the disadvantaged , chronically ill or disabled, however the proposal proportionally does affect all working age customers in receipt of Council Tax Support within these categories they would see an increase in their contributions.

We also understand that these changes would also see those households that have non dependant adults over 18 living in their household as part of the family they would be expected to contribute more towards the Council Tax payable.

In order to mitigate this we are proposing to continue with the discretionary Council Tax Support fund as part of our local council tax support scheme to help people who may face exceptional and extraordinary difficulties in paying their council tax as a result of these changes.

This could also include offering additional support to those people who are disproportionately affected by other changes under welfare reform including moving on to Universal Credit. This will only be available where a person is receiving some level of council tax support.

It is inevitable with the current welfare reform programme including the introduction of Universal Credit and reduction to Council Tax Support, that more customers have sought help from the Council as well as the voluntary sector, over the last 12 months, therefore in preparation to these changes Reading introduced a Welfare Benefits Team to work alongside the voluntary sector, debt advisors, Housing Associations, Private Landlords, Local Job Centre's and employers to provide guidance and support to our customers including maximising their opportunities to find work, improve their choices and in addition we have increased our debt advice services and access to online tools and support.

#### **Alternative suggestions put forward by respondents :**

Ask those who can afford to pay Council Tax to pay more, Increase Council Tax for higher bands.

Stagger the increase over 2 years

## Stop Council Tax Support

Lobby Central Government to no longer protect pensioners so the burden can be shared beyond working age customers only.

Our response:

Asking everyone to pay an extra 10% across our working age Council Tax Support customers is the fairest way to implement this change as this encompasses all of our priority groups.

The continuation of the discretionary Council Tax support fund will allow us to consider individual needs where a customer is experiencing financial difficulty.

As the legislation currently stands we are not able to consider applying changes to pensioners and asking them to contribute more by not protecting them in our current scheme.

We are unable to increase Council Tax for higher banded properties or increase the % increase without the legislation being amended or in case of a higher % overall, the Council carrying out a referendum beyond the current % increase in our Budget Setting report this year.

### 3. Are you recommending any modification to the proposal?

No given the financial pressures faced by the Local Authority we believe these proposals are necessary to be able to continue with some although reduced level of support to the most vulnerable of our customers.

*A. Using the options below please set out the conclusions of your EqIA. Where the requirement for a full EqIA is identified it should also be attached.*

### 4. Summary of Analysis of Equality Impact (where required)

Negative impact identified or uncertain\*...

In order to mitigate this proposal is we are proposing to continue with the discretionary Council Tax Support fund as part of our local council tax support scheme to help people who may face exceptional and extraordinary difficulties in paying their council tax as a result of these changes.

Based at the time of modelling this scheme the following observations were made to the Council Tax Support Customer Base:

35% liability reduction - affects all working age cases equally in addition with the following changes:

**£3000 capital limit**

Would effect:

- 5 Households with 1 Child
- 6 Households with 2 Children or more
- 5 Households who have a disability benefit in payment
- 39 Households in work with no children

**£10 non-dep low deduction would effect:**

- 5 Households with a carer
- 8 Households with 2 children or more
- 8 Households with 1 child or more
- 162 Households with no children

**£15 non-dep high deduction would effect:**

- 55 Households with no children

It is not possible to equality Impact the administrative easements proposed in respect to how we process Universal Credit Claims as this is an unknown.

# Directorate of Adult Care and Health Services

# Proposal for Change: Adult Care & Health Services

## Proposal 1: Changes to Adult Social Care Fees & Charges

Corporate Plan Priority: Safeguarding & protecting those that are most vulnerable

Directorate: DACHS Delivery Unit Ref: DACHS1-C

Head of Service: Jo Hawthorne

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>17</sup>
<p>The Care and Support Charging &amp; Financial Assessment Framework (or Charging Policy) was comprehensively reviewed last year, and following consultation a number of changes were introduced for April 2017. These have delivered significant additional income during the current financial year. This proposal would progress some further changes to the Appendices of the Framework for 2018-19 in line with the Council Budget Setting Progress. These are expected to generate additional income:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing the administration charges for self-funders (people with savings over £23,250 who are required to pay the full cost of their care and support) to cover the full cost of the service provided</li> <li>- Reviewing the charges for in-house services to ensure these fully represent the cost of providing these services</li> <li>- Proposal to implement a flat rate charge for Transport provided for Service Users to and from Council services</li> <li>- Improving the internal efficiency of invoicing for contributions to Personal Budgets and speeding up the reconciliation process to</li> </ul>



facilitate faster payment

A full costing exercise would be carried out to calculate the approximate increased income that could be generated through these amended charges.

The Policy would remain the same apart from the element of Transport, therefore a consultation process would be required for this and would need to be factored into the timescales.

The remaining proposed changes to charges would be part of the revision of fees and charges that form part of the Council's Budget Setting Process to be approved by Councillors to put in place for April 2018.

Further work undertaken in December for the different elements is presented below:

Self Funder charges:

Reading currently applies one of the highest charges for Self Funders. However if the Council considered raising its charges marginally an additional £5k to £10k of income could be generated.

## 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

70 %

*Explanation:*

Until the costing exercises have taken place the potential additional income is an estimate. There is also a risk that increased fees will reduce the number of people accessing services, impacting on the additional income achieved.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

People with care and support needs may be required to pay higher fees to access services than previously.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

In-house services that are part of the review of charges  
Financial Assessment & Benefits (FAB) team

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>	
<i>Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)</i>	
No staffing impacts from this proposal.	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
<i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i>
Project oversight with operational, finance and financial assessments and benefits support with the charging review work.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
Identify project lead	December
Undertake charging review and analysis to determine scale of changes and associated possible additional income	December
Contribute to Council's review of Fees & Charges for Budget Setting Process	January
Approval by Members	February
Commence consultation relating to Transport charges	February
Implement revised charges (non Policy changes)	April
Close consultation and create recommendation report	May
Seek approval for revised Policy	June
Implement new Policy	July

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b>
<i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i>
Risk that the increased charges lead to fewer people choosing to use the services, reducing income generated.
Risk that Reading charges a significantly higher fee to self-funders compared to other local authorities.

<b>9. Dependencies</b>
<i>Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.</i>
Work to market services to self-funders - may be impacted by increased charges.

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b>
---

Is the equality duty relevant?

Yes, a full EIA will be required.

### 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?

For the Policy change a full consultation will be required but clear communication to affected service users will be provided in a timely way.

### 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

The fee charged to service users cannot be higher than the cost to the council to provide this.

### 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>18</sup>

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	No
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)	December

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£ 50	-£	£ 50
2019/20	£	£	-£	£
Total	£	£ 50	-£	£ 50

### 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£

<sup>18</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL	£nil

# Proposal for Change: Adult Care & Health Services

## Proposal 2: Changes to the Adult Social Care Front Door

Corporate Plan Priority: Safeguarding & protecting those that are most vulnerable  
 Directorate: DACHS Delivery Unit Ref: DACHS2-C  
 Head of Service: Maura Noone

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p><b>Access to Universal services pre Adult Social Care will be promoted through an:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online portal</li> <li>• Phone contact to the Contact Centre</li> </ul> <p>Online referral and simple assessment will be developed so that people can see whether they may be eligible for services. A first level financial assessment will also be developed for use online so that people can see whether they may have to pay for services. Both developments will sit alongside the Reading Services Guide which will help people to make their own choices about advice, information, care and support. This online guide provides information about services in the community including universal services that could meet their needs.</p> <p>The contact centre will provide information and advice as needed, and also provide a simple assessment. The current arrangements between the contact centre and the Department will be revised so that expert advice is available at the front door. This will result in timely intervention and quicker decisions to provide care and support when people need it most</p>

without requiring a lengthy process which pulls people into the service.

We will adopt principles in this part of the service which promote the 'three conversation model' which is a nationally recognised tool that delivers a proportionate response and keeps people out of the service for longer. We will also adopt a digital approach ensuring that people self serve an complete online assessments as far as possible.

The combination of both developments will result in savings of £250,000 made up of:

1. Reduced demand for services as people self-serve therefore cost avoidance
2. Reduced time spent on assessments as the first stage will be completed at the front door therefore resulting in potential staffing reductions

## 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

50 %

*Explanation:*

The work to redesign the front door is not yet fully scoped or established, so there is a significant risk that if the required transformation is not achieved then the saving will not be delivered or will be delayed.

Measuring the impact of this work is difficult, however mechanisms will need to be determined at the beginning of the project to measure this.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

Residents who were expecting to access council support may be encouraged to access support elsewhere instead, or to use online options to answer their questions. However, there is also a risk that people are discouraged from seeking help for which they are eligible for if the system put into place is not easy to navigate or accessible.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

Impacts for the Contact Centre who currently provide the initial response to social care calls from the public, and would be part of the redesign work.

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>	
<i>Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)</i>	
Unknown until redesign work is completed Staff could be affected if a reduced level of assessments are needed/ required, and if contact centre is carrying out work which was previously completed by other parts of the service.	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	Up to 4
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
<i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i>
Project Management (resourced from ASC Transformation Programme), plus support from Finance.
IT staff to support with online processes, plus investment in portal/online tools if evidenced to be effective in managing demand. An estimated £90,000 has been listed as costs to resource this. This will also require funding for ongoing license costs.
Operational staff would need to be involved in the change, not least to scope it and be able to participate in trials to test the principle.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
Establish Project Lead	January
Review other models of front door to inform project	January
Investigate and identify online solutions to facilitate channel shift for residents	January
Develop detailed options for a revised front door	February
Seek approval for interim changes e.g. DMT/CMT/LMB	February
Implement Pilot Approach to front door with interim IT & performance measures to effect the change on a short term to test the principles	March
Analyse pilot in parallel and develop long term solutions to Business Process and IT	June
Develop proposal for permanent front door	July
Decide on online tool and commence procurement (as appropriate)	July
Seek approval for changes	August
Undertake staff consultation for any permanent moves required to implement the new model	August
Implement new front door	September

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

Will require a culture change in line with Transformation Programme objectives to signpost people to alternative services and encourage self-service.

Will require some investment in online portal.

Opportunities to build on what works well with the front door currently and to learn from other local authorities to provide a more appropriate response at the first point of contact and to allow people to self-serve more effectively.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

Contact Centre and Customer Services

Reading Services Guide

Health partners (depending on any integration at the front door)

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

A full EIA would be required to be completed.

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

To be confirmed depending on the redesign work. Likely a staff consultation if changes to current staffing roles. Communication of any changes required with partner organisations and the public potentially.

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- *Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?*
- *Whether or not you require a delegation to implement*
- *Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)*
- *Is there a statutory duty to consult?*

Ensuring statutory duties under the Care Act are still met by any changes.



