

Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

25th January 2011

Healthier Communities & Older People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

26th January 2011

Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel

27th January 2011

Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

8th February 2011

Overview and Scrutiny Commission

9th February 2011

Agenda item:

Wards:

Subject: Budget Update 2011/12

Lead officer: Caroline Holland

Lead member: Mark Allison

Contact officer: Grant Miles

Forward Plan reference number:

Recommendations:

1. That the Panel consider the latest information in respect of the Budget 2011/12 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 and refer comments on the draft package of budget proposals to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission.
 2. That the Overview and Scrutiny Panel considers the comments of the Panels and provides a response on the revenue and capital proposals to Cabinet when it meets on the 9th February 2011.
-

1. Purpose of report and executive summary

- 1.1 This report requests Scrutiny Panels to review the latest information on the Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 and Capital Programme and feedback comments to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission.

2. **Details - Revenue**

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Commission on the 18th November, after considering feedback received from Scrutiny Panels during November, scrutinised the Phase 1 savings and growth proposals that were approved by Cabinet on 8th November 2010 and provided comments to Cabinet.
- 2.2 Cabinet which met on the 13th December considered the comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on the Phase 1 savings. The comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and the responses from Cabinet are set out in Appendix 10.
- 2.3 A risk analysis of all Phase 1 and Phase 2 savings which have been approved by Cabinet on the 8th November and the 13th December is set out in Appendix 1. The total Phase 1 and 2 savings and growth proposals for all the Panels are analysed by type in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3. A copy of the report to Cabinet on 13th December 2010 is set out at Appendix 8 excluding the original Appendices setting out growth proposals, savings proposals and the Capital Programme.
- 2.2 The detailed savings and growth for each Panel separated between Phase 1 and 2, together with the analysis of these in terms of risk and by type is set out in Appendices 4 to 7. This information identifies separately those savings and growth proposals (Phase 1) which were agreed by Cabinet on 8th November 2010 and considered by Overview and Scrutiny Commission on the 18th November 2010 from those approved by Cabinet on the 13th December (Phase 2).
- 2.3 These savings and growth proposals are shown in Panel order as follows:-
 - Appendix 4 Sustainable Communities
 - Appendix 5 Children and Young People
 - Appendix 6 Corporate Capacity;
 - Appendix 7 Healthier Communities and Older People;
- 2.4 The comments of the Scrutiny Panels upon these revenue and capital budget proposals will be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 9th February 2011 which will co-ordinate a joint overview and scrutiny response on behalf of the Panels for Cabinet to consider when it meets on 14th February 2011.

3. **Alternative Options**

- 3.1 It is a requirement that the Council sets a balanced budget. The Cabinet report on 13th December 2010 sets out the Council's budget proposals for 2010/11 and progress made towards setting a balanced budget and identify the current

budget position that needs to be addressed between now and the next report to Cabinet on 14th February 2011.

4. **Capital Programme 2011-15**

4.1 This report also contains details of the new schemes and other amendments which will form the basis of the draft Capital Programme 2011-15 which was considered by Cabinet on the 13th December. The feedback of the Scrutiny Panels will be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission which will provide comments to Cabinet which meets on the 14th February. Details of the new capital schemes proposed for inclusion in the Capital Programme are set out in Appendix 9(v) in Panel order.

5. **Consultation undertaken or proposed**

5.1 Further work will be undertaken as the process develops.

6. **Timetable**

6.1 The timetable is set out in the following table

	First round of Scrutiny
17 th January 2011	-Cabinet
25 th January 2011	- Sustainable Communities
26 th January 2011	- Healthier Communities and Older People
27 ^h January 2011	- Corporate Capacity
8 th February 2011	- Children and Young People
9 th February 2011	- Overview and Scrutiny Commission
14 th February 2011	-Cabinet
2nd March 2011	-Council

7. **Financial, resource and property implications**

7.1 These are set out in the Cabinet report for 13th December 2010.

7.2 Detailed schedules setting out the detail of the savings and growth are set out in Appendices 4 to 7. In addition the savings/income and growth proposals have been analysed by type. (Section 12 lists the Appendix numbers for each panel).

7.3 A risk analysis of the savings proposals has been undertaken with respect to:-

- a) Deliverability
- b) Reputation

This uses the same risk matrix used for 2010/11 which assesses the risk as low, medium, or high. The mix of deliverable and political risk of the savings proposals for 2011/12 is set out in a chart for each Panel (set out in Appendices 4 to 7).

8. Legal and statutory implications

8.1 All relevant implications have been addressed in the Cabinet reports. Further work will be carried out as the budget and planning proceeds and will be included in the budget report to Cabinet on the 14th February 2011.

9. Human Rights, Equalities and Community Cohesion Implications

9.1 All relevant implications have been addressed in the Cabinet reports. Further work will be carried out as the budget and planning proceeds and will be included in the budget report to Cabinet on the 14th February 2011.

10. Crime and Disorder implications

10.1 All relevant implications have been addressed in the Cabinet reports. Further work will be carried out as the budget and planning proceeds and will be included in the budget report to Cabinet on the 14th February 2011.

11. Risk Management and Health and Safety Implications

11.1 All relevant implications have been addressed in the Cabinet reports. Further work will be carried out as the budget and planning proceeds and will be included in the budget report to Cabinet on the 14th February 2011.

12. Appendices – the following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report

Appendix 1	Total Risk Analysis for all Panels	
Appendix 2	Total Savings Analysis by Type for all Panels	
Appendix 3	Total Growth Analysis By Type for all Panels	
Appendix 4(i)	Risk Analysis of Sustainable Communities Savings	
Appendix 4(ii)	Sustainable Communities Savings Analysis by Type	
Appendix 4(iii)	Sustainable Communities Savings	8 th November 2010
Appendix 4(iv)	Sustainable Communities Savings	13 th December 2010
Appendix 4(v)	Sustainable Communities Growth Analysis by Type	

Appendix 4(vi)	Sustainable Communities Growth	13 th December 2010
Appendix 5(i)	Risk Analysis of Children and Young People Savings	
Appendix 5(ii)	Children and Young People Savings Analysis by Type	
Appendix 5(iii)	Children and Young People Savings	8 th November 2010
Appendix 5(iv)	Children and Young People Savings	13 th December 2010
Appendix 6(i)	Risk Analysis of Corporate Capacity Savings	
Appendix 6(ii)	Corporate Capacity Savings Analysis by Type	
Appendix 6(iii)	Corporate Capacity Savings	8 th November 2010
Appendix 6(iv)	Corporate Capacity Growth Analysis by Type	
Appendix 6(v)	Corporate Capacity Growth	13 th December 2010
Appendix 7(i)	Risk Analysis of Healthier Communities and Older People Savings	
Appendix 7(ii)	Healthier Communities and Older People Savings Analysis by Type	
Appendix 7(iii)	Healthier Communities and Older People Savings	8 th November 2010
Appendix 7(iv)	Healthier Communities and Older People Savings	13 th December 2010
Appendix 7(v)	Healthier Communities and Older People Growth Analysis by Type	
Appendix 7(vi)	Healthier Communities and Older People Growth	13 th December 2010
Appendix 8	Report to Cabinet + Appendix 3: Equality Impact Assessments	13 th December 2010
Appendix 9(i)	Capital Programme Summary	
Appendix 9(ii)	Sustainable Communities – Capital Programme	
Appendix 9(iii)	Children and Young People – Capital Programme	
Appendix 9(iv)	Corporate Capacity – Capital Programme	
Appendix 9(v)	Proposed new capital schemes in Panel Order	
Appendix 10(i)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission & Corporate Capacity Scrutiny panel comments on Phase 1 revenue and capital budget proposals	
Appendix 10(ii)	Cabinet decisions in response to Overview and Scrutiny Commission comments on Phase 1 savings and growth proposals	

Contacts

- Report author:
 - Name: Grant Miles, Head of Finance
 - Tel: 0208 545 3458
 - email: grant.miles@merton.gov.uk
- Meeting arrangements - Democratic Services:
 - email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
 - Tel: 020 8545 3356/3357/3359/3361/3616
- All press contacts - Merton's Press office:
 - email: press@merton.gov.uk
 - Tel: 020 8545 3181
- London Borough of Merton:
 - Address: Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, SM4 5DX
 - Tel: 020 8274 4901

Useful links

Merton Council's Web site: <http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Readers should note the terms of the legal information (disclaimer) regarding information on Merton Council's and third party linked websites.
<http://www.merton.gov.uk/legal.htm>

This disclaimer also applies to any links provided here.