13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>19</sup>				
<i>It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.</i>				
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No				No
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				April
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£ 250	£	-£	£ 250
2019/20	£	£	-£	£
Total	£ 250	£	-£	£ 250

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£ 90
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£ 40
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£130</b>

<sup>19</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Adult Care & Health Services

## Proposal 3: Reducing Adult Social Care contracts spend

Corporate Plan Priority: Safeguarding & protecting those that are most vulnerable  
 Directorate: DACHS Delivery Unit Ref: DACHS3-C  
 Head of Service: Dorne Kanareck

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>20</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>The estimated DACHS spend through contracts in 2017-18 is £39m, excluding public health contracts. There are a number of initiatives in place designed to review the terms, value for money and performance of all of our contracts. Within the existing Transformation programme there was a planned savings of £300k for 2018/19 and £500k for 2019/20 which will be delivered from this area. This area of spend is also expected to deliver additional savings which are presented in this proposal.</p> <p>National surveys suggest that Reading is an outlier in terms of the cost for commissioned spend for certain client groups. In addition we can see that our costs on Residential Care are well above the negotiated block rates as we are placing a number of clients in more expensive spot purchase arrangements. This picture does provide us with confidence that there is scope to reduce spend in this area.</p> <p>Savings for future years are still being considered but for 2018/19 it has been identified that the following initiatives will yield savings to achieve the</p>

target. It is proposed that re-provision of the Home Care Framework contract due in 2019 be based on a revised approach using outcome based Commissioning. Outcome based commissioning is proven to generate savings as Providers are incentivised to support a service users recovery and this requiring less overall support. In addition it allows Providers to work creatively with individuals to provide support when it suits the individual but often providing dual benefit to both Provider and service user.

The stream lining of the Personal Budget Support Team, along with integrating the Public Health and Adult Social Care commissioning team structure will also realise efficiency savings, develop skills within the team, ensure succession planning is enhanced and matrix working is realised.

Finally the BUPA Parkside block contract- instead of renegotiating the current 15+10yr block due in 2019 RBC go out to the market to re-procure only block beds needed (including contingency). RBC to re-negotiate the land lease Bupa hold on the Parkside site.

The proposal will involve working closely with V4S to support the identification of further savings opportunities.

This proposal excludes Pubic Health contracts and any associated savings as these are covered under a separate proposal.

## 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

50 %

*Explanation:*

A full detailed financial analysis of these savings proposals has yet to be worked up, however some initial work suggests the proposals to re-provision both the Home Care and Bupa Parkside contracts via a different model would render the target achievable if the project was given the appropriate level of resources. This is in addition to the examination of partnerships with providers who are currently building in RBC along with the detailed analysis of all other Adult Social Care contracts held with a view to re-negotiating cost and/or considering alternative delivery models and/or providers. There is a risk to deliver due to staff resources and expertise and a full project cost plan would need to be outlined.

### 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

The impact on service users should contracts change to outcome based commissioning should be seen as positive in that they will get a more personalised service which is tailored to them as individuals. The impact on providers contracting with the council is that they will need to provide a more outcome focused service which relies on what the service users wants. It should also longer term cut down on their administrative costs. The potential to destabilise some providers who may not be able to deliver the renegotiated contracts should be considered as a risk, however we would expect to work with providers very early in the process to ensure we stimulate the market to consider other models of service delivery.

### 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

The Social Work teams will be required to define a service users needs based on outcomes to enable Providers to be measured against these.

### 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

The bulk of this proposal is not based on a reduction of staffing but a realignment at this stage.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

### 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

Project management, Commissioning Team staff - It should be noted that resources are currently limited within commissioning due to skills, expertise and vacancies. Procurement, Finance, Legal input.

### 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

Complete analysis of contracts in conjunction with V4S to prioritise areas to deliver 2018/19 savings and develop work plan	January
Create project plan and agree associated resources	February
Develop proposal for staffing structure within the team to	February

ensure appropriate skills mix and sustainability	
Seek approval for staffing consultation	March
Launch staff consultation	March
Project 3 month review to ensure on track and negotiations are commencing as planned	May
Review consultation feedback and develop final proposed staffing structure	June
Seek approval for final structure and publish	July
Project 6 month review to ensure on track and negotiations are commencing as planned	August
New staffing structure in place	September
Deliver savings through planned activity	2018-19 - 2019-20

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)  
What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

Limited staff with appropriate skills and expertise in Commissioning and elsewhere in RBC is a risk however is mitigated somewhat by the support from V4S.

The timescale for delivery of savings given contract procurement timescales is a risk if the detailed analysis and project plan along with resources to deliver is not produced within an extremely tight timescale.

It is imperative that it is clear that this proposal requires a two strand approach within the existing team, inevitably impacting on capacity. Expertise may need to be taken to deliver this proposal within the tight timescales from within the team whilst the day to day operations will need to continue.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

Finance, Legal, HR & Procurement capacity will be required to support this initiative.

The ability to deliver is dependant on the support from V4S.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

Depending on the individual commissioning activities an EIA may be required specific to these changes.

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

Consultation may need to take place with service users and the wider public using services depending on the individual activities and commissioning

changes undertaken to achieve the savings.  
 Direct negotiations will take place with Providers as required.  
 A staff consultation will be required in relation to any staff structure changes.

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement). Is there a statutory duty to consult?*

Any changes will need to take place with due regard to statutory duties such as safeguarding and procurement rules.

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>21</sup>

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	No			
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)	Jan 2018			
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£ 450	£	-£	£ 450
2019/20	£ 750	£	-£	£ 750
Total	£ 1,200	£	-£	£ 1,200

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£nil</b>

<sup>21</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Adult Care & Health Services

## Proposal 5: Increased usage of Assistive Technology and Equipment

Corporate Plan Priority: Safeguarding & protecting those that are most vulnerable

Directorate: DACHS Delivery Unit Ref: DACHS5-C

Head of Service: Maura Noone

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p><i>The increased use of telecare and Assistive Technology is part of a Berkshire West 10 scheme to transform the way in which the current service is delivered. The use of telecare has been proven to deliver:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• A corresponding decrease in the use of home care</i></li> <li><i>• A reduction in the need or delays the need for residential or nursing home care</i></li> <li><i>• Is most effective when it is used as part of a total package which also includes adaptations and equipment.</i></li> </ul> <p>To achieve these outcomes we can first build on the work already undertaken to reduce “two carer” calls and exploring the use of telecare to ensure that needs are being met.</p> <p>Through the BW10 partnership, PA Consulting have been engaged to develop a business case for a new service model for assistive technology, to be adopted across Health &amp; Social Care. This will calculate the cost/benefits of different options and support the delivery of the savings for RBC. This is likely to result in a phased approach to implementation with the first phase</p>

being implemented and evaluated before any additional implementation is agreed to. Extract from Business case below:

The detailed financial business case for Option 1 level of implementation, identifies investment of circa £175k, which could deliver savings of circa £31k in 2018-19 and additional savings of circa £236k in 2019-20.

## 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

50 %

*Explanation:*

The plan for this proposal is dependent on work across three local authorities.

The adoption of telecare is dependent on local knowledge of what is available and how it can best be used and adopting a less risk averse approach to utilise telecare as a direct alternative to face to face care where appropriate.

Much of the saving will be cost avoidance as new packages are commissioned with the use of telecare. However the investment will come from the Better Care Fund so the gross savings will be attributed to the Council.

An existing project to reduce two carer calls through reviews has delivered savings over the last two years and it will be harder to find further savings from this work.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

People receiving care and support may experience a change in how their needs are met.

Carers will need reassurance about the safety and quality of assistive technology.

Care providers may need to adapt their working methods in order to realise the full potential of assistive technology.

Assistive Technology may have an impact on longstanding arrangements for sleep ins if used successfully.



#### 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

The implementation of Assistive Technology into "Smart houses" could affect the ongoing planning and design of any extra care or other social housing in Reading.

#### 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

There may be an impact on RBC staff in terms of culture and knowledge, although there is not any anticipated staffing reduction.

Assessments for Assistive Technology will be needed and may require existing skill sets to be enhanced.

Independent sector staff will be affected if Assistive Technology is seen as a viable alternative to sleep in arrangements.

The number of FTE that might be lost is: 0

The number of posts that might be lost is: 0

#### 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

Funding for the Assistive Technology contract will come from the Better Care Fund. Additional equipment purchased will be funded by the fact we will be commissioning a reduced amount of existing services, which could include community reablement, home care, supported living (sleep ins). Also we should note a delay in placements into residential and nursing homes.

Support from the following would be required:

Commissioning

Lead Occupational Therapist

Project Management (resourced within ASC Transformation Programme)

Finance

#### 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

Establish project lead and plan	December
PA Consulting Business Case signed-off	December
Review spend through Equipment contract	January
Agree strategic position and operational lead for assistive technology	January
Prepare staff for expanding the use of assistive technology e.g. training and strategy/policy	February - March
Develop business process and KPI's within MOSAIC to ensure the impact of the project is easily monitored and benefits	March

can be tracked	
Identify current clients who may benefit from assistive technology and generate savings and commence reviews	March
Implement new way of working and monitor through Panel	April
Monitor savings delivered monthly and report progress	April 2018 - March 2019

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

Risk that the work already completed to reduce two carer calls over the last two years means that some areas of saving has already been achieved.

Risk that service users, families or providers do not embrace the potential for assistive technology in how their care needs are met.

Opportunity to provide more creative support to meet people's needs, in a less intrusive way through more effective use of assistive technology and equipment solutions.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

Current contracts for equipment provision & assistive technology.

PA Consulting Business Case and review of Assistive Technology across BW10.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

An Equality Impact Assessment would be required if there was a change to the strategic position on use of assistive technology or equipment. Individual changes to care packages would be assessed at this level to ensure the person's needs were taken into consideration.

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

Consultation is not required; the changes relate to individual care packages and would be discussed with the service user and their family/carers as appropriate.

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement). Is there a statutory duty to consult?*

N/A.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>22</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	No
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)	January

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£ 200	£	-£	£ 200
2019/20	£	£	-£	£
Total	£ 200	£	-£	£ 200

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£nil</b>

<sup>22</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Adult Care & Health Services

## Proposal 7: Increased usage of Direct Payments

Corporate Plan Priority: Safeguarding & protecting those that are most vulnerable

Directorate: DACHS Delivery Unit Ref: DACHS7-C

Head of Service: Dorne Kanareck

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>Increasing the number of people managing their care and support with a direct payment is a priority for Adult Social Care. Reading is currently well below the national average for people in receipt of Direct Payments so there is certainly scope for improvement.</p> <p>Savings in Direct Payments could be achieved from the shift to meeting people's care and support needs through directly employing Personal Assistants (PAs) to provide care, rather than care from a homecare agency. Many people choose direct payments because their own PA offers a more flexible and reliable service that meets their individual needs. Employing a PA typically has an hourly rate that is lower than that for a homecare agency, and so the cost to meet someone's needs is less. To support this shift, investment would be required to develop the PA market, to ensure people were supported to find and employ PAs and to support them on an ongoing basis with any employment issues or queries.</p> <p>At the end of service users annual cycle of care any unspent Direct Payment is "clawed-back" as the money is no longer required to meet needs. It is</p>

proposed that when this takes place these service users are referred for a review to ensure that the assessment hasn't changed and to reduce the package if appropriate.

### 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

60 %

*Explanation:*

The proposal is yet to be fully planned with costed estimates for savings and the investment plus resources required to deliver this. Direct Payments take-up has historically been low in Reading despite work to increase this, and a significant channel shift and culture change driven by senior management is required.

The current system is cumbersome and time consuming so it proposed that as part of this proposal channel shifting to an on-line portal should be explored. Alongside this we would look to rationalise the back office and associated documentation to move to a much more simple process.