Total Risk Analysis for all Scrutiny Panels - All Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	4.54% (1.4% 2010/11)	2.88% (10.1% 2010/11)	9.57% (0.4% 2010/11)
	Medium	7.73% (9.1% 2010/11)	31.01% (27.1% 2010/11)	16.60% (2.8% 2010/11)
	Low	15.10% (28.8% 2010/11)	9.07% (17.0% 2010/11)	3.50% (3.3% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Total Risk Analysis for all Scrutiny Panels - Non ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	4.92% (1.4% 2010/11)	3.13% (10.1% 2010/11)	10.38% (0.4% 2010/11)
	Medium	7.63% (9.1% 2010/11)	32.69% (27.1% 2010/11)	14.87% (2.8% 2010/11)
	Low	14.05% (28.8% 2010/11)	8.54% (17.0% 2010/11)	3.80% (3.3% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Total Risk Analysis for all Scrutiny Panels - ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Medium	8.88% (N/A 2010/11)	11.10% (N/A 2010/11)	37.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Low	27.57% (N/A 2010/11)	15.45% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

TOTAL SAVINGS ANALYSIS FOR ALL PANELS - All Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	1,419	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	1,020	-100	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	1,761	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	4,361	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	823	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	1,686	128	15	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	2,740	52	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	62	-22	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	3	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		13,875	58	15	0

TOTAL SAVINGS ANALYSIS FOR ALL PANELS - Non ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	1,419	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	1,020	-100	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	1,761	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	4,019	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	723	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	1,153	128	15	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	2,634	52	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	62	-22	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	3	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		12,794	58	15	0

TOTAL SAVINGS ANALYSIS FOR ALL PANELS - ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	342	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	100	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	533	0	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	106	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		1,081	0	0	0

TOTAL GROWTH ANALYSIS BY TYPE - All Panels

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
GI1	Income: Decrease due to fall in demand for service	0	0	0	0
GI2	Income: Decrease due to reduction/deletion of service	155	89	0	0
GS1	Staffing: increase in level of service	0	0	0	0
GS2	Staffing: New service	66	0	0	0
GNS1	Non - Staffing: increase in level of service	73	0	0	0
GNS2	Non - Staffing: New service	0	0	0	0
GP1	Addition to Procurement / Third Party arrangements	180	250	0	0
GPROP	Increase in Property Related costs	0	0	0	0
		474	339	0	0

Sustainable Communities All Savings (All Non ABG)

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	4.96% (1.69% 2010/11)	0.00% (6.14% 2010/11)	7.78% (1.28% 2010/11)
	Medium	12.70% (7.53% 2010/11)	15.79% (31.14% 2010/11)	31.69% (2.34% 2010/11)
	Low	6.23% (20.71% 2010/11)	12.41% (23.18% 2010/11)	8.45% (5.99% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

SAVINGS ANALYSIS SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES All Savings (All Non ABG)

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£001
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	952	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	320	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	1,033	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	1,003	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	308	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	433	15	15	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	383	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	62	-22	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	3	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		4,497	-7	15	0

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)	
SC	ER01	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Development Control i) Expansion of existing pre-application charging system to include charge for advice given to household development - e.g. extensions, dormer roofs etc-£10k ii) Merging of Building Control and Development Control Teams involving deletion of 1 Section manager, one deputy team leader and one surveyor post-£110k</p> <p>Service Implication i) Provision of formalised detailed advice for household development will lead to an improved level of service. ii) Loss of expertise, skills and knowledge, reduction in enforcement of Building regulations.</p> <p>Staffing Implications i) Increased number of formal meetings, requirement to produce formalised reports of same.ii) deletion of 2.5 posts.</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments i) Potential for increase in income. ii)Limited i) Requirement for staff from other teams, particularly Conservation/Urban design, to attend extra pre-application meetings.ii) Initial impact as a result of restructure</p> <p>Equalities Implications None</p>	1,869	120	0	0	0	0	Medium	High	SI2 & SS1
SC	ER02	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Licensing i) Disperse with budget and allocated for "bought in inspections" - £25k ii) Surrender unused financial allocations-£33k iii) Capitalisation of salary expenditure on Disabled Facility Grant and Empty Property Grant provision-£58k iv) Reconfiguration of structures within Licensing and Env.Health Housing £48k.</p> <p>Service Implication i) Reduction in the number of high risk inspections required annually to meet this target iv) reduction in size of Licensing and EH housing teams.</p> <p>Staffing Implications iv) Deletion of 1 FTE</p> <p>Business Plan implications i) Potential failure to meet NI184 and national Food premises inspection targets; iv) Reduced levels of enforcement, delayed response to service requests and consideration of housing grant applications.</p> <p>Impact on other departments Equalities Implications Some impact on other teams such as Development Control. None</p>	1,452	164	0	0	0	0	Low	Medium	SS1 & SNS1
SC	ER03	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Parking Services Increase in various parking charges: i) Removal of 20 minute free parking £60,000 (5 min = 15k, 10 min = 30k, 15 min = 45k) ii) Mobile CCTV £87,000 iii) Trade Permit £30,000 iv) New Person set up charge £65,000 v) Business Permits £108,000</p> <p>Service Implication Once the initial work has been completed and implemented there is likely to be an increase in third party representations/complaints.</p> <p>Staffing Implications Staff time dealing with the above.</p> <p>Business Plan implications None</p> <p>Impact on other departments None</p> <p>Equalities Implications None</p>	9,636	350	0	0	0	0	Medium	High	SI1

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER04	Service Area Description	266	27	0	0	0	High	Low	S11 & SS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
SC	ER05	Service Area Description	400	160	0	0	0	Low	Low	SP1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
SC	ER06	Service Area Description	131	15	15	15	0	Low	High	SNS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
SC	ER07	Service Area Description	1,774	57	0	0	0	Low	High	SNS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
SC	ER08	Service Area Description	479	70	0	0	0	Low	Medium	S11
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER09	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	1,083	35	0	0	0	Low	Medium	SI1
SC	ER10	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	70	100	0	0	0	High	Low	SI2
SC	ER11	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p>	180	47	0	0	0	Low	Medium	SS1 & SS2
SC	ER12	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	400	10	0	0	0	Medium	Low	SS2

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER13	Service Area Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	280	22	-22	0	0	Medium	Low	SG1
		Physical Regeneration Utilising external funding (from the remaining planning delivery grant) from a fulfilled Urban Design Post to fund existing team members. This is not an ongoing revenue saving as its based on using a Government Grant - not available from 2010 onwards. Future needs will be considered as part of the transformation programme underway. None None None None								
		Economic Development Substitution of LABGI and/or S106 funding for existing Principal Economic Development Officer post The post will focus on delivering priorities within the Economic Development Strategy. Other functions of the current post can be absorbed by existing staff or commissioned as discrete pieces of work, some at sub-regional level. Reduction of one post funded from Revenue to be replaced by a fixed term contract post funded from other sources The new post will focus on delivering priorities within the Economic Development Strategy. None None								
		Vestry Hall: Additional Income Vestry Hall was granted the necessary planning consents in 2009/10 for additional uses that have increased income generation opportunities. None None None None None								
SC	ER14	Service Area Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	142	40	0	0	0	Low	Low	SG1
		Traffic and Highways - Carriageway Patching Reduction in available revenue budget to undertake carriageway patching. The need for carriageway patching is identified by regular safety inspections. This budget has been substantially decreased over the years and further reductions will lead to increased carriageway resurfacing scheme costs funded from Capital programmes. A reduction in this budget will also impact on the condition of Principal Roads and Non-Principal Roads and their National Indicators. We will continue to repair pot holes in accordance with agreed intervention criteria. Pot hole repairs are short term fixes compared to carriageway patching. Increased level of complaints. Increase work-load for Highway Safety Inspectors. Rapid deterioration of asset resulting in the need for substantial future investment in maintenance. Potential increase in insurance claims. Adversely impact vulnerable road users such as cyclists and motorcyclists.								
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
SC	ER15	Service Area Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	138	20	0	0	0	Medium	Low	SI2
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
SC	ER16	Service Area Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	157	157	0	0	0	Medium	High	SNS2
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER17	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	263	113	0	0	0	Medium	High	SNS2
		<p>Traffic and Highways - Footway Maintenance Reduction in overall revenue budget available for footway maintenance. A proportion of non urgent works identified from regular Highway Safety Inspections will not be undertaken. This will mean that these areas will be left to deteriorate until they become a safety issue or repair work is undertaken as part of a larger scheme funded from the capital programme. This reduction in budget will also increase pressure on the existing reactive repair budget. The Council may receive increased level of complaints about the condition of footways in the borough. Highway Safety Inspectors workload will increase proportionately. Footway condition will deteriorate and the whole life costings of the asset will increase, requiring substantial future investment to bring redress the decline. May result in increased insurance claims. May have an adverse impact on vulnerable road users, particularly the disabled and those with impaired visibility.</p> <p>Traffic and Highways Review of the Traffic and Highway Structure with the deletion of one Highway Safety Inspector and two technical support officers (Admin) Should be minimal - savings through efficiencies Loss of 3 FTE None None None</p>	1,087	75	0	0	0	Medium	Medium	SS1
SC	ER19	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	826	40	0	0	0	Medium	Medium	SNS2
		<p>Traffic and Highways - Walk Sheets Restrict Highway Safety Inspections response to 2hrs and 20 days only. Non replacement of posts/bollards Defects are currently graded on the basis of urgency; emergency works are repaired within 2 hours, less urgent works are repaired within 24 hrs, 7 days or 28 days. The quicker the response time required the higher the premium with respect to rates. This proposal would remove the interim response times and the council will only respond to repairing defects that are urgent within 2 hrs or defects that are non urgent and can be repaired within 20 days. Reduced ability to replace damaged posts / bollards. Increased level of customer complaints Increased whole life costings of the asset. Increased in insurance claims. Could impact on vulnerable road users, such as the elderly, visually impaired and wheelchair users.</p>								