### 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

Service users would have more choice and control over how their care and support needs were met through use of a direct payment. The current system is cumbersome so we would need to develop a more user friendly approach for both individuals and practitioners. The risk of fraud against the vulnerable would need to be managed but this is seen as part of a risk matrix which would see us target individuals suitable for direct payments incrementally.

Increasing the use of PAs could impact on the homecare market, which is already fragile and struggling to meet demand, but we would look to the market to address this as part of their business models. We would also look to the third sector and possible co-production to increase the PA market perhaps through a community interest company model.

### 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

There would be an impact on the Commissioning team, the Operations team the Personal Budget Support Team and Finance in the first instance but we would see this as part of our channel shifting plus wider change to outcome based commissioning on an incremental basis to minimise disruption.

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>	
<i>Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)</i>	
No staffing impacts from this proposal.	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
<i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i>
Project management, with support from ASC teams, finance, commissioning. Dedicated resource to develop the PA market and promote this to increase take-up of this option from service users. This may include investment in IT to support this such as a portal that allow for PA advertisement and matching.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
Project lead appointed	January
Project plan developed for DMT approval, including identification of savings detail	January
Business process review including recommendations (in line with wider MOSAIC review)	February
Review PA Database modules in line with online self serve options	February
Research best practice options for increasing uptake of Direct Payments and PA Support service models	March
Develop and agree principles of how Direct Payments will be implemented and how measured	March
Launch revised process and measure performance	April

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b>
<i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i>
Culture change and possible marketing campaign required to actively promote Direct Payments as a preferred option once the work to simplify the process has been carried out.
Market development of Personal Assistants will need to be delivered for this to be successful which will take time.
Opportunity for more people to have their needs met in a more personalised

way, with greater choice and control.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

Homecare Framework, including plans for recommissioning.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

An EIA is not required; people's care needs will still be assessed and reviewed on an individual basis to determine the most appropriate way to meet these. This proposal does not represent a change to the Council's policy or strategic direction.

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

A detailed project planning and analysis would need to be undertaken but consultation is unlikely to be required. There will be communication with providers and groups as part of the PA market development, and with service users on an individual basis.

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- *Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?*
- *Whether or not you require a delegation to implement*
- *Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)*
- *Is there a statutory duty to consult?*

The Care Act sets out how councils must and should support people to employ a PA to meet their care needs, and how direct payments should be reviewed regularly.

13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>23</sup>				
<i>It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.</i>				
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No				No
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				January
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£ 100	£	-£	£ 100
2019/20	£ 100	£	-£	£ 100
2020/21	£ 100			£ 100
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 300</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>-£</b>	<b>£ 300</b>

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£ 45
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£45
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£ 45
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£45
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£90</b>

<sup>23</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.



# Directorate of Children, Education and Early Help

# Proposal for Change: Increased income target with Education Welfare Officer to taper reduction in revenue spend

Saving headline: Increase of income target with buy back service

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate: Children's, Education & Early Help Services

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS1-C

Head of Service: Vicky Rhodes

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>24</sup>
<p>Education Welfare Service has extensive experience of trading their services. With schools buying in EWS increasing revenue to the Authority. Business Plan designed to extend the core offer and contractual arrangements.</p> <p>Commissioning cycle for 2018/19 has commenced with an options paper. Options have been developed and will be cascaded to Schools by late January. Including a minimum expectation of a 2 year SLA per establishment.</p> <p>The proposal outline plans to further increase the revenue from £140k to £210k by 2021.</p> <p>There is no request for additional staffing to match this activity. It will be managed on current funding and staffing levels. The intention is that budgetary savings put forward by this service area will be offset by the increase in revenue.</p>

**2a. Confidence level**

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

100 %

Explanation:

Analysis of current business activity, engagement with stakeholders and the development of SLAs indicate that this change will have an impact but will also stabilise the offer

**3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:**

Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?

A service with higher capacity to carry out activities in line with Education Welfare.

**4. Impact on other services we provide**

Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?

There will be no impact on other services other than ensuring that we have involvement across schools.

**5. Impact on staff**

Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)

Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

6. Resources and support needed to make the change	
<p><i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i></p> <p>None</p>	
7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
January SLAs sent to schools	January 2018
New Commissioning cycle commenced	April 2018

8. Risks and Opportunities
<p><i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i></p> <p>Risks</p> <p>Additional revenue not achieved due to schools not wanting to enter in to a longer agreement (current contract 12 months)</p> <p>Opportunities</p> <p>To put the department on a more business-like footing with the opportunity to forward plan by knowing the income for 2 years not on a 12 month basis.</p> <p>To afford the department the time to plan the development and improvement of the service and its capacity to explore new business opportunities and engage with new schools .</p>

9. Dependencies
<p><i>Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.</i></p> <p>NA</p>

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment
<p><i>Is the equality duty relevant?</i></p> <p>NA</p>

11. Consultation and Communications plans:
<p><i>Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?</i></p> <p>To be published through the schools forum January 2018</p>

12. Legal Implications
<p><i>Please consider</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?</li> <li>• Whether or not you require a delegation to implement</li> <li>• Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)</li> <li>• Is there a statutory duty to consult?</li> </ul> <p>Procurement, Commissioning and Legal actively involved with service</p>

development.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>25</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No Yes

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£5	-£0	£5
2019/20	£0	£10	-£0	£10
2020/21	£0	£15	-£0	£15
Total	£0	£30	-£0	£30

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>25</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Review of Continuing Health Care (CHC) funding for children to ensure that eligible children are funded through NHS provision.

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,  
Education & Early

Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS2-C

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>26</sup>

*Insert details of the proposal*

Review of all relevant children's cases to ensure social care, education and health costs are in line with relevant guidance and recovery for health funding is achieved where appropriate.

Work with stakeholders and partners needed to agree and scrutinise financial responsibilities and ensure that they are in line with government policy.

This will reduce total costs to Childrens Services and improve transition to Adults Social Care.

In order to conduct the review and next steps it is proposed that funding on an invest to save approach is allocated to recruit a FTE Social Worker for 6 months and Business Admin for 12 months - costing £60K.

## 2a. Confidence level

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

50 %

Explanation:

Charges no doubt can be matched to health funding however this will take skill, negotiation and persistence. Budgets across public services are stretched. Until the review and scoping activity is completed it is difficult to nail down the level and overall confidence of what can be achieved.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?

No impact on delivery to residents but the impact on other organisations budgets will be the challenge when redistributing resources.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?

Potentially Public Health and CCGs

## 5. Impact on staff

Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)

Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

Recruitment of a FTC Social Worker for 6 months and Business Admin for 12 months - costing £60K.

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings


## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

NA

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

There will be a consultation with regards to the Continuing Health Care fund. The approach will be agreed upon funding of the posts

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- *Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?*
- *Whether or not you require a delegation to implement*
- *Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)*
- *Is there a statutory duty to consult?*



13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>27</sup>				
<i>It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.</i>				
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No				
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£50	£0	-£0	£50
2019/20	£100	£0	-£0	£100
2020/21	£150	£0	-£0	£150
Total	£300	£0	-£0	£300

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£60
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£60
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£60</b>

<sup>27</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Develop an edge of care offer as 'wraparound' adolescent service

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,

Education & Early

Help Services

Head of Service: Vicky Rhodes

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS3-C

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>28</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>The proposal is to develop and position an edge of care offer as a 'wraparound' adolescent service in order to prevent older children from becoming looked after children (LAC). This is a cost avoidance measure to reduce LAC spend.</p> <p>Budget target activity to make cost savings is underway. An area of focus will include current structures and staffing, operating procedures and cost base.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p><i>Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.</i></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">80 %</div> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p>Other areas have developed models such as this and we are confident that with scoping and thinking with partners we can develop a strong model.</p>

<b>3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:</b>
<i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?</i>
None at this stage

<b>4. Impact on other services we provide</b>
<i>Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?</i>
The service realignment is a structural transition and not a service redesign at this stage, there is not expected to be a negative impact.

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>	
<i>Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)</i>	
Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
<i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i>
No additional resources needed

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
Edge of Care Delivery Plan	January 2018
Edge of care budget delivery plan	April 2018

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b>
<i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i>
<b>Risks</b> Edge of care services will need to focus on adolescent group which means alternative models will be needed for younger children
<b>Opportunities</b> Keeping young people closer to networks and communities and avoiding expensive residential placements.

## 9. Dependencies

Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.

Will need to connect across children and adult services and engage with key partners.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

Is the equality duty relevant?

NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?

Potential consultation depending on outcome of financial reductions

## 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

NA

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>29</sup>

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£0	-£0	£0
2019/20	£60	£0	-£0	£60
2020/21	£184	£0	-£0	£184
Total	£244	£0	-£0	£244

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's

2017/18

Capital Costs

-£

<sup>29</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
	TOTAL	

# Proposal for Change: Increase Reading Borough Council Foster Carers

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,  
Education & Early  
Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS4-C

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
X	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>30</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>The proposal is to increase the recruitment of in house foster carers using LimeTree Marketing campaign. The aim is to recruit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18/19 - 2</li> <li>19/20 - 5</li> <li>20/21 - 8</li> </ul>

## 2a. Confidence level

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

75 %

*Explanation:*

Nationwide there is a genuine shortage of foster carers, LAs are continuing to pay for external provision.

Marketing and recruitment activity commenced November 2017 currently very early days.

The external partner has been successful in other local authorities.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

Expansion of in house and external foster carers will impact positively on residents and our community of looked after children. Our marketing approach is to expand in house providers and work with our in care council to market what they would like to see from a good foster carer.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

Positive impact in being able to place children more locally at less cost.

## 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

6. Resources and support needed to make the change	
<p><i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i></p> <p>This activity has been funded on an invest to save basis already.</p>	
7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones	
<p>To include key decision points and governance meetings</p>	
April 2019	Increase in Foster Carers x 2

8. Risks and Opportunities
<p><i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i></p> <p>There will be an positive impact on those residents who want to register as an inhouse foster carer</p>

9. Dependencies
<p><i>Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.</i></p> <p>NA</p>

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment
<p><i>Is the equality duty relevant?</i></p> <p>NA</p>

11. Consultation and Communications plans:
<p><i>Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?</i></p> <p>Communications and marketing plan to be approved January 2018</p>

12. Legal Implications
<p><i>Please consider</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?</li> <li>• Whether or not you require a delegation to implement</li> <li>• Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)</li> <li>• Is there a statutory duty to consult?</li> </ul>

13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>31</sup>	
<p><i>It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.</i></p>	
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)	

<sup>31</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.



£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£23	£0	-£0	£23
2019/20	£58	£0	-£0	£58
2020/21	£94	£0	-£0	£94
Total	£175	£0	-£0	£175

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

# Proposal for Change: Increase capacity of local 'under 20 mile' placements for looked after children (LAC)

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,  
Education & Early  
Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS5-C

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>32</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>The proposal is to increase the capacity of local 'under 20 mile' placements for looked after children (LAC).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-profiling of LAC to lower cost placements</li> </ul> <p>Expansion of market offer and development of placements. Analysis of Looked after Children profile and community to identify market provision and development.</p> <p>To include exploration around residential settings, increase in local in house foster carers, including specialisms.</p>

**2a. Confidence level**

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

50	%
----	---

Explanation:

Nationwide there is a genuine shortage of foster carers, LAs are continuing to pay for external provision. Market development with key stakeholders and expert provisions as well as approaching new leads and reviewing our in-house foster care support provision.