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)	
SC	ER20	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Traffic and Highways Removal of Anti-Skid budget and a reduction in budget available for maintenance of carriageway markings (white and yellow lines) across the Borough (13K). Removal of Hanging Baskets budget (13K). Reduction in overall Street Lighting Contract budget (8K). Removal of outstanding Traffic signal Budget (6K). Reduction in equipment purchase budget (6K). Reduction in Misc Hired Services Budget (5k)</p> <p>Service Implication A reduction in carriageway markings maintenance budget will result in a decline in road markings condition and non-compliance to the Traffic Signs and General Directions 2002. Reduced maintenance will also lead to an decrease in customer satisfaction and an increase in level of complaints. The Council will no longer provide hanging baskets. A Reduction in routine maintenance and non urgent Street Lighting repairs. Transport for London operate and maintain traffic signals across London. Equipment purchase budget reduction will be absorbed by the service.</p> <p>Staffing Implications The budget reduction will lead to an increase in customer complaints. The Council will not be able to undertake a planned cyclical routine maintenance programme and only deliver a reactive and emergency service. The Council may seek to provide hanging baskets through Parks and Leisure Services.</p> <p>Impact on other departments Potential increase in insurance claims.</p> <p>Equalities Implications None</p>	598	51	0	0	0	0	Low	Medium	SNS2
SC	ER21	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Refuse/Recycling Collection - Commercial Increase charges 1,460 customers. 0910 income outturn £1,256M. Collection resource: 2 x RCVs Refuse bins + 1 x RCV Recycling + 1 small RCV Refuse bags. Implications for town centre bags/bins and Enforcement team. LATS issues. Estimated additional income if fees & charges increased to bring in additional income as per 10/11 = £80K. A further report will be brought forward in November/December with identified opportunities for growing the business, increasing our customer base and delivering higher levels of return from this service. On average this represents an approximate increase in charges of 7%.</p> <p>Staffing Implications None</p> <p>Business Plan implications Minimal</p> <p>Impact on other departments None</p> <p>Equalities Implications None</p>	-1,421	80	0	0	0	0	Low	Low	SI1

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER22	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Street Cleansing Service Efficiencies and Reductions 1. Reduced weekend working. Saturday reduction of 2 staff out of existing 21. Sunday & Bank Holiday reduction of 5 staff out of existing 21; plus reducing hours of 10 operatives from 7 hours to 5 hours (Service efficiency). 2. 10 combined teams of 1+2 manual & deep cleansing, saving 9 staff. (deletion of litter picking on the same day following waste collections. Tidy Britain Group observed that 50% of litter in Merton is derived from waste collection method. Also deletion of the one response team). Area based teams will continue to focus on streets needing cleaning as and when required. This has improved cleanliness standards allowing this saving to be deliverable. Potential risk of reduction in National Indicators (at present) & Residents Survey performance and a rise in complaints. 3 staff reduced in 2010-11 budget setting exercise. 3. Purchase of 6 vehicles that are currently on hire (saving is net of capital financing costs). The proposals contained herein are scalable or could be disaggregated if felt appropriate. Loss of 9 FTEs and reduced weekend & Bank Holiday working Sustainable Communities - (2) reduction in our ability to enhance our street scene, with emphasis on continuing to improve our core cleansing and residents satisfaction None None</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	2,768	285	0	0	0	Medium	Medium	SS1
SC	ER23	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Waste Transfer Station, Amenity Way Service efficiency Take opportunity resulting from Sutton joining SLWP Contract 3 from Sep 09, for Merton to direct deliver dry recyclables to Beddington Lane. Implications for Merton from loss of option of transfer facility for any waste; current disposal contract; winter gritting shared use of plant; and possibly SLWP Phase B. Change to contract involved and actual costs yet to be negotiated with contractor. Linked with Contract 1 not signed yet. £110K of costs taken out in 2010/11 budget setting process. It should be noted that this level of saving remains dependent upon negotiations with the current contractor. 4 staff (excluding Depot Manager post) None None Staff. TUPE may apply.</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	235	96	0	0	0	High	Low	SS1 & SP1

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER24	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Garden Waste Collection Service reduction 41,800 bookings over last year. There are possible charging options but Sutton tried introducing a chargeable collection during 0809 and ended up collecting only 5% of previous tonnage. Any proposal to introduce a chargeable service would ensure that all costs of collection and treatment are recovered through the charging mechanism, realising a net saving of £227K. 1,300 tonnes collected in 0910 in addition to 2,430 tonnes collected via HRRCs. Worst case is that residents would instead put collected tonnage out for landfill collection increased tonnage for H2H crews, rather than home compost or transport it to HRRCs. 2.7 small RCVs currently used for collection. This proposal would be complemented by the promotion and subsidised provision of home compost bins. Garden waste that can be effectively managed at home will reduce the carbon impact of transport and centralised treatment and will not incur additional treatment costs.</p> <p>5 Waste staff + 2 Contact Centre staff. 1,300 tonnes = 1.2% of the 33.6% recycling/composting 0910 outturn. Minimal Implications for residents without access to a vehicle, including disabled and elderly residents. Neighbours, relatives and voluntary organisations could be encouraged to assist.</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	227	227	0	0	0	Low	High	SS2
SC	ER25	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Community Waste Partnerships Service reduction No Merton recycling/waste minimisation direct education input into borough schools, tailored to the local environment. Negative longer term impact on environment and street scene. Previously tried unsuccessfully to transfer to Education budget. Plan is to move to supporting schools in presenting waste issues themselves with support from the Community Engagement team.</p> <p>Loss of 1 FTE Longer term environmental impact Increased direct Education input needs consideration Minimal</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	497	47	0	0	0	Low	Medium	SS2
SC	ER26	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Enforcement & Inspection Service reduction Reduce team of 1 Manager and 5 Officers, by 1 Officer. This is not a statutory service but there could be a negative impact on environment and street scene. The proposal would however be to concentrate most resources on identified hot spot areas within the Borough rather than the current method of operating on a geographical basis. Loss of 1 FTE Limited impact on performance, environment and street scene Minimal Minimal</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	278	36	0	0	0	Low	Medium	SS2

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER27	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Close 36 Weir Road HRRC (currently operates Fri-Mon inclusive at present)</p> <p>The annual management fee for Weir Road is £175K. Facility is open Friday to Monday and only accepts recyclables. This is in addition to £400K for Garth Road. 14 year contract from Sept 2008, with break option in 2015. Proposal would affect SLWP contract and variation to contract would need negotiating. Weir Road handled 1,230 tonnes in 1011, compared with 10,720 tonnes at Garth Road. Weir Road therefore handles some 10% of waste stream. The majority of London boroughs operate a single site. Internal transfer of £60K 'rental' per annum to E&R Estates also involved. However, closure of the site will create opportunity for disposal or revenue generating capacity. Alternative options would include the partial closure of the site: closing the site on Mondays and/or Fridays could realise £35 - £80K savings. It should be noted that these levels of savings remain dependent on contract negotiations with the current contractor.</p> <p>Run by contractor</p> <p>Possible impact on overall recycling/composting rates if waste not diverted to Garth Road.</p> <p>Minimal</p> <p>Minimal</p>	175	175	0	0	0	Medium	High	SP1
SC	ER28	<p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p> <p>Service Area</p> <p>Deletion of three posts in Safer Merton</p> <p>None</p> <p>Loss of two posts (currently vacant) and one other post</p> <p>None</p> <p>Tasks will have to be picked up by existing staff</p> <p>None at present</p>	504	105	0	0	0	Low	Medium	SS2
SC	LI01	<p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p> <p>Libraries & Heritage</p> <p>Revised Library opening hours</p> <p>Overall increase in library opening hours achieved by: restructuring staff and refocusing them on core services; using partner agencies to deliver other services; using volunteers to help with defined roles; using security guards at specified times. NB overall saving estimated at £141k, but annual maintenance for the self-service technology needs to be accounted for at £23k p.a., leaving net saving of £118k</p> <p>Staff restructure required to reduce numbers, re-grade remaining staff. Training in quality core service delivery, partnership working and supporting volunteers. Some redundancies will occur.</p> <p>Should not affect BP adversely but rather support improved access and improved quality of core services leading to improved customer satisfaction and higher usage.</p> <p>Work with other council departments as partners, eg CSF's Children's centres, possibly Connexions. Other possibilities to be considered as transformation across the council is co-ordinated.</p> <p>Impact should be positive; partner agencies will target audiences more effectively, volunteer support create better engagement with customers and add capacity; extra hours will support students and working people.</p>	1,194	118				Medium	Low	SS1

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	HO01	Service Description Service Implication	1,142	41				Medium	Low	SS1
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
SC	HO02	Service Description Service Implication	3	3				Low	Medium	SG2
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
Total Sustainable Communities for 2011-2015				2,886	-7	15	0			

Panel

- C&YP Children & Young People
- CC Corporate Capacity
- HC&OP Healthier Communities & Older People
- SC Sustainable Communities

Risk Type of Saving Key

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Risk | Type of Saving Key |
| Low | Income - increase in current level of charges |
| Medium | SI1 Income - increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service |
| High | SI2 Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency |
| | SS1 Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service |
| | SS2 Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service |
| | SNS1 Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency |
| | SNS2 Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service |
| | SP1 Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency |
| | SG1 Grants: Existing service funded by new grant |
| | SG2 Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced grant |
| | SPROP Reduction in Property related costs |

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)	
SC	ER29	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Parking Services Increase in various parking charges and changes to enforcement policy and practice in respect of observation times. i) reduction of existing 5 minute observation to 2 mins £19k. ii) WTC £60k iii) Increase on street pay, and display tariffs by 10% £193k iv) review of existing tariff charging structures £138k.</p> <p>Once the initial work has been completed and implemented there is likely to be an increase in third party representations/complaints.</p> <p>None</p> <p>The changes proposed with the heading "review of existing tariff charging structures" are subject to full consultation which can take up to six months. This is taken into account in the estimate.</p> <p>The implementation of some of the proposals will require input from Traffic & Highways which will place demands on that team's resources.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	9,636	410	0	0	0	Medium	High	SI1	
SC	ER30	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Building Control Commercialise Building Control by offering service to other Councils/Stakeholders</p> <p>The proposal is to look at offering the Council's Building Control services as a provider for other local authorities. To a certain extent this has already started to evolve with a DS service provided by the London Borough of Merton to the London Borough of Sutton. However, it is felt that there is scope to expand this service and provide to other neighbouring local authorities whilst putting it on a more commercial footing.</p> <p>Another aspect of the proposal is to increase the market share from 85% upwards. This will involve a more aggressive marketing campaign and promotion of Building Control services offered.</p> <p>Implementation will avoid the loss of an FTE that would otherwise occur as a result of the efficiency saving (ER01) previously agreed.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	958	80	0	0	0	0	Medium	Medium	SI2
SC	ER31	<p>Service Area Description</p> <p>Greenspaces Parks grounds service operational restructure including a reduction in staffing establishment, realignment of duties and reduction in the use of agency staff and overtime. Recovery of all costs on lettings.</p> <p>Reduction of parks service and quality standards across the board. Operational shift to mobile working. Less staff presence in parks as a whole. Refocus of time and quality investments in 25 or so key parks and open spaces. Numerous open space sites un maintained or maintained to minimal standards unless community or friends groups adopt them. (Note: excludes parks locking up service costs already agreed).</p> <p>Net loss of 3.8 FTEs together with a reduction in overtime payments and the use of agency staff.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>No specific implications</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	1,700	350	0	0	0	0	High	High	SS2

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER32	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	275	80	0	0	0	Medium	Medium	SS1
		<p>Greenspaces Cemeteries service restructure Loss of 1 supervisor and 2 grounds operative posts. Reconfigure operations as a single service shared across the borough's 3 main cemeteries, rather than the current 2 separate services. Loss of 3 FTEs. None None No specific implications</p> <p>Spatial Planning, Transport Planning and Physical Regeneration From transformation of three teams into 1 Transformation of the Spatial Planning, Physical Regeneration and Transport Planning teams into one team. Savings achieved through the reduction of L3 Managers from 3 to one (£100,000 saving). Additional £50,000 to be found through efficiency savings with joining the teams together and natural wastage through staff who may apply for voluntary severance as part of the transformation. Full details to be determined through transformation process. Transformation process to change the way of working of the three teams and drive out savings. Savings will also come from reduction in use of agency staff, reduction in use of fixed term contracts and smarter use of income. May be a reduction in FTEs as a result of the transformation - full scope to be determined.</p>	1,239	150	0	0	0	Medium	Medium	SS1
SC	ER33	<p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p> <p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p>	5,022	250	0	0	0	Medium	Low	SNS1
		<p>The timing and priorities for project delivery will have to be revised to fit in with reduced resources The level of support to other depts will have to be reconsidered and possibly reduced to account for reduced resources. None anticipated</p> <p>Waste Disposal Savings in Landfill Costs Relates primarily to residual waste for first 6 months of 2010/11 being 2.7% down compared with the same period for 2009/10. Deliverability risk includes landfill and haulage contract indices rates being higher than expected; and/or a resumption in waste growth resulting from a mix of additional housing, population increase and economic growth. Also some risk from the agreed (8 November Cabinet) stopping of green waste collection direct from households. None As above Minimal None</p>	5,022	250	0	0	0	Medium	Low	SNS1

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	Risk Analysis DELIVERABILITY	Risk Analysis REPUTATIONAL	Type of Saving (see key)
SC	ER35	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Commercial Waste Increase in volume from marketing of service. Additional income from proposed growth in commercial waste collection service along the lines of Hammersmith & Fulham business plan. £80K additional income already agreed at 8 November 2010 Cabinet (ER21). In addition there is a forecast income deficit of £94K on the 2010/11 budget to be recovered. Total targeted additional income therefore £284K, representing 20% growth. Deliverability risk relates to business growth from existing 1,460 customer base in current economic climate and degree of increased business to be achieved to bring in full-year revenue effect. Assumes medium term that South London Waste Partnership will secure a non-landfill solution for residual waste and Merton will not longer be shackled by statutory Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme additional costs.</p> <p>Staffing Implications 1 additional sales officer + 1 additional sales support officer, making 2 of each in total, along Hammersmith & Fulham model, to be met from reprioritising existing resources.</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications As above Minimal None</p>	1,421	110	0	0	0	Medium	Low	SI2
SC	ER36	<p>Service Area Description Service Implication</p> <p>Traffic and Highways Services Staffing Reductions</p> <p>Merger of RASWA Manager and Network Coordinator posts. Reduction of Autocad Engineer post from 1 to 0.5. Deletion of the Network, Inspection and Third Party Works Manager's post. Existing functions will be absorbed by the rest of the service and, with regards to the merger of the RASWA Manager post, some of the functions such as the weekly roadworks bulleting and attendance at Area Forums will no longer be provided and there will be less emphasis on dealing with third party planned events such as gas works etc.</p> <p>Loss of 2.5 FTE. None None None</p> <p>Libraries & Heritage Libraries management reduction A reduction in the libraries management team and a mini-reorganisation. Management restructure, review of management responsibilities, redistribution of tasks. Reduced capacity to undertake outreach to deliver improved performance targets. Customer satisfaction, new and active members likely to decrease.</p> <p>None None</p>	1,951	100	0	0	0	Medium	High	SS2
SC	LI03	<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p>None None</p>	81	81				Low	High	SS2
Total Sustainable Communities for 2011-2015			1,611	0	0	0	0			

GROWTH ANALYSIS BY TYPE - SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
GI1	Income: Decrease due to fall in demand for service	0	0	0	0
GI2	Income: Decrease due to reduction/deletion of service	155	89	0	0
GS1	Staffing: increase in level of service	0	0	0	0
GS2	Staffing: New service	66	0	0	0
GNS1	Non - Staffing: increase in level of service	0	0	0	0
GNS2	Non - Staffing: New service	0	0	0	0
GP1	Addition to Procurement / Third Party arrangements	0	0	0	0
GPROP	Increase in Property Related costs	0	0	0	0
		221	89	0	0

PANEL: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES GROWTH: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Growth	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £002	Type of Growth (see key)
SC	ERG1	Service Area					
		Description	35	89			G12
		Parking - visitor Permits					
		Reduction in the cost of half day visitor parking permits from £2.50 to £1.50 in 2011-12 and to £1 in 2012-13. The 2011-12 estimated figure is based upon the number of half day visitor permits (35,080) purchased in 2009 2010 remaining constant (35,080 x					
		Minimal					
		None					
		Service Implication					
		Staffing Implications					
		Business Plan implications					
		Impact on other departments					
		Equalities Implications					
SC	ERG2	Service Area					
		Description	186				G12 & GS2
		Refuse Collection - Bulky waste Collection					
		The removal of charges for Household bulky waste collection					
		No longer charge for bulky waste collection. Demand expected to increase					
		Increase of 3 FTEs					
		Expectation of reduced fly-tipping.					
		None					
		Service now expected to be more attractive to lower-income groups.					
		Total Sustainable Communities Growth for 2011-2015	221	89	0	0	