Marketing and recruitment activity commenced November 2017 currently very early days.

**3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:**

Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?

*Expansion of in house and external foster carers will impact on residents and our community of looked after children. Our marketing approach is to expand in house providers and work with our in care council to market what they would like to see from a good foster carer.*

**4. Impact on other services we provide**

Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?  
By reducing costs associated with LAC the spend pressures will adapt. LAC is our current highest area of spend.

NA

**5. Impact on staff**

Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

Project/Commissioning Officer to develop the market in Reading to negotiate lower costs placements.

**Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.**

**By expanding the number of 'within 20 mile placements' there is potential to save 1 FTE IRO and transport costs depending on the sufficiency of the placements.**

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

Increase in foster carers in-house registered	April 2018 - 2
Marketing pla and commissioning cycle	May 2018

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)  
What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

There will be an impact on those residents who want to register as an in-house foster carer

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

NA

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

Communications and marketing plan to be tabled January 2018

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- *Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?*
- *Whether or not you require a delegation to implement*
- *Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)*
- *Is there a statutory duty to consult?*

To be explored

13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>33</sup>				
<i>It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.</i>				
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No				
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£0	-£0	£0
2019/20	£1,538	£0	-£0	£1,538
2020/21	£1,538	£0	-£0	£1,538
Total	£3,076	£0	-£0	£3,076

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£60
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£60
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£60</b>

<sup>33</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Designate specialist foster carers for emergency provision and parent and child

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,  
Education & Early  
Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS6-C

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>34</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>The proposal is to designate specialist foster carers for emergency provision and parent and child.</p> <p>Assumes 1 child per month from 19/20 preventing emergency foster placements being placed with Independent Fostering Agencies.</p> <p>Assumes recruiting 2 specialist parent and child carers per year to avoid excessive market costs.</p> <p>Within the overall review of Looked after Children and cost placement analysis we know that we pay more for external placements. Within the business activities an approach to identify, mentor and support specialist foster carers will be undertaken, specifically for young people who are difficult to match to a placement in an emergency situation.</p>

### 2a. Confidence level

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

80	%
----	---

*Explanation:*

Early analysis of the pressures to place and lack of suitable settings would indicate that we are operating on a deficit model therefore we are confident that we can affect change for 2019/2020 in this area.

### 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

**By reducing costs associated with LAC the spend pressures will adapt.  
LAC is our current highest area of spend.**

### 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

**By reducing costs associated with LAC the spend pressures will adapt.  
LAC is our current highest area of spend.**

### 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

This work will be captured within the current staffing structure and the in house Foster Care recruitment team.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

***No additional resources at this stage as we will utilise external partner.***

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

Business plan April 2018 to align with Lime Tree Marketing approach	April 2018
Intensive Foster Carers identified and enlisted on training by	December 2018

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)  
What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

There will be a positive impact on those residents who want to register as an inhouse foster carer.

Opportunity to approach differently with an engaging and dynamic overview. Looking at the financial package for Specialist Foster Carers, their training and support.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

NA

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

Summer 2018



## 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>35</sup>

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£0	-£0	£0
2019/20	£76	£0	-£0	£76
2020/21	£67	£0	-£0	£67
Total	£143	£0	-£0	£143

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>35</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Increase income with targeted and specialist youth to taper reduction in revenue.

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,  
Education & Early  
Help Services

Head of Service: Vicky Rhodes

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS8-C

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>36</sup>
<p>This proposal is to increase income target with targeted and specialist youth to taper reduction in revenue spend.</p> <p>Using the Education Welfare Service model which has extensive experience of trading their services. With schools buying in EWS increasing revenue to the Authority. Business Plan under construction to extend the core offer and contractual arrangements.</p> <p>Commissioning cycle for 2018/19 will commence with an options paper in February 2018.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p><i>Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.</i></p> <p>75 %</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Analysis of current business activity, engagement with stakeholders and the development of SLAs indicate that this change will have an impact but will also stabilise the offer.</p>

### 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

A service with a business approach and capacity to carry out commissioned activities in schools and settings .

### 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

There will be no impact on other services other than ensuring that we have involvement across schools.

### 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

### 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

None

### 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

February consultation with schools	February 2018
New Commissioning cycle commenced and traded by	Dec 2018

### 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

#### Risks

Additional revenue not achieved due to schools not wanting to buy in to a traded youth service

#### Opportunities

To put the department on a more business-like footing with the opportunity

to forward plan by knowing the income for 2 years not on a 12 month basis.

To afford the department the time to plan the development and improvement of the service and its capacity to explore new business opportunities and engage with new schools.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

NA

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

February 2018

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- *Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?*
- *Whether or not you require a delegation to implement*
- *Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)*
- *Is there a statutory duty to consult?*

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>37</sup>

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£15	-£0	£15
2019/20	£0	£30	-£0	£30
2020/21	£0	£45	-£0	£45
Total	£0	£90	-£0	£90

<sup>37</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
	<b>TOTAL</b>	

# Proposal for Change:

## Early Years Transformation

Corporate Plan Priority: Service  
Delivery Model

Directorate: Children's, Education and  
Early Help Services

Delivery Unit Ref:  
DCEEHS9-C  
Option 1

Head of Service: Vicky Rhodes

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>38</sup>

We are seeking to recruit a transformation/project officer to develop a sustainable, modernised integrated 0-5 offer across Health, Education & Children's Centres. The 12 month project will develop a service delivery model that:

- a) achieves required savings & long term sustainability to 2021
- b) ensures the Borough continues to provide targeted support to the most vulnerable under 5s
- c) ensures the Borough meets its statutory Early Years functions

## 2a. Confidence level

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

100 %

*Explanation:*

Significant elements of the existing & planned 0-5 offer are supported via Public Health funding. This includes additional funding to Children's Centres & the newly commissioned 0-19 health contract.

There are some unknown risks to the security of this investment as reliant on Public Health England. The funding formula for 18/19 for Early years will not be known until December 2017

The scope of scheduled savings may vary if other sections of Children's Services cannot achieve their targets

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

The post holder will need to evaluate the impact/risks of the proposed savings for 2018-21. The post holder will need to generate plans for income generation, including feasibility for charging options alongside developing capacity in the local, voluntary sector for the delivery of non-statutory services.

By 2019, the transformed model could offer opportunities to engage business & other organisations to deliver more accessible/cost effective support across Reading. We anticipate digital solutions being part of the project scope.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

The post holder will review the impact & opportunities with other linked services: these will include: admissions, transitions, SEND & will be integral to the revised Early Help model for improved efficiency.

A successful collaborative model, that builds family resilience, meets needs & sustains outcomes at the earliest opportunity will help reducing demand on both RBC & partner high intensity/high cost services.

The post holder will need to consider future models in line with the planned capital investment in Community Hubs & identify opportunities for added value.

## 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

No existing posts will be lost. The success of the role will mitigate future staff reductions currently required in savings targets.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

Recruitment of a FTC for 12 months - costing £50K.

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Recruitment to Post	01.04.18
Scope of post agreed with key partners, audit of current service delivery; predictive analysis of demographic data set; digital transformation	30.06.18
Initial transformation model that achieves 2018/19 savings	30.09.18
Consultation with key stakeholders completed & final model presented to Senior Management	31.12.18
Model agreed & budgets built to 2022	31.3.19

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

There are minimal risk to recruiting to the post & a range of opportunities given the post holder will develop:

- Service delivery model of a modernised 0-5 offer for Reading families
- Alternative delivery model that achieves required savings & generates income for long term sustainability
- Digital solutions for earliest intervention



## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

Interdependency across range of RBC services including Housing ( particularly around the planned investment in Community Hubs) children's services

Adult Care & Health (Wellbeing, Commissioning & Improvement) - in relation to the commissioning of the 0-19 Health Offer.

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

Not applicable to the proposed post.

The post holder would need to complete impact assessment attached to the proposed model.

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

See implementation plan above.

The resulting service delivery model will require consultation with key stakeholders - we would adopt the approach used in recent restructure of children's centres

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- *Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?*
- *Whether or not you require a delegation to implement*
- *Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)*
- *Is there a statutory duty to consult?*

There are no legal implications attached to the recruitment of the post. The post holder will need to review legal implications, particularly around statutory duties, in the proposed model.

13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>39</sup>				
<i>It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.</i>				
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No				
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£150	£	-£	£150
2019/20	£150	£	-£	£150
2020/21	£200	£	-£	£200
Total	£ 500		£	£500

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£50
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£50
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£50</b>

<sup>39</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Design and implement a Reading Supported Lodging Scheme for Care Leavers

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,  
Education & Early  
Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS10-C

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>40</sup>

*Insert details of the proposal*

The proposal is to design and implement a Reading Supported Lodging Scheme either in house or with a local provider to reduce costs of Care Laver accommodation.

Early stage engagement with regular trusted providers indicates there is a real market interest in developing a more stable market offer. This market development is creating a lot of energy from both internal, external providers and from the young people who are needing supported lodging.

Activity commenced to analyse and understand costs currently associated with purchased placements.

## 2a. Confidence level

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

80 %

Explanation:

The ART Team continue to negotiate costings on case by case approach however this would ensure movement to bulk placement purchase with also an opportunity to sell 'places' to other authorities therefore a commissioning traded services model. Other local authorities manage similar schemes successfully.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?

By reducing costs associated with LAC the spend pressures will adapt. LAC is our current highest area of spend.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?

*By reducing costs associated with LAC the spend pressures will adapt. LAC is our current highest area of spend.*

## 5. Impact on staff

Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)

Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

2 commissioning / project officers and Admin support to engage, develop and design the Supported Lodgings scheme ( as well as other key proposals) within the Access to Resources Team to manage the market. The current ART team is unable to support this activity due to capacity and team size

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

Scope and go live	June 2018 - September 2018
-------------------	----------------------------------

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)  
What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

### Risk

Do nothing and continue to see costs for external supported lodging increase

### Opportunity

By developing an in-house provision with costs controlled and an approved supplier, demand can be managed.

Moving the Access to Resources team towards a business operational model that is also able to broker traded services generating income from neighbouring authorities.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

Interdependent with housing

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

NA

## 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

There will be commissioning and procurement procedures to follow with a consultation

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>41</sup>

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£52	£0	-£0	£52
2019/20	£130	£0	-£0	£130
2020/21	£209	£0	-£0	£209
Total	£391	£0	-£0	£391

## 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£151
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£151
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£151</b>

<sup>41</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Introduction of Charging Policy for Section 20 cases

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,

Education & Early

Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS12-C

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

## 2. Outline of the proposed change<sup>42</sup>

*Insert details of the proposal*

Introduction of a charging policy for Section 20 cases where parents ask for children to be accommodated. Policy would develop a flat weekly charge for 0 to 15 year olds, and full cost recovery for over 16's. Further work to benchmark other authorities success on introducing a charging policy.

### 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

30 %

*Explanation:*

This needs to be worked through, need to benchmark with other authorities and understand their progress.