Panel

C&YP

CC

HC&OP

SC

Children & Young People

Corporate Capacity

Healthier Communities & Older People

Sustainable Communities

Type of Growth Key

G11 Income: Decrease due to fall in demand for service

G12 Income: Decrease due to reduction/deletion of service

GS1 Staffing: increase in level of service

GS2 Staffing: New service

GNS1 Non - Staffing: increase in level of service

GNS2 Non - Staffing: New service

GP1 Addition to Procurement / Third Party arrangements

GPROP Increase in Property Related costs

Children & Young People All Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	9.44% (5.63% 2010/11)	4.72% (0.0% 2010/11)
	Medium	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	23.47% (21.16% 2010/11)	25.50% (6.83% 2010/11)
	Low	15.77% (54.61% 2010/11)	21.10% (6.66% 2010/11)	0.00% (5.12% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Children & Young People Non ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	16.54% (5.63% 2010/11)	8.27% (0.0% 2010/11)
	Medium	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	31.18% (21.16% 2010/11)	11.58% (6.83% 2010/11)
	Low	9.26% (54.61% 2010/11)	23.16% (6.66% 2010/11)	0.00% (5.12% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Children & Young People ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Medium	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	13.20% (N/A 2010/11)	44.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Low	24.42% (N/A 2010/11)	18.37% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE All Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	232	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	679	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	250	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	757	13	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	200	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		2,118	13	0	0

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE Non ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	232	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	337	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	150	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	290	13	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	200	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		1,209	13	0	0

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	342	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	100	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	467	0	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	0	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		909	0	0	0

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)	
Area Based Grant Savings											
C&YP	CSF1	Description	43	43				Low	Low	SS2	
		Service Implication									Education Health Partnerships Cease Healthy Schools programme central co-ordination - schools will continue to be encouraged to pursue aims of programme even if national funding is withdrawn 1 FTE redundancy
		Staffing Implications									Possible impact on Healthy Schools targets - although these may be abandoned by coalition government Schools would lose overall LA coordination, challenge and support for meeting Healthy Schools standards. None specific
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications									
C&YP	CSF2	Description	244	50				Low	Medium	SS2	
		Service Implication									Extended Schools Start Up Ending of central co-ordination and support to school clusters in connection with extended services provided by schools - Grant for 2011/12 not yet known but may go entirely
		Staffing Implications									1FTE redundancy with possible 5 further redundancies subject to further grant reduction/removal
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications									Schools' commissioning ability will need to develop to compensate for loss of LA support none Key elements of extended services are delivered to targeted groups vulnerable to poorer outcomes

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF3	Description	68	50				Low	Low	SS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
Impact on other departments Equalities Implications										
C&YP	CSF4	Description	29	29				Low	Low	SS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
Impact on other departments Equalities Implications										

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)	
C&YP	CSF5	Description	528	200				Medium	High	SNS2	
		Service Implication									Carers Grant/Childrens Fund (Early Intervention and Prevention Commissioning) These grant funding streams are currently aligned with others to provide overall commissioning budget for EIP services. Reduction will be achieved through decommissioning of lower level services provided and overall raising of thresholds for accessing th
		Staffing Implications									None for council but services to be decommissioned are currently provided by the local community and voluntary sector.
		Business Plan implications									Reduced overall capacity of preventive services to support families at lower levels of need. Reducing investment in these services risks subsequent increase in pressures on specialist services.
C&YP	CSF6	Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	448	40				Low	Medium	SS2	
		Service Implication									Some EIP services are targeted at specific equalities groups and all are working with families vulnerable to poorer outcomes.
		Staffing Implications									None
		Business Plan implications									Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services
C&YP	CSF6	Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	448	40				Low	Medium	SS2	
		Service Implication									Deletion of specialist post providing mental health support to looked after children and care leavers
		Staffing Implications									Vacant post deleted
		Business Plan implications									Some impact on capacity of overall service to key priority group
C&YP	CSF6	Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	448	40				Low	Medium	SS2	
		Service Implication									None
C&YP	CSF6	Staffing Implications	448	40				Low	Medium	SS2	
		Business Plan implications									Looked after children and care leavers are recognised as vulnerable to poorer outcomes without comprehensive services.

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)	
C&YP	CSF7	Description	34	10				Low	Medium	SNS2	
		Service Implication	Child Death Reviews Reduction in administrative support to this shared function hosted by NHS Sutton and Merton. Impact will be minimised through increased collaboration across NHS and other LA partners								
		Staffing Implications	Potential implication for NHS Sutton and Merton employee								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	None None None specific								
C&YP	CSF8	Description	1473	200				Medium	High	SNS2	
		Service Implication	Connexions Connexions grant provides information advice and guidance (IAG) to young people through a six borough careers service contract. LBM will cut investment in the new contract by reducing level of careers advice in schools, by reducing commissioning of Connex								
		Staffing Implications	Likely staffing reductions in Connexions main provider and other commissioned services.								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	Saving will reduce capacity of statutory advice and guidance service and is likely to impact on NEET target for young people School based service will be reduced. Targeted service to young people most in need of IAG will continue.								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF11	Description	<p>Teenage Pregnancy</p> <p>Reduction in overall capacity of teenage pregnancy services, specifically impacting on work to link young parents into mainstream health and early years provision</p> <p>Deletion of vacant post in PCT</p> <p>Saving will not impact on specific teenage pregnancy targets</p> <p>NHS hosted post to be deleted</p> <p>Teenage parents and their children are more vulnerable to poorer outcomes</p>	27				Low	Medium	SNS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
C&YP	CSF12	Description	<p>Transfer of Learning and Skills Council Functions</p> <p>None specific as saving can be made from uncommitted grant provided to LAs to assume ex LSC functions from 2010-11 onwards.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>	100				Low	Low	SNS1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
Commissioning, Strategy and Performance										
C&YP	CSF13	<p>Restructure the Research and Information Service and reduce by 1 post Delaying and removal of one management post will require some rationalisation of products delivered by R+I team to managers in CSF and council and to external bodies</p> <p>Staffing Implications 1 FTE redundancy</p> <p>Business Plan implications None specific</p> <p>Impact on other departments None</p> <p>Equalities Implications None</p>	373	54				Low	Low	SS1
C&YP	CSF14	<p>Remove One Admissions Post Service will need to further increase electronic school admissions applications - already at high levels - to mitigate loss of staff capacity and anticipated large increase in volume of school applications over next 3-5 years Deletion of post on retirement of current postholder</p> <p>Staffing Implications None specific</p> <p>Business Plan implications Possible impact on Merton Link</p> <p>Impact on other departments None</p> <p>Equalities Implications None</p>	212	38				Low	Low	SS1

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
Education										
C&YP		Service Description								
	CSF15	Service Implication	School Standards and Quality Cease Match Funding for Playing for Success Initiative	35				Low	Medium	SNS2
		Staffing Implications	Proposed saving in match funding and announcement that this national initiative will not be continued means service will end from July 2011.							
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	Redundancies of 3 - 5FTE None specific None All young people attending provision are nominated by schools on basis of learning needs and emotional vulnerability							
Children's Social Care										
C&YP		Service Description	Community Support and Social Care Delete 2fte Family Support Co-ordinators	70						
	CSF16	Service Implication	Work involving placing pre school children in need in supportive day care placements will be transferred from Children's Social Care to Early Years service as part of overall CSF department Target Operating (TOM) remodelling. May require two redundancies but retirement of one post holder likely.							
		Staffing Implications	None							
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	None None Children in need including those subject to a child protection plan are key users of children's services.							

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF17	<p>Youth and Inclusion</p> <p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	305	30				Low	Medium	SS2
		<p>Youth and Inclusion</p> <p>Educational Welfare Team</p> <p>Reduction of 0.75 FTE Education Welfare Officer will be mitigated by reallocating work across remaining staff using LEAN review tool but some reduction in overall service capacity likely</p> <p>1 redundancy potentially</p> <p>Attendance and Persistent Absence targets at risk through reduced service</p> <p>Some reduction in EWS support to schools</p> <p>Children missing school are vulnerable to poorer educational and other outcomes</p>								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF18	<p>Youth and Inclusion</p> <p>Restructure Youth Provision</p> <p>Savings proposal is part of major transformation project developing new Target Operating Model (TOM) for youth service. Current review is ongoing of configuration of centres; overhead costs and balance of direct provision and external commissioning of service. TOM will result in reduction in universal youth offer and increased targeting of service</p> <p>Likely to involve redundancies and/or transfer of staff to new providers</p> <p>Likely impact on achievement of targets for participation in youth provision and achievement of accredited outcomes.</p> <p>Reduction in diversionary work with young people in some parts of the borough may lead to increased youth crime and anti-social behaviour with impact on Safer Merton and Community and Housing department</p> <p>TOM will focus the service on reaching higher risk groups.</p>	198	110	13			Medium	High	SNS2
		<p>Service Description</p>								
		<p>Service Implication</p>								
		<p>Staffing Implications</p>								
		<p>Business Plan implications</p>								
		<p>Impact on other departments</p>								
		<p>Equalities Implications</p>								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
Early Years										
C&YP	CSF19	<p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	68	50				Low	Medium	SNS2
		<p>Early Years</p> <p>Reduction of training budget</p> <p>Reduction in free early years training offer to schools, PVI settings and childminders</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>See above</p> <p>None specific</p>								
Cross Cutting										
C&YP	CSF20	<p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	80	40				Medium	Medium	SS2
		<p>Cross Cutting</p> <p>Reduce Young People's Participation Budget</p> <p>Saving will be achieved through a Target Operating Model (TOM) review and restructure of the service. Some prioritisation and targetting of participation work will be required.</p> <p>1 FTE redundancy likely</p> <p>Work to support the new youth advisors will need to be retained.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Participation officers promote the involvement of young people inc Looked After Children in decision-making</p>								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
Social Care and YP										
C&YP	CSF21	<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	20	20				Low	Low	SS1
<p>Community Support and Social Care Delete one admin post. Removal of admin support to Family Support coordinators. Deletion of vacant post and reallocation of work</p> <p>None None None specific</p>										
C&YP	CSF22	<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	102	30				Low	Medium	SNS2
<p>Community Support and Social Care Reduction in daycare budget. Reduced capacity to subsidise the provision of daycare for vulnerable pre-school children. None None None Providing daycare for young children in need can improve their outcomes educationally and within their families</p>										

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 09/10 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF23	Service Description	63	15				Low	Medium	SNS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments								
		Equalities Implications								
Community Support and Social Care Reduce Section 17 budgets across social care teams. Reduced capacity to provide ad-hoc financial assistance in defined circumstances to families of children in need. None None None This saving will impact on poorer families with children in need										
ABG			789	0	0	0	0			
Non ABG			492	13	0	0	0			
Total Children and Young People Savings for 2011-2015				1,281	13	0	0			

SS2

Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service

SNS1

Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency

SNS2

Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service

SP1

Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency

SG1

Grants: Existing service funded by new grant

SG2

Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced grant

SPROP

Reduction in Property related costs

Panel

C&YP

CC

HC&OP

SC

Children & Young People

Corporate Capacity

Healthier Communities & Older People

Sustainable Communities

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
Area Based Grant Savings										
C&YP	CSF24	<p>Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	221	120				Medium	Medium	SS2
<p>Primary/Secondary Strategy - Central Co-ordination</p> <p>Complete service restructure in School Standards and Quality with increased targeting of residual funding and development of new models of delivery of school improvement services</p> <p>11 possible redundancies through known grant reduction.</p> <p>Significant impact on LA's ability to intervene to raise education attainment and school standards.</p> <p>none</p> <p>Need to protect support for schools in respect of their work to improve educational outcomes for vulnerable groups of pupils</p>										
Education										
C&YP	CSF25	<p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	303	50				Low	Medium	SNS1
<p>Special Educational Needs</p> <p>Service efficiencies and rationalisation of budgets</p> <p>Saving will be achieved through removal of training budget for schools and LA officers and increase in income generation targets</p> <p>None</p> <p>None specific</p> <p>Some impact on overall CSF training offer to schools</p> <p>None specific</p>										

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF26	Service Description	<p>Special Educational Needs Reduce Budget for SEN Transport Saving will be achieved through review of transport eligibility policy and use of escorts undertaken alongside service user groups. None in CSF but potential impact in E+R</p>	100				Medium	Medium	SNS1/SNS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
C&YP	CSF27	Service Description	<p>Schools Standards and Quality Merton's LgFL Annual Revenue Contribution Saving will be achieved through reduction in Merton's match funding contribution currently funding MLE consultants in schools - we will seek to achieve higher 'buy back' commitments from schools in order to retain service. 1 possible redundancy if schools do not buy back</p>	40				Low	Medium	SS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)		
Children's Social Care												
C&YP	CSF28	Service Description	Integrated Services Integrated Services Efficiencies	592	100			High	High	SS1SNS1		
		Service Implication	Saving will be achieved through a review of the role of Brightwell and efficiencies achieved through the new integrated model of service delivery									
		Staffing Implications	Not known at this stage - review of Brightwell is ongoing and not due to produce final report until end December									
		Business Plan implications	None specific									
		Impact on other departments	None									
		Equalities Implications	Potential impact on key equalities group although review of Brightwell aims to broaden service user access to respite services									
C&YP	CSF29	Service Description	Strategy and Development Restructure	111	70			Medium	Medium	SS2		
		Service Implication	Will reduce capacity to deliver current Common Assessment Framework (CAF) training and co-ordination across agencies providing children's services in the borough									
		Staffing Implications	Up to 3 fte redundancies									
		Business Plan implications	Will impact on partnership approach to the identification of, and support for, children with additional needs									
		Impact on other departments	None in council but will affect partner agencies eg NHS Trusts; police; CVS and schools									
		Equalities Implications	CAF is a national assessment framework designed to prevent the needs of vulnerable children escalating									

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF30	Service Description	<p>Community Support and Social Care Delete 1 Assistant Team Manager post in the Fostering Team Reduction in overall management oversight of social workers undertaking fostercarer assessments and support Deletion of vacant post None specific None Children's Social Care works with some of the most vulnerable families in Merton</p>	50				Medium	Medium	SS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments								
		Equalities Implications								
C&YP	CSF31	Service Description	<p>Community Support and Social Care Delete 0.5 wte Assistant Team Manager post in Family Support Team. Reduction in overall management oversight in Family Support Team. Deletion of vacant post None specific None Family Support Team works with some of the most vulnerable families in Merton</p>	22				Medium	Medium	SS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications								
		Impact on other departments								
		Equalities Implications								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
C&YP	CSF32	Service Description Service Implication	1,149	25				Medium	Medium	SS2
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
Youth and Inclusion										
C&YP	CSFD33	Service Description	659	30				Medium	High	SS2
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								

PANEL: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)	
C&YP	CSF34	Cross Cutting									
		Service Description									
		Service Implication	Cross Cutting Access to Resources (ART) Savings in Placement Costs Planned project to establish new access to resources team from 1/4/11 to strengthen 'gatekeeping' and budget monitoring and achieve procurement savings from reduced unit costs of looked after children and SEN placements. Establishment of team will involve assimilation of existing staff None specific None	2,255	200				High	Medium	SP1
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	More robust procurement should improve quality of placements for these key equalities groups.						Low	Medium	SS2
C&YP	CSFD35	Cross Cutting									
		Service Description									
		Service Implication	Cross Cutting Reviewing of Training and Supplies Budgets None specific although this saving will pressure further budgets which are already considered small. None		30						
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	None None None None								
ABG				120							
Non ABG				717							
Total Children and Young People Savings for 2011-2015				837	0	0					

Corporate Capacity All Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)
	Medium	0.00% (14.07% 2010/11)	72.64% (25.68% 2010/11)	1.37% (1.77% 2010/11)
	Low	25.99% (40.20% 2010/11)	0.00% (16.86% 2010/11)	0.00% (1.43% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Corporate Capacity Non ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)	0.00% (0.0% 2010/11)
	Medium	0.00% (14.07% 2010/11)	73.97% (25.68% 2010/11)	1.40% (1.77% 2010/11)
	Low	24.63% (40.20% 2010/11)	0.00% (16.86% 2010/11)	0.00% (1.43% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Corporate Capacity ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Medium	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Low	100.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - CORPORATE CAPACITY All Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	700	-100	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	20	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	2,679	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	66	0	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	182	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		3,647	-100	0	0

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - CORPORATE CAPACITY Non ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	700	-100	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	20	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	2,679	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	0	0	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	182	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		3,581	-100	0	0

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - CORPORATE CAPACITY ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	0	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	66	0	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	0	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		66	0	0	0

PANEL: CORPORATE CAPACITY SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving		Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
CC	CS1	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	<p>ABG Reduction Reduction in Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) budgets. This will lead to less money available for PVE initiatives.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Less funding available to support CSF in the engagement work with schools.</p> <p>The reduction in funds will have an impact on our ability to fund projects to engage with sections of the population most at risk within the borough - young males and females from minority ethnic groups.</p>	246	66				Low	Low	SNS2
CC	CS2	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	<p>Corporate Services & Chief Executives Staffing Restructure of Support Services See Appendix 6 for details.</p> <p>Net reduction of 65 ftes, but a number of these are vacant.</p> <p>None</p> <p>See Appendix 6 for details.</p> <p>See Appendix 5 for details</p>	13,770	2,166				Med	Med	SS2
CC	CS3	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	<p>Corporate Services & Chief Executives Staffing Customer Services Restructure Reduction in cash office opening hours. Supported community forums reduced to one per annum for each forum. Reduced communications and marketing activity Reduction of 13,46 budgeted FTE.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Reduced communications and marketing activity.</p> <p>See appendix.</p>	6,137	463				Med	Med	SS2
CC	CS4	<p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	<p>CHAS Contractors Health and Safety service. CHAS is a national service operated by Merton to provide Health and Safety expertise to a wide range of customers. Anticipated additional income based on current level of demand for the service, which is anticipated to continue in 2011/12.</p> <p>None</p> <p>The figure is net of any additional temporary staff required to provide the service during peak periods.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Increased volume of transactions through other computer systems Ash and Proactis. None</p>	-2,857	700	-100			Low	Low	SI2