### 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

**Will affect parents who are relinquishing their parental responsibilities**

### 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

NA

### 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

NA

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

### 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

**The impact on staffing is not fully understood therefore scoping activity needs to commence. This would be staffed through the additional resources within the Access to resources team that is already captured on DCEHS10**

### 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

Scoping and benchmarking	April 2018
--------------------------	------------

### 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

**Risks: This is a politically sensitive move, however this brings opportunity to deter parents from relinquishing their responsibilities if they are financially liable**

### 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

NA

### 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

NA



<b>11. Consultation and Communications plans:</b>
Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens? NA
<b>12. Legal Implications</b>
Please consider <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?</li> <li>• Whether or not you require a delegation to implement</li> <li>• Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)</li> <li>• Is there a statutory duty to consult?</li> </ul> This will need to be examined carefully within the scoping activity

<b>13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>43</sup></b>				
It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.				
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No				
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£0	-£0	£0
2019/20	£0	£tbc	-£0	£tbc
2020/21	£0	£tbc	-£0	£tbc
Total	£0	£tbc	-£0	£tbc

<b>13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)</b>		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>43</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Review of all post order payments

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,

Education & Early

Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS13-C

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
✓	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>44</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>Review of all post order payments - Adoption Order payments, Special Guardianship Orders, and Care Arrangement Orders.</p> <p>Legacy of payments to individuals providing care for Children and Young People, our internal infrastructure has omitted to establish end dates meaning we have a number of payments being made beyond their end date.</p>

**2a. Confidence level**

Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.

100 %

Explanation:

*Legacy of SGOs and other payments to family / friends for looking after Children who would otherwise be a Looked after Child. However we have an issue with payments being set up but not ended. Therefore following a review CS know that there is significant works to unpick and end numerous financial arrangements.*

**3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:**

Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?

*It will impact people in receipt of payments that they are no longer entitled to claim.*

**4. Impact on other services we provide**

Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?

*Will have to identify with Adults whether there is any overlap with vulnerable adults that they also make direct payments to.*

**5. Impact on staff**

Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)

Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*

*Will be captured within additional resource through ART*

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

	Planned approach	March 2018
	Initial savings	Summer 2018

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)  
What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

Risk around ending payments without assessing current situation of child / young person

Opportunity to reclaim, end payments that should not be currently active. There is also an opportunity to train staff in setting up on MOSAIC payments with a clear end date.

## 9. Dependencies

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

NA

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

NA

## 12. Legal Implications

*Please consider*

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

Consultation with Legal.

Communication to all in receipt of a payment advising them of the review

### 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>45</sup>

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£25	£0	-£0	£25
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
2020/21	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£25	£0	-£0	£25

### 13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)

£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>45</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Review all direct payment and short break provision for children with disabilities.

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,

Education & Early

Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS14-C

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
✓	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>46</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>Review of all direct payment and short break provision. Reduction of service:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2018/19 - 5%</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2019/20 - 10%</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2020/21 - 10%</p> <p>Refocus on preventing the escalation of need working alongside the voluntary sector with careful negotiation, providing good value for money reducing pressure on CYPDT resources and budgets.</p>

**2a. Confidence level**

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

100 %

Explanation: commissioning and review of contracting process needed to ensure most cost effective good outcome based service is delivered.

**3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:**

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

Large majority of services delivered via the voluntary sector , communication and engagement needed to work alongside.

**4. Impact on other services we provide**

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

Short breaks used by parent s of children with disabilities.

**5. Impact on staff**

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)*

Existing staff do not have the capacity to take on this additional specific work. Timing is an issue to ensure savings are achieved as soon as possible.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

6. Resources and support needed to make the change	
<p><i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i></p> <p>No extra resource requested</p>	
7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones	
<p>To include key decision points and governance meetings</p>	
Inc into commissioning cycle	April 18

8. Risks and Opportunities
<p><i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)</i>  <i>What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i></p> <p>Risks          Sensitive area for those families affected. A planned reduction over 3 years will flag up concerns and possible complaints.</p> <p>Due to increasing numbers of children with disabilities and complex needs any reduction in care plans may be counteracted by increasing numbers.</p> <p>Opportunity to look at traded services model and engagement with neighbouring authorities around their approach as well as wider grant application to voluntary sector.</p>

9. Dependencies
<p><i>Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.</i></p> <p>NA</p>

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment
<p><i>Is the equality duty relevant?</i></p> <p>NA</p>

11. Consultation and Communications plans:
<p><i>Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?</i></p> <p>Will need to be a clear consultation and communications plan</p>

12. Legal Implications
<p><i>Please consider</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether or not you require a delegation to implement</i></li> <li>• <i>Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)</i></li> <li>• <i>Is there a statutory duty to consult?</i></li> </ul> <p>To be explored within scoping</p>



13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year <sup>47</sup>				
<i>It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.</i>				
Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No				
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£25	£0	-£0	£25
2019/20	£51	£0	-£0	£51
2020/21	£51	£0	-£0	£51
Total	£127	£0	-£0	£127

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		

<sup>47</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Review of school transport provision

Corporate Plan Priority:

Directorate:

Children's,  
Education & Early  
Help Services

Head of Service: Kim Drake

Delivery Unit Ref:

DCEEHS15-C

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
✓	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>48</sup>
<p><i>Insert details of the proposal</i></p> <p>Review of school transport provision - SEN transport has been allocated to children under the 3 mile statutory requirement. All of these transport packages will be reviewing in line with statutory policy and withdrawing where we assess we can.</p> <p>The potential integration of school transport with other transport provision will provide wider savings. In addition a post 16 policy is also being developed.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p><i>Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.</i></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">90 %</div> <p><i>Explanation: if Reading adopt the national legislation for school transport savings can be achieved.</i></p>

<b>3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:</b>
<i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?</i>
<i>Impact on residents getting their children to school themselves and absorbing the cost</i>

<b>4. Impact on other services we provide</b>
<i>Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?</i>
Potential impact on other directorates using the same transport pool at peak times

<b>5. Impact on staff</b>	
<i>Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc)</i>	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b>
<i>Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.</i>
<i>The potential integration and creation of a transport pool will spur on wider changes and efficiencies</i>

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b>	
To include key decision points and governance meetings	
Post 16 policy	June 2018

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b>
<i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?</i>
Risk - Concern from parents and disability representatives.
Opportunities - operation as part of a wider business model and application of clear legislation ensuring that those in need of transport receive it.

<b>9. Dependencies</b>
<i>Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test</i>

these out.  
NA

## 10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment

Is the equality duty relevant?  
NA

## 11. Consultation and Communications plans:

Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?  
Wider consultation as part of the transport department alignment.

## 12. Legal Implications

Please consider

- Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped?
- Whether or not you require a delegation to implement
- Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement)
- Is there a statutory duty to consult?

Legal consultation and sign off from DMT

## 13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>49</sup>

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£50	£0	-£0	£50
2019/20	£100	£0	-£0	£100
2020/21	£200	£0	-£0	£200
Total	£350	£0	-£0	£350

<sup>49</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
	<b>TOTAL</b>	

# Directorate of Environment and Neighbourhood Services

# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Neighbourhood Services

**Saving headline: Parks and Open Spaces Invest to Save - additional income generation of £130k per annum.**

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref: DENS  
Directorate: DENS 2C  
Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
<p>The Parks and Open Spaces department is a well-established provider of professional, chargeable landscape, arboricultural and consultancy services as a part of its current operation. Revenue from chargeable work in 2016/17 was £511k and the department is committed to two further Invest to Save proposals to generate an additional £93k by 2019/20.</p> <p>This proposal outlines plans to further increase the revenue from this chargeable operation by a further £130k per annum.</p>

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>
100%

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
<p>A service with higher capacity to carry out internal and external consultancy, design and works will be available to all customers.</p>

**4. Impact on other services we provide** *(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)*

There will be no Impact on other services we provide.

**5. Impact on staff** *(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

Reorganise existing team structure.

The number of FTE that might be lost is: 0

The number of posts that might be lost is: 0

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change** *(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)*

Revenue funding for additional staff will be required to create management and supervisory capacity and a team of sufficient scale to operate the larger chargeable service described.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones** *(To include key decision points and governance meetings)*

*Planned accomplishments to track progress* [Milestone] [Date]

Put new staff structure in place 01.02.18

**8. Risks and Opportunities** *(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)*

Risks:

Additional revenue from commercial works is not realised.

Opportunities:

To put the department on a more business-like footing.

To generate additional income off-setting revenue costs.

To afford the department the time to plan the development and improvement of the service and its capacity to explore new business opportunities such as children's playground inspection, design and construction for third parties.

**9. Dependencies** *(Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)*

Finance, Communications Department, Website team & Admin support.

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.



Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

None

**12. Legal Implications** *(Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)*

None

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>50</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	It is not possible at present to demonstrate market size for this service within the Borough. A market sizing exercise will be carried out prior to any further business development work. The department does not currently market or promote their services beyond the Commercial Services page of the RBC website. All our new business comes from referrals indicating we are providing a quality service.
---	--

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£100	-£35	£65
2019/20	£	£100	-£35	£65
Total	£	£200	-£	£130

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£

<sup>50</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£

---

# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Neighbourhood Services

Saving headline: *Increase Green Waste collection charges*

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref: DENS  
Directorate: DENS 3C  
Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>																	
<p>The chargeable green waste collection service was introduced in April 2017 after having previously been a free service taken up by 16,700 residents. The chargeable service had 15,000 subscribers as of 01.11.17.</p> <p>Proposal: Increase Green Waste collection charges by £10 for bins and £5.00 for bags in 19/20. The proposed increases generate an additional £145k per annum as shown below: (NB this excludes any decrease in subscriber levels).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="167 1388 1404 1534"> <thead> <tr> <th>Financial Year 19/20</th> <th>Subscribers</th> <th>Rate</th> <th>Revenue</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bins</td> <td>14,000 bin subscribers</td> <td>£60</td> <td>£840k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bags</td> <td>1,000 bag subscribers</td> <td>£20</td> <td>£20k</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>Total Revenue</b></td> <td><b>£860k</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Financial Year 19/20	Subscribers	Rate	Revenue	Bins	14,000 bin subscribers	£60	£840k	Bags	1,000 bag subscribers	£20	£20k			<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>£860k</b>
Financial Year 19/20	Subscribers	Rate	Revenue														
Bins	14,000 bin subscribers	£60	£840k														
Bags	1,000 bag subscribers	£20	£20k														
		<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>£860k</b>														

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
100%	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>	

Increased service cost.

**4. Impact on other services we provide** *(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)*

None

**5. Impact on staff** *(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

None

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	
The number of posts that might be lost is:	

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change** *(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)*

None beyond existing.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones** *(To include key decision points and governance meetings)*

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]
Inform subscribers as part of service renewal.	01.03.19

**8. Risks and Opportunities** *(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)*

Risks:  
Reduction in the number of subscribers.

**9. Dependencies** *(Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)*

Communications Team & Admin support

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.

Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--	----	--------------------------

Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--	----	--------------------------

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

None

**12. Legal Implications** *(Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)*

Green waste collection is a discretionary service for which the Council can charge.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>51</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/ <del>No</del>	Yes - See calculations set out in section 2			
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
<b>£'000's</b>	<b>Savings</b>	<b>Income</b>	<b>Growth/Costs</b>	<b>Total</b>
2018/19	£	£	-£	£
2019/20	£	£145	-£	£145
Total	£	£145	-£	£145

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		<b>£'000's</b>
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>-£</b>

<sup>51</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Network Management & Parking Services

**Saving headline: *Increase on-street pay & display charges***

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref:  
Directorate: DENS 7C  
Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
It is proposed that the charges for on-street (Highway) pay & display parking are increased by £0.10 per tariff band.