PANEL: CORPORATE CAPACITY SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
CC	CS5	<p>Decision Package/Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p><u>Review of HR business partners function shared with Sutton - Merton contribution to be £50K through reduced staffing</u> Reduction in Business Partner staffing - exact post/s yet to be identified and subject to consultation Will impact on level of HR business partner support provided to service departments Likely to see a reduction or one or two posts Will impact on support provided to departments Will impact on level of HR business partner support provided to service departments Not known at this stage - as subject to final consultation</p>	482	50				Med	High	SS2
CC	CS6	<p>Decision Package/Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p><u>Review of procurement of occupational and employee assistance contracts to achieve improved value through tendering</u> Retender occupational health and employees assistance contracts We aim to retain the same level of service as far as possible but at a reduced cost None None We aim to minimise any loss of service quality None None</p>	183	30				Low	Low	SP1
CC	CS7	<p>Decision Package/Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p><u>Review of learning development and diversity function</u> Aim to co-locate the team and reduce staffing level We will seek to reduce administrative overheads as far as possible to achieve the saving Yes - likely to be one post - still subject to consultation None We aim to minimise any loss of service quality Yet to be determined</p>	123	20				Med	Med	SS1

PANEL: CORPORATE CAPACITY SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
CC	CS8	<p>Corporate</p> <p>Reduced Agency margins following renegotiation of Merton's contract with Hays</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Total Corporate Capacity Savings for 2011-2015</p>	-236	152				Low	Low	SP1

Panel

- C&YP Children & Young People
- CC Corporate Capacity
- HC&OP Healthier Communities & Older People
- SC Sustainable Communities
- O&SC Overview & Scrutiny Commission

Risk

- Low
- Medium
- High

Type of Saving Key

- SI1 Income - increase in current level of charges
- SI2 Income - increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service
- SS1 Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency
- SS2 Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service
- SNS1 Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency
- SNS2 Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service
- SP1 Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency
- SG1 Grants: Existing service funded by new grant
- SG2 Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced grant
- SPROP Reduction in Property related costs

GROWTH ANALYSIS BY TYPE - CORPORATE CAPACITY

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
GI1	Income: Decrease due to fall in demand for service	0	0	0	0
GI2	Income: Decrease due to reduction/deletion of service	0	0	0	0
GS1	Staffing: increase in level of service	0	0	0	0
GS2	Staffing: New service	0	0	0	0
GNS1	Non - Staffing: increase in level of service	0	0	0	0
GNS2	Non - Staffing: New service	0	0	0	0
GP1	Addition to Procurement / Third Party arrangements	180	250	0	0
GPROP	Increase in Property Related costs	0	0	0	0
		180	250	0	0

PANEL: CORPORATE CAPACITY GROWTH: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Growth	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Type of Growth (see key)
CC	CSG1	Decision Package/Service Description	180				GP1
		Service Implication					
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications					
CC	CSG2	Decision Package/Service Description		250			GP1
		Service Implication					
		Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications					
Total Corporate Capacity Growth for 2011-2015			180	250	0	0	

Healthier Communities & Older People All Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	11.26% (3.35% 2010/11)	5.54% (32.74% 2010/11)	24.30% (0.00% 2010/11)
	Medium	13.87% (10.31% 2010/11)	12.34% (23.70% 2010/11)	7.97% (3.35% 2010/11)
	Low	14.75% (15.47% 2010/11)	7.03% (11.08% 2010/11)	2.93% (0.00% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Healthier Communities & Older People Non ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	11.61% (3.35% 2010/11)	5.70% (32.74% 2010/11)	25.04% (0.00% 2010/11)
	Medium	11.55% (10.31% 2010/11)	12.72% (23.70% 2010/11)	8.21% (3.35% 2010/11)
	Low	14.91% (15.47% 2010/11)	7.24% (11.08% 2010/11)	3.02% (0.00% 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

Healthier Communities & Older People ABG Savings

SUMMARY OF 2011/12 RISKS

DELIVERABILITY RISK	High	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Medium	90.57% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
	Low	9.43% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)	0.00% (N/A 2010/11)
		Low	Medium	High
		REPUTATIONAL RISK		

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES & OLDER PEOPLE All Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	467	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	476	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	0	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	265	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	430	100	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	1,975	52	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		3,613	152	0	0

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES & OLDER PEOPLE Non ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	467	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	476	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	0	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	265	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	430	100	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	1,869	52	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		3,507	152	0	0

SAVINGS ANALYSIS - HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES & OLDER PEOPLE ABG Savings

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
SI1	Income: increase in current level of charges	0	0	0	0
SI2	Income: increase arising from expansion of existing service/new service	0	0	0	0
SS1	Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SS2	Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	0	0	0	0
SNS1	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to efficiency	0	0	0	0
SNS2	Non - Staffing: reduction in costs due to deletion/reduction in service	0	0	0	0
SP1	Procurement / Third Party arrangements - efficiency	106	0	0	0
SG1	Grants: Existing service funded by new grant	0	0	0	0
SG2	Grants: Improved Efficiency of existing service currently funded by unringfenced	0	0	0	0
SPROP	Reduction in Property related costs	0	0	0	0
		106	0	0	0

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC01	Service Description	40	10				Low	Low	SP1
		ABG Reduction								
		Reduction in Supporting People supplies and services budgets.								
		This relates to efficiency savings identified in the Supporting People administration supplies and services budgets. None None None None								
HC&OP	CC02	Service Description	41,585	638				High	High	SP1
		Service Implication								
		Access & Assessments and Commissioning								
		Propose an inflation increase of 0% on all providers. Providers may require that client's are removed from their care (this has been very rare to date). Other LA's will probably have a 0% uplift so will be easier to manage - may be exceptional circumstances where inflation increases will be required. The figure is based on an assumption for inflation in the MTFS of 2%. None Contributes to efficiency savings None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC03	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning Negotiate a single hourly rate for homecare Benchmarking figures awaited to confirm whether the proposed hourly rate (£13.50) is sustainable. Based upon current approved providers average rate of £15.40 per hour for approved providers & projected hours for 2010/11 & a flat rate of £13.50 per hour through re-tendering. Could be higher if non-approved providers are considered.</p> <p>Staffing Implications None</p> <p>Business Plan implications Contributes to efficiency savings</p> <p>Impact on other departments None</p> <p>Equalities Implications None</p>	8,763	387				High	Low	SP1
HC&OP	CC04	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning Use Care Funding Calculator to reduce placement costs. Review of existing high cost residential care packages to negotiate fair price and negotiation of fair price on all new residential care packages</p> <p>Staffing Implications Post of LD Placement Broker to be filled on a 2 year internal secondment basis</p> <p>Business Plan implications In line with the aim of delivering cost effective, person centred services.</p> <p>Impact on other departments None</p> <p>Equalities Implications Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>	9,742	150				Medium	Low	SP1

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC05	<p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	18,318	100				Medium	Medium	SP1
<p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning</p> <p>Employ Older People broker to reduce spot placement cost.</p> <p>The saving will include ensuring that absences from the home are paid at the reduced rate for hospitalisation & providers are not charging for services which are included in the weekly fee & agreement of cost/volume rates with larger spot providers, as well as re-negotiation of specific client packages & using host authority rates (where lower than LBM). The target saving is £130k but as £30k is transferred from 2009/10 savings, it leaves £100k to contribute towards 2011/12.</p> <p>An earmarked reserve was agreed from 2009/10 under-spend to fund a post for one year.</p> <p>In line with the aim of delivering cost effective, person centred services & efficiency savings.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>										
HC&OP	CC06	<p>Service Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	4,379	100				Medium	Low	SP1
<p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning</p> <p>Reduction in Older People block contracts</p> <p>Review of existing contracts has taken place within commissioning. A further reduction (2 x nursing & 1 x EMI), will equate to further reduction in block provision . To try & reduce down the spot bed rate with CCHT (or look to spot purchase elsewhere). To work with Access & Assessment.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Contributes to efficiency savings</p> <p>None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>										

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC07	Service Description	524	80				Medium	High	SP1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
HC&OP	CC08	Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	1,093	20				Medium	Medium	SP1
		Service Description								
		Staffing Implications								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)	
HC&OP	CC09	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	327	30	40			Low	Low	SP1	
<p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning Meals on Wheels contract reduction. Proposal received from Sodexo. Through them delivering frozen meals at same time as hot meal provision (therefore, reducing down on frozen meal delivery van). Figures to be reviewed & then agreement to be made with Sodexo.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Contributes to efficiency savings</p> <p>None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>											
HC&OP	CC10	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	510	25				Low	Low	SI1	
<p>Direct Provision MASCOT charges MASCOT is currently reviewing existing charges to individual and corporate customers to achieve a more flexible method of recovering costs. Staff are actively seeking additional contracts with partner organisations.</p> <p>None at present - if expansion is successful then increased staffing levels might follow if the budget allows.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>											

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC11	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	776	240				High	High	SNS1
HC&OP	CC12	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	4,958	126				Medium	Medium	SS1

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC13	<p>Service Description</p> <p>All sections</p> <p>Disability Related Expenditure- changes to Fairer Charging Policy introducing a standard disregard of £10 and setting a maximum attendance allowance of £47.80.</p> <p>This change will mean most customers will be better off or the same. A minority will be worse off. Most customers should prefer the change as they will no longer have to submit receipts if their DRE's</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>	506	27				Low	High	SI1
HC&OP	CC14	<p>Section Description</p> <p>Changing the maximum homecare charge from £395.30 per week to having no maximum limit.</p> <p>The system will be updated to ensure the full amount is invoiced rather than being capped at £395.30. The change will effect a small number of customers, and only those paying full cost for their services.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>	280	58			Medium	High	SI1	

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC15	<p>Section Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	355	16				Medium	Low	SP1
		<p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning</p> <p>Re-negotiate the hourly rate as allowed for under the Crossroads contract.</p> <p>Currently £14.21, aim to reduce down to new rate of £13.50 per hour. A saving of £0.71 per hour. Savings due the merger of provider (Merton Crossroads) with South Thames Crossroads.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Contributes to efficiency savings</p> <p>None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>								
HC&OP	CC16	<p>Section Description</p> <p>Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications</p> <p>Impact on other departments</p> <p>Equalities Implications</p>	53	3				Low	Low	SP1
		<p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning</p> <p>Contract for LD Advocacy Service (including: DOLS & IMCA)</p> <p>Savings to be made through merging 3 x contracts into 1x. This would give reduced overheads from provider due to only having one contract. Further savings to be gained through having the DOLS service on a spot basis. Reviewing the service & re-letting it could contribute to further savings.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Contributes to efficiency savings</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC17	Section Description	259	12				Low	Low	SP1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Access & Assessments and Commissioning Provision of care at Autumn Close for LD clients (de-registering to a Supported Living Scheme) De-registering to a Supported Living Scheme -1/4 of the annual saving as 3/4 of it will be achieved in 2010/11 None Contributes to efficiency savings None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.								
HC&OP	CC18	Section Description	355	48				Low	Low	SP1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Access & Assessments and Commissioning Contract for the provision of BME & Adult Mental Health Day Services Renegotiate the spend in Adult Mental Health (Imagine) contract. Reduction in annual contract from £310k to £262k. None Contributes to efficiency savings None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.								
HC&OP	CC19	Section Description	222	22				Medium	Low	SP1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Access & Assessments and Commissioning Extra Care Housing Supported Housing Scheme Through reducing down night worker from 2:1 (as allowed under the contract) this will create an additional £22,000 savings pa. None Contributes to efficiency savings None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC20	Service Description Service Implication	486	5				Medium	Low	SP1
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
HC&OP	CC21	Access & Assessments and Commissioning Respite Provision at Trellis House Converting a flat into a respite unit to have one less respite care home placement None Contributes to efficiency savings None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.	259	25				Low	Low	SNS1
		Direct Provision								
		Goods and services Each establishment has been scrutinised and savings in goods and services budgets identified. None None None None								
		Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 1 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC23	<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	380	380				Low	Low	SNS2
		<p>Give up growth agreed in previous year None. The free personal care at home bill will not come into effect and the growth identified for 2011/12 can be given up.</p>								
		<p>None None None None</p>								
		Total Healthier Communities and Older People Savings for 2011 2015		2,502	40	0				

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC24	Service Description	3,467	96				Medium	Low	SP1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan Implications								
HC&OP	CC25	Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	3,467	100				Medium	Low	SP1
		Service Description								
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)	
HC&OP	CC27	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	510	12				Medium	Low	SI1	
<p>Direct Provision MASCOT charges MASCOT is currently reviewing existing charges to individual and corporate customers to achieve a more flexible method of recovering costs. Staff are actively seeking additional contracts with partner organisations. None at present - if expansion is successful then increased staffing levels might follow if the budget allows. None None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>											
HC&OP	CC28	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	347	20				High	Low	SP1	
<p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning Review of No Recourse to Public Fund cases. Reduction in resource through furthest tightening of demand management and cost control. None None None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>											
HC&OP	CC29	<p>Service Description Service Implication</p> <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p>	2,427	200				Medium	Medium	SS1	
<p>Access & Assessments Reablement staffing restructure The reductions will be across the Promoting Independence service but the aim is to restructure to absorb the loss and drop some non-essential functions. The core reablement service will continue to be able to respond to demand. There will be a reduction of 9/10 wte via compulsory redundancy in a range of roles and functions. None None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>											

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC30	Service Description	2,427	100				High	Medium	SI1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
HC&OP	CC31	Service Description	4,958	150				Medium	High	SS1
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								
HC&OP	CC32	Service Description	5,208	100				High	Medium	P11
		Service Implication								
		Staffing Implications								
		Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)
HC&OP	CC33	<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications</p> <p>All Reduction in training opportunities This could affect the amount of training and backfill we are able to offer, or reduced statutory training. Reduced ability to provide training to staff.</p> <p>None None No equalities impact on clients. Training protocol will need to ensure that there are no equalities implications on staff.</p>	234	50				Low	Medium	SNS2
		<p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p>None None Access & Assessments and Commissioning</p>								
		<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications</p> <p>53 38 12</p> <p>None. Advocacy support being remodelled to be delivered via user led/peer support/voluntary groups. Linked with CC16. None None None None</p>								
HC&OP	CC34	<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications</p> <p>Commissioning Target the discretionary use of Freedom Passes for mentally ill people. The proposal is to end issuing of Freedom Passes on a universal basis but to retain some funding to support people who require this as part of their agreed care programme. The phasing of this will depend on how quickly Freedom Passes are renewed.</p> <p>None None None</p>	140					Low	High	SNS2
		<p>Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>								
		<p>Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications</p> <p>100</p>								

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE PHASE 2 SAVINGS: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Saving	Baseline Budget 10/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Risk Analysis - Deliverability	Risk Analysis - Reputational Impact	Type of Saving (see key)	
HC&OP	CC36	Service Description	6,444	204				Low	Medium	SI1	
		Service Implication									
		Staffing Implications									
HC&OP	CC37	Business Plan Implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications	316	41				Low	High	SI1	
		Service Description									
		Service Implication									
		Staffing Implications									
		Business Plan Implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications									
		Total Healthier Communities and Older People Savings for 2011 2015		1,111	112	0	0			0	

GROWTH ANALYSIS BY TYPE - HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES & OLDER PEOPLE

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
		£000	£000	£000	£000
GI1	Income: Decrease due to fall in demand for service	0	0	0	0
GI2	Income: Decrease due to reduction/deletion of service	0	0	0	0
GS1	Staffing: increase in level of service	0	0	0	0
GS2	Staffing: New service	0	0	0	0
GNS1	Non - Staffing: increase in level of service	73	0	0	0
GNS2	Non - Staffing: New service	0	0	0	0
GP1	Addition to Procurement / Third Party arrangements	0	0	0	0
GPROP	Increase in Property Related costs	0	0	0	0
		73	0	0	0

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE GROWTH: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Growth	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Type of Growth (see key)
HC&OP	CCG01	<p>All Services Demographic Growth in Placements: LD PD OP MH No recourse to public funds Unallocated placement budgets MTFS growth agreed for 2009/10 in 08/09 MTFS growth agreed for 2009/10 in 09/10</p> <p>This relates to the increase in service users; increase in intensity of care required in some cases and the reduction in service requirements in other cases. None</p> <p>This is required to provide critical and substantial services to vulnerable adults. None</p> <p>Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they effect people in this category.</p>	1,482	2,133	TBA	TBA	GP1
			390	508	TBA	TBA	
			-259	-845	TBA	TBA	
			179	261	TBA	TBA	
			145	283	TBA	TBA	
			-416	-433	TBA	TBA	
			-1,240	0	0	0	
			-281	-1,907	0	0	
			0	0	0	0	
			0	0	0	0	

PANEL: HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE GROWTH: 2011-2015

Panel	Ref	Description of Growth	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	Type of Growth (see key)
HC&OP	CCG02	<p>Service Description</p> <p>All Services Inflation above 1.5%</p> <p>LD PD OP MH No recourse to public funds MTFS contractual above Inflation adjustment 08/09 MTFS contractual above Inflation adjustment 09/10</p> <p>Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p>This relates to the increase in inflation above the corporate allocation. None This is required to provide critical and substantial services to vulnerable adults. None Community care customers are at risk of exclusion from ordinary life for reasons of age, disability or illness. Measures which reduce or increase staffing or service therefore have an equality implication in that they affect people in this category.</p>	70	215	TBA	TBA	GP1
			23	66	TBA	TBA	
			95	282	TBA	TBA	
			16	49	TBA	TBA	