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
70%	The changes will require alterations to the Traffic Regulation Orders for each restriction and statutory consultation.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
The use of P&D in the town centre is very high with very good turnover. P&D bays remain a very convenient and cost-efficient means of parking close to visitors destinations, particularly for short-stay visits.

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
None

<b>5. Impact on staff</b> <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
None	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b> <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>	
The proposals will require investment to advertise changes to the current Traffic Regulation Order, change the pricing structure and change the signs on each P&D machine.	
The proposals will require support from Legal Services, and the Councils Direct Labour organisation.	

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b> <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]
Report proposal to Traffic Management Sub-Committee (seek approval to conduct a statutory consultation)	Mar 18
Review TROs and draft statutory consultation notices for Legal Services	Apr 18
Legal Services to create the legal notice for statutory consultation and NM team to arrange advertisement and arrange setup of webpage	May 18
Notices to be placed on street and 21-day consultation conducted	May 18
Results of statutory consultation to be analysed and reported to Traffic Management Sub-Committee (seek approval to implement)	Jun 18
Legal Services to seal the order and NM team to arrange advertisement of the notice.	Jul/Aug 18
Contractor instructed to change charging rates on the machines (including signs) and on Ringo application.	Sept 18

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b> <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>	
There is a risk that the statutory consultations will result in a significant number of objections (and negative publicity) being received.	

<b>9. Dependencies</b> <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>	
The proposal requires support from Legal Services.	

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>	
If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.	

Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

The proposal will require statutory (formal) public consultation for the required changes to the affected Traffic Regulation Orders. These will be conducted in accordance with appropriate legislation.

**12. Legal Implications** *(Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)*

The proposal will require statutory (formal) public consultation for the required changes to the affected Traffic Regulation Orders. These will be conducted in accordance with appropriate legislation.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>52</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	<p>This information projects a likely income increase if £0.10 were to be added to each tariff band for the TOWN (Inner &amp; Outer) Pay &amp; Display operation.</p> <p>The information is from the known sales to date (April - September FY17/18) and added £0.10p to each ticket sold at the known tariff band (e.g. £0.60p changed to £0.70p, £1.10 to £1.20 etc.).</p> <p>For the Projections for the remainder of the year (October - March) we have used the income from last year (FY16/17) and added 6.19% to that figure. This increase is taken from the average % projected increases seen across the first six months of this year.</p> <p>We have not taken account of the possible increase in income that may occur for the next six months. The first six months has seen an average monthly increase of over 10%, however, this is unlikely to continue and is more likely a result of the increased provision of P&amp;D parking bays recently introduced.</p> <p>This information assumes an implementation of the new charges from 1st October 2018.</p>
---	--

<sup>52</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.



If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£19	-£0	£19
2019/20	£	£19	-£0	£19
Total	£	£38	-£0	£38

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£0
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£5
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£5
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£ 0
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£0
TOTAL		-£ 5

# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Strategic Transport

Saving headline: Increased income from *Greenwave Bus Service*

Corporate Plan Priority:

Delivery Unit Ref:

Directorate: DENS 8C

Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
There is an existing budget saving proposal to make a saving of £60k on the Greenwave bus service from April 2018 as presented to Policy Committee in 2017. Following a review of the existing budget and projected increased patronage on the route it is proposed that an additional £100k saving can be made on the Greenwave service, resulting in a £160k saving from April 2018 in total when combined with the previous saving proposal.

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
100%	Forecast increases in patronage will result in additional income for the service.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
There will be no impact on residents or businesses as the Greenwave service will continue to operate.

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
None

<b>5. Impact on staff</b> <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
None	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b> <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>
The Transport Planning team will lead on implementing this change. Support from the Finance Team will be required.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b> <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]
Saving Achieved	01/04/18

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b> <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>
Income is received from third parties (Green Park and Reading International Business Park) for the operation of the service, however there is a risk that either partner may decide to remove or reduce their contribution at any time. If this happened then the Council has the ability to reduce the level of service (and therefore operational cost) in line with the reduced income.

<b>9. Dependencies</b> <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>
Finance support.

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>				
If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.				
Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** (Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)

None required.

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

The council has a statutory duty under the Transport Act 1985 to secure the appropriate provision of bus services, which members of the public rely on to get from place to place.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>53</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	Yes - the proposed savings will be achieved by reviewing the existing operation of the Greenwave Service and expected increased patronage.
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)	

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£100	£0	-£0	£100
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£100	£0	-£0	£100

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£

<sup>53</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Network Management & Parking Services

**Saving headline: *Revise existing access (no entry) restriction in Beresford Road at its junction with Portman Road and convert into bus gate.***

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref:  
Directorate: DENS 10C  
Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
Revise existing access restriction (no entry) in Beresford Road at its junction with Portman Road and convert into a bus gate. The conversion of this existing junction restriction to a bus gate will allow effective enforcement against non-authorized vehicles, protect the local environment for Residents, and ensure effective vehicular controls are in place prior to the opening of Cow Lane bridges in September 2018.

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
70%	The proposed changes will be subject to completing a statutory consultation.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None.

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>

None.

**5. Impact on staff** *(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

None.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:

The number of posts that might be lost is:

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change** *(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)*

This proposal will require a capital investment of £75K for advertising the traffic order, adjusting the road layout and signing changes. The Councils Legal Services Team will be required to support the statutory process. The Councils DLO will be required to support the highway works and installation of signs.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones** *(To include key decision points and governance meetings)*

*Planned accomplishments to track progress* [Milestone] [Date]

Reports to Traffic Management Sub-Committee seeking authority to advertise and make the relevant Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Mar 2018

Prepare TRO April 2018

Statutory consultation April/May 2018

Objections to TM Sub June 2018

Implement change July 2018

**8. Risks and Opportunities** *(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)*

As this is an adjustment to an existing restriction, the risks are minimal however, if the benefits are not properly explained and understood there is likely to be some resistance to the proposal. The opportunities are improved access for bus services and emergency services, and an improved local environment for the nearby residential estate as the route will no longer be abused by large commercial vehicles.

**9. Dependencies** *(Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)*

The introduction of this proposal will require support from Legal support to arrange the changes to the movement restriction, and the Council's DLO to make changes to the highway.

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.

Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

The proposals will require statutory public consultation. Any objections will be reported through the Traffic Management Sub Committee.

**12. Legal Implications** *(Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)*

Statutory consultation will be carried out in accordance with the appropriate legislation

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>54</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	The proposal and projected income are based on other similar bus gate restrictions in the Borough.			
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)				
£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£25	-£0	£25
2019/20	£	£25	-£0	£25
Total	£	£50	-£0	£50

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
		-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£75
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£

<sup>54</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

	<i>Sub-total</i>	- £75
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£ 75



# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Network Management & Parking Services

**Saving headline: *Introduce further areas of pay and display in the town centre, and other local centres.***

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref:  
Directorate: DENS 11C  
Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
<p>Introduce further areas of pay and display in the town centre, and other local centres such as Caversham, Shinfield, Tilehurst, Oxford Road, Wokingham Road and London Road.</p> <p>There are several areas that are either unrestricted, or have existing limited waiting areas for short term parking. Creation of such areas provides residents and visitors with more certainty of short term parking, and a higher turnover of available spaces.</p>

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
70%	The proposals are subject to the outcome of a Statutory Consultation process.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
<p>Residents in the vicinity are largely already protected by the resident permit parking scheme and their access to parking will remain as it is currently.</p> <p>This proposal will better balance the demand for parking in the local centres to encourage turn-over of parking to the benefit of the local economy. This proposal will improve access to kerbside space</p>

for disabled drivers as P&D bays can be used by blue badge holders. This proposal will also help with enforcement of waiting restrictions and stop the abuse of the current limited waiting times that currently exist.

**4. Impact on other services we provide** *(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)*

None

**5. Impact on staff** *(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

None - the work required to implement this change will be carried out by in-house resources.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
--	---

The number of posts that might be lost is:	0
--	---

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change** *(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)*

This proposal will require a capital investment of £250K for advertising the traffic order, signing changes and P&D machines.

The Councils Legal Services Team will be required to support the statutory process. The Councils DLO will be required to support the installation of signs and P&D machines.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones** *(To include key decision points and governance meetings)*

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]
Reports to Traffic Management Sub-Committee seeking authority to advertise and make the relevant Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)	Mar 2018
Prepare TRO	April 2018
Statutory consultation	April/May 2018
Objections to TM Sub	June 2018
Implement change	July 2018

**8. Risks and Opportunities** *(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)*

As this is an expansion of an existing scheme the risks are minimal. However, if the benefits are not properly explained and understood there may be some resistance to the proposal. The opportunities are improved access to kerbside space within local centres with better enforcement and increased income from revenue generated.

**9. Dependencies** *(Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)*

The introduction of this proposal will require support from Legal Services.

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.

Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
---	-----	--------------------------	----	--

Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--	----	--------------------------

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

The proposals will require statutory public consultation. Any objections will be reported through the Traffic Management Sub Committee.

**12. Legal Implications** *(Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)*

Statutory consultation will be carried out in accordance with the appropriate legislation.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>55</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	Yes - The first six months has seen an average monthly increase of over 10%, however, this is unlikely to continue and is more likely a result of the increased provision of P&D parking bays recently introduced.
---	--

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)	
--	--

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£50	-£0	£50
2019/20	£	£50	-£0	£50
Total	£	£100	-£0	£100

<sup>55</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£250
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	- £250
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£ 250

# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Streetcare Services

Saving headline: *Capitalise Highways Operatives Salaries in 18/19 only*

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref:  
Directorate: DENS 12C  
Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
Capitalise posts in the Highways & Drainage Service to implement capital improvement works funded from grant Funding in <u>18/19 only</u> .

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>
100%

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None.

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
None.

**5. Impact on staff** *(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

None.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:

The number of posts that might be lost is:

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change** *(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)*

Support from the Finance Team.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones** *(To include key decision points and governance meetings)*

*Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone] [Date]*

Policy Committee Approval Feb 18

Implement change Apr 18

**8. Risks and Opportunities** *(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)*

None.

**9. Dependencies** *(Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)*

Support required from the Finance Team to make the change.

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.

Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?

Yes

No

Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.

Yes

No

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

No consultation required.

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider; Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

None.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>56</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No      Yes - The grant has been confirmed.

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£75	£0	-£0	£75
2019/20	-£75	£0	-£0	-£75
Total	£0	£0	-£0	£0

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
		-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
		<i>Sub-total</i>
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
		<i>Sub-total</i>
TOTAL		-£

<sup>56</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change:

## Transportation and Streetcare

### Network Management & Parking Services

**Saving headline: *Introduce a 24 hours a day, 7 days a week charge for all Town Centre Pay & Display (P&D)***

Corporate Plan Priority:  
 Delivery Unit Ref:  
 Directorate: DENS 13C  
 Head of Service: Cris Butler

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
To amend the charges for use of pay and display areas within the Town Centre to apply 24 hours a day, 7 days a week (currently applies 8am-8pm).

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
80%	This is a change to the current scheme where there are no charges currently between 8pm and 8am and requires a statutory consultation.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
Extending on-street Pay and Display to cover the period between 8pm and 8am will provide more short term parking for the area but will impact on some residents/businesses who currently use those parking areas between 8pm and 8am for free. If accepted, the adjusted charging regime will manage parking in the pay and display areas in the same way that the current 8am to 8pm scheme is managed.



**4. Impact on other services we provide** *(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)*

There will be no Impact on other services we provide.

**5. Impact on staff** *(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

There will be no impact on staff.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:

The number of posts that might be lost is:

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change** *(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)*

Staff time in Network Management and Legal Services to promote the proposed changes and complete the Statutory Consultation

Support from the Councils' Direct Labour Organisation will be required to make changes to the on-street parking signs.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones** *(To include key decision points and governance meetings)*

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Reports to Traffic Management Sub-Committee seeking authority to advertise and make the relevant Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)	Mar 2018
Prepare TRO	April 2018
Statutory consultation	April/May 2018
Objections to TM Sub	June 2018
Implement change	July 2018

**8. Risks and Opportunities** *(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)*

There may be residual impact on residents, although most of the risks have been realised through the introduction of the existing scheme.

**9. Dependencies** *(Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)*

The internal legal team will be required to support the legal process to produce the TRO(s).

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.

Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

The proposals will require statutory public consultation. Any objections will be reported through the Traffic Management Sub Committee.

**12. Legal Implications** *(Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)*

Statutory consultation will be carried out in accordance with the appropriate legislation

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>57</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	The model of charging for short term parking in the form of pay and display is already in place across the Borough. This proposal will create a charging regime covering all hours in the day rather than the current 8am to 8pm charging period.
---	---

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£	£45	-£0	£45
2019/20	£	£25	-£0	£25
Total	£	£70	-£0	£70

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

	£'000's	
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£0
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£5
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0

<sup>57</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£5
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£0
TOTAL		-£5

# Proposal for Change: Transportation and Streetcare Re3

## Saving headline: *Adjustment to Base Assumptions (Re3)*

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref:  
Directorate: DENS 15C  
Head of Service: Alison Bell

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
<p>The saving is proposed by identifying surplus Business Rates. It is proposed that these will be removed from the budget for 2018/19.</p> <p>In respect of the Business Rates allocation, there will need to be some coordination with the team that centrally sets the amount identified for the payment of this cost - to ensure accuracy. The surplus identified is based on the 17/18 budget</p>

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
100%	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None

<b>4. Impact on other services we provide</b> <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>	
None	

<b>5. Impact on staff</b> <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
None	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	N/A
The number of posts that might be lost is:	N/A

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b> <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>
None

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b> <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]
Setting Business Rates	(late) Dec 2017
Budget Setting	Jan 2018

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b> <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>
In respect of the Business Rates allocation, there will need to be some coordination with the team that centrally sets the amount identified for the payment of this cost - to ensure accuracy.

<b>9. Dependencies</b> <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>
As above at 8.

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>				
If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.				
Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** (Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)

N/A

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

N/A

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>58</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No  
Yes. The 17/18 budget has a surplus allocation in the categories described above.

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£100	£0	-£0	£100
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£100	£0	-£0	£100

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	- £
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£

<sup>58</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Housing General Fund

## Reducing B&B Expenditure

Corporate Plan Priority: Providing homes for those in most need.  
Safeguarding and protecting those that are most vulnerable.

Directorate/reference: DENS 17C

Head of Service: Sarah Gee

1. The proposal is to:	
✓	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <sup>59</sup>	
<i>Insert details of the proposal</i>	
<p>This proposal is to set a stretch target to further reduce expenditure on emergency accommodation for homeless households. Reducing B&amp;B use and length of stay is a key priority for the Council to deliver the best outcomes for homeless families. Ambitious targets have already been set and agreed in July over a period of the next three years to reduce B&amp;B usage - £300k for 17/18 and £250k per annum for each the subsequent two financial years - a total of £800k.</p> <p>A clear and driving focus on reducing B&amp;B use through a comprehensive multi-strand approach is having significant traction - although market conditions remain challenging due to limited availability of affordable housing. The numbers of households in B&amp;B have reduced from 144 at year end March 17 to currently circa 60. With the new Lowfield Road temporary accommodation development due to be let in the new year, the service is aiming to finish the 2017-18 financial year with no more than 50 households in B&amp;B.</p> <p>Whilst it is likely that at year end the service will be significantly ahead of schedule in delivering the total 3 year saving target, there are significant risks and pressures ahead which are difficult to quantify at this stage - including the roll out of Universal Credit in December 2017 and the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act from April 2018.</p> <p><b>In this context, the service proposes setting a challenging but achievable additional savings</b></p>	

target of £450k - profiled £350k in 2018/19, no further saving in 19/20 and an additional £100k in 2020/21. The budget and savings target makes allowance for additional costs arising from the Homelessness Reduction Act.

This assumes numbers of households in B&B: 18/19 start 50 - end 40; 19/20 start 40 end 20; 20/21 start 20 - end 20: note that this equates to min historic use of B&B - some level of emergency provision is likely to be required.

## 2a. Confidence level

*Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.*

%90

The target makes allowances for additional staffing and other costs arising from the Homelessness Reduction Act as detailed below and allows for some growth in costs in respect of B&B use - this is anticipated as the authority continues to improve the quality of emergency provision used.

Additional budget provision has also been made for payments to alleviate or prevent homelessness to help more households' secure private rented sector accommodation.

## 3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

*Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?*

If successful this will have a positive impact as homeless families will spend less time in B&B.

## 4. Impact on other services we provide

*Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?*

Positive if the use of B&B is avoided or lengths of stay reduce for families with complex or additional needs and they are supported to prevent homelessness or to access secure accommodation more swiftly.

## 5. Impact on staff

*Insert information here... (include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

None - additional staff resources have been agreed to enable the service to meet the additional duties and cover the consequent workload created by the Homelessness Reduction Act. This will further support the Council's emphasis on prevention, early intervention and cost avoidance.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:

0

The number of posts that might be lost is:

0

## 6. Resources and support needed to make the change

*Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required e.g., Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.*



See Section 5.

## 7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

To include key decision points and governance meetings

None specific to this additional stretch target. A detailed action plan is in place in respect of the Homelessness Reduction Act.

## 8. Risks and Opportunities

*(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies)*

*What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? What opportunities are there for collaborative working?*

### RISKS

**Universal Credit** has been introduced incrementally thus far for new claimants who are single and was introduced for all new claimants or those with a change of circumstance in December 2017; claimants are paid 6 weeks in arrears and this is anticipated to lead to a (potentially significant) rise in evictions. Data and insight provider **HouseMark** found that (in social housing) the average rent arrears of a tenant receiving Universal Credit is almost five times the average of those not in receipt of the welfare payment. There is a real risk of evictions increasing due to arrears and market perception/risk avoidance.

**Local Housing Allowance (LHA)** is the maximum amount Housing Benefit will pay accommodation; this has now been frozen since April 2015 - as time passes and market rents rise the pool of affordable accommodation for those on benefits shrinks further.

**Homelessness Reduction Act** - The DCLG anticipate that the introduction of the Act will result in a 26% increase in homelessness caseloads (Wales saw a 28% increase). Additionally pilot authorities have seen substantive increases in the length and intensity of case work. The introduction of the Act is significant not only in terms of the duties which it heralds, but it will place huge demands on frontline management to implement whilst maintaining momentum to reduce B&B use and manage demand more widely.

**Supply of temporary accommodation** - Currently 40 decanted flats on the Dee Park estate are being used for temporary accommodation pending demolition - these could be required from 2019 at the earliest but a re-housing programme would need a sufficient lead-in to accommodate this number of households.

### MITIGATION

A detailed action plan is in place in respect of the Homelessness Reduction Act with a clear project structure to ensure delivery of the necessary changes to support implementation of the requirements of the Act. As above additional staff are being employed to ensure that the authority can meet it's new statutory duties.

Performance in respect of homelessness/B&B reduction is tightly monitored and projections of need and demand are regularly reviewed and updated.

The Housing Service will continue taking a proactive and targeted approach to mitigating the impacts of welfare reforms. Tenant Services has employed a team of welfare reform support officers (part funded by DWP and part through the Housing Revenue Account) to identify and support those affected. This includes maximising access to benefits; supporting people through learning pathways, work experience, volunteering and training to prepare them for paid employment; accessing debt advice/money management; and working collaboratively with other teams within the Council to provide support.

**OPPORTUNITIES**

To further strengthen the Council's preventative and early intervention approach to homelessness.

**9. Dependencies**

*Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.*

N/A re this proposal

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment**

*Is the equality duty relevant?*

Not applicable.

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:**

*Would there be a need to carry out staff/public or stakeholder consultation? If so, how is it proposed that this happens?*

Not applicable.

**12. Legal Implications**

None as a result of this proposal.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>60</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No	Yes - although service is demand led and so there remains a risk re deliverability
If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)	

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£250	£	-£	£250
2019/20	£100	£	-£	£100
2020/21	£100	£	-£	£100
<b>Total</b>	<b>£450</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>-£</b>	<b>£450</b>

<sup>60</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)		
£'000's		
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		

# Proposal for Change: Housing & Neighbourhood Services Housing Revenue Account

**Saving headline: *Transfer of void council housing properties to Homes For Reading Ltd.***

Corporate Plan Priority: Remaining financially sustainable  
 Delivery Unit Ref: DENS 18C  
 Directorate: DENS  
 Head of Service: Sarah Gee

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>	
<p>The General Consent for the Disposal of Land held for the purposes of Part II of the Housing Act 1985, allows void Housing Revenue Accounts (HRA) properties to be sold at Market Value. Where the properties are sold to a company owned by the Local Authority, such as Homes for Reading, the consent is limited to 5 properties a year.</p> <p>There are different regulations for properties that are sold voluntarily to those sold through Right to Buy and therefore the Council are allowed to retain 100% of the receipts for these units. In addition, the receipts are not ring fenced to the HRA and can be utilised within the General Fund.</p> <p>As this is a Capital receipt, in most circumstances, the income from the sale of the units would need to fund Capital spend and would therefore reduce borrowing by the corresponding amount. The revenue impact of reduced borrowing equates to c.£35k for every £1m of reduced borrowing. However, Reading Borough Council currently has an agreement with Central Government under a framework within the Statutory Guidance on the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts which allows Capital receipts to be used to directly fund the revenue costs of transformation projects. This flexibility is time limited to the end of March 2019.</p> <p>Therefore, it is proposed that 5 HRA units are sold when void in 17/18 (if it proves possible to complete transactions in that timeframe) and in 18/19, and that the receipts be used to fund transformation projects within the General Fund. In order for the properties to still be available to meet housing need in Reading, it is proposed that they are sold to Homes for Reading, Reading Borough Council's wholly owned housing company, within a restrictive covenant created at the point of sale that secures that the properties are let with rent no higher than Local Housing Allowance (LHA) levels, which is the maximum amount Housing Benefit will pay. A covenant of this nature will</p>	

decrease the market value of the units (which makes the proposition viable for the company). The company would then be expected to allocate these properties to homeless households or those threatened with homelessness - as it currently would for any other sub-market rental property.

Due to the complications created by creating an additional leaseholder in blocks of flats, it is proposed that only houses are sold. In addition, the impact of Welfare Reform on the finances of low income households is felt more acutely by larger families and it is therefore proposed that only two-bed units are sold with larger houses retained within the HRA and let at social rents.

Individual valuations of each property would need to be completed at the point that the units become void and are considered for sale. Therefore, the figures set out below are only illustrative of the potential income this proposal could generate.

Each two-bedroom house, with a restrictive covenant in place to cap the rent to LHA levels, is estimated to be valued at c£185k. For each sale c.£25k associated debt would need to be absorbed within the HRA business plan (spread across the remaining properties this would have minimal impact).

The sale of 5 units would therefore release a receipt of c.£925k that could be used to fund transformation activity within the General Fund. On the basis that, in subsequent years a reduction in borrowing, commensurate with a Capital receipt of this order, would only reduce borrowing within the General Fund by c.£32k p.a., it is not proposed that further transfers are affected beyond 2018/19 as there are disadvantages over the longer term to reducing social housing availability.

**2a. Confidence level** *(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)*

60%

This proposal is contingent on the Board of Homes for Reading agreeing to purchase the void two-bed units that become available on the basis described above. Further legal advice will be required to ensure that implications have been fully considered by both RBC and HfR.

**3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:** *(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)*

The impact of this proposal is that there would be a reduction in 5 properties owned by RBC and let as social housing let to residents via the housing register. However, there would be an increase in 5 units let to homeless households by Homes for Reading, although these units would be let at Local Housing Allowance levels and on an Assured Shorthold Tenancy (AST) rather than Secure or Fixed Term tenancies.

There is no expected impact on businesses and other organisations.

**4. Impact on other services we provide** *(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)*

No significant impact expected if limited to two financial years. If annual transfers were pursued over the longer term this would have a cumulatively greater impact on the HRA and this has not, at this stage, been modelled.

<b>5. Impact on staff</b> <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
No impact expected.	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b> <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>
Valuations and Legal services will be required to value the properties, secure the covenants and manage the sale of the units to Homes for Reading. This resource may need to be sourced externally if there is no capacity within the internal teams.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b> <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Due diligence completed/HfR Board approval sought	End Jan 2018
5 units sold	31 <sup>st</sup> Mar 2018
5 units sold	31 <sup>st</sup> Mar 2019

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b> <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>
As the proposal is for the units to still be let at Affordable rents (LHA levels), this mitigates against the risk of any increase in the number of families placed in B&B.

<b>9. Dependencies</b> <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>
None

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>				
NOT REQUIRED.				
Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** (Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)

No consultation required. Need to advise tenant representatives and seek consent from the Board of Homes for Reading.

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

The sale of the units and introduction of a covenant at that time will need to be delivered within the relevant legislative framework.

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>61</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No Yes

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£0	-£0	£0
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£0	£0	-£0	£0

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£925,000
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£925,000
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		1,850,000

# Proposal for Change: Planning Development and Regulatory Services

**Saving headline: *Charge time for work related to investment purchases***

Corporate Plan Priority:  
Delivery Unit Ref:  
Directorate: DENS 19C  
Head of Service: Giorgio Framaliccio

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
Revised fee and income assumptions and increase recovery of state costs associated with asset management.

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
25%	Achieving this income would be dependent on the availability of suitable commercial property and the successful completion of purchases (s).

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
Increased Council Debt.



<b>5. Impact on staff</b> <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
None	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b> <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>
Corporate agreement as to the level / scale of the fee arising.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b> <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Agreement with Finance as to the level of the fee	January 18
Implementation	January 18

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b> <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>

<b>9. Dependencies</b> <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>
Agreed position on the level of income

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>				
If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.				
Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	✓
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	✓

<b>11. Consultation and Communications plans:</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>
None

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider; Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

None

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year**

It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No      Income is based on % of the purchase price.

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£25	£0	-£0	£25
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£25	£0	-£0	£25

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£

# Proposal for Change: Planning Development and Regulatory Services

Saving headline: *Capitalisation of salaries (valuations team)*

Corporate Plan Priority:

Delivery Unit Ref:

Directorate: DENS 20C

Head of Service: Giorgio Framaliccio

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income. How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
Revised fee and income assumptions and increase recovery of state costs associated with asset management.

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
70%	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
Increased debt

<b>5. Impact on staff</b> <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
None	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

<b>6. Resources and support needed to make the change</b> <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>
Finances agreement to the capitalisation of salaries in year and agreement to build the capitalisation of salaries into base budgets for 18/19.

<b>7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones</b> <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Agreement with Finance as to the extent of posts to be capitalised in year	January 18
Agreement with Finance as to the extent of posts to be capitalised in year	January 18
18/19+ Budgets amended accordingly	April 18

<b>8. Risks and Opportunities</b> <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>

<b>9. Dependencies</b> <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>
Agreed position on the extent of capitalisation and agreement in relation to future budgets

<b>10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>				
If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.				
Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	✓
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	✓

<b>11. Consultation and Communications plans:</b> <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>
None

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider; Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

None

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>62</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No Yes.

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£57	£0	-£0	£57
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£57	£0	-£0	£57

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£

<sup>62</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Planning Development and Regulatory Services

## Saving headline: *S106 - fees from viability appraisals*

Corporate Plan Priority:

Delivery Unit Ref:

Directorate: DENS 21C

Head of Service: Giorgio Framaliccio

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income. How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
✓	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
Revised fee and income assumptions and increase recovery of costs associated with asset management (income associated with the appraisal of Section 106 viability information).

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
70%	Achieving this income would be dependent on viability submissions being made for assessment

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
None

5. Impact on staff <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
None	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

6. Resources and support needed to make the change <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>	
None	

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
Updated Fees agreed through fees and charges report	February 18
Implementation	April 18

8. Risks and Opportunities <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>	

9. Dependencies <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>	
None	

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>				
If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.				
Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	✓
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	✓

11. Consultation and Communications plans: <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>	
None	

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

None

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>63</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No      Current fee income levels suggest that this increase in fee income from April 18/19 is achievable.

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£10	£0	-£0	£10
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£10	£0	-£0	£10

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>		-£

<sup>63</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.



# Proposal for Change: Planning Development and Regulatory Services

## Saving headline: *Increase income from commercial property acquisitions*

Corporate Plan Priority:

Delivery Unit Ref:

Directorate: DENS 22C

Head of Service: Giorgio Framaliccio

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
Continue to invest in the Council's property investment portfolio.

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
25%	Achieving this income would be dependent on the availability of suitable commercial property and the successful completion of purchases (s).

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
Increased council debt.

**5. Impact on staff** *(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)*

None

The number of FTE that might be lost is: 0

The number of posts that might be lost is: 0

**6. Resources and support needed to make the change** *(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)*

Agreement as to the level / scale of investment fund as part of the Council's Capital Programme.

**7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones** *(To include key decision points and governance meetings)*

<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress</i> [Milestone]	[Date]
Revised Capital Programme	February 18
Implementation (purchases will be made in 18/19)	April 18

**8. Risks and Opportunities** *(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)*

**9. Dependencies** *(Interdependencies & dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)*

Availability of appropriate investments.

**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.

Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	✓
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	✓

**11. Consultation and Communications plans:** *(Please refer to guidance & further information attached for what to include here)*

None

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

None

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>64</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£250	£0	-£0	£250
2019/20	£250	£0	-£0	£250
2020/21	£250	£0	-£0	£250
Total	£750	£0	-£0	£750

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

	£'000's	
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
<b>TOTAL</b>	-£	

<sup>64</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

# Proposal for Change: Planning Development and Regulatory Services

## Saving headline: *Planning Fee Income*

Corporate Plan Priority:

Delivery Unit Ref:

Directorate: DENS 23C

Head of Service: Giorgio Framaliccio

1. The proposal is to:	
	<b>Managing Demand</b> <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income. How could we work across the wider local system with partners? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
✓	<b>Increasing Productivity</b> <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	<b>Service Delivery Models</b> <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could work in Reading to deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19</i>
	<b>Reductions in Services</b> <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change <i>(Insert details of the proposal)</i>
Revised fee and income assumptions and increase recovery of state costs associated with asset management.

2a. Confidence level <i>(Officers should indicate their level of confidence in delivering the saving identified. This should be expressed as an overall percentage (in units of 10%). Please also provide a brief explanation for the chosen confidence level.)</i>	
65%	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations: <i>(Are there services which partners could provide instead? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves? How are business and other organisations affected?)</i>
None.

4. Impact on other services we provide <i>(Are there impacts on other services delivered by the directorate or services in another directorate?)</i>
None

5. Impact on staff <i>(Insert information here... (Include indicative number of proposed posts at risk etc.)</i>	
None	
The number of FTE that might be lost is:	0
The number of posts that might be lost is:	0

6. Resources and support needed to make the change <i>(Insert information about leverage funding/match funding from external sources. Any additional resources required eg, Finance, HR, legal, HR, IT, procurement, project management. This will need to be detailed further in section13.)</i>	
None	

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones <i>(To include key decision points and governance meetings)</i>	
<i>Planned accomplishments to track progress [Milestone]</i>	<i>[Date]</i>
20% increase in planning application fees to be in place	January 18
Implementation	April 18

8. Risks and Opportunities <i>(i.e. Risks: impact on community, knock-on impact on Council teams and other agencies) What opportunities are available to the Council to further reduce/increase demand? Opportunities for collaborative working?)</i>	

9. Dependencies <i>(Interdependencies &amp; dependencies please insert here NB may need to connect with other directorates to test these out.)</i>	
Government implementing its proposed 20% increase in planning fees from January 2018.	

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>				
If the answer is Yes to any of the below, and if accepted, a full EQIA will be completed as part of the consultation process.				
Do you have evidence or reason to believe that some (racial, disability, gender, sexuality, age and religious belief) groups may be affected differently than others?	Yes		No	✓
Is there already public concern about potentially discriminatory practices/impact or could there be? Think about your complaints, consultation, and feedback.	Yes		No	✓

11. Consultation and Communications plans: <i>(Please refer to guidance &amp; further information attached for what to include here)</i>	
None	

**12. Legal Implications** (Please consider: Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? Whether or not you require a delegation to implement? Any relevant standing orders or Procedure Rules that you are following (including procurement) Is there a statutory duty to consult?)

None

**13.a Financial implications - net change to service budget in each year<sup>65</sup>**

*It is expected that savings identified are evidence based. Any supporting information, including analysis to be submitted with the proposal.*

Are the savings evidenced based? Yes/No      A review of fee income arising from planning application has been undertaken and based on the previous year's income levels and takes account of a proposed increase of 20% from April

If no, when is evidence expected? (enter date)

£'000's	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total
2018/19	£0	£25	-£0	£25
2019/20	£0	£0	-£0	£0
Total	£0	£25	-£0	£25

**13.b One off project costs and income (not included in above)**

		£'000's
2017/18	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	-£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	<i>Sub-total</i>	£
TOTAL		-£

<sup>65</sup> i.e. budget changes are recurrent. If saving is a 'one off' or is lower in a subsequent year this change should then be entered as a negative '-' in the relevant year. Please refer to your finance contact if you are unsure.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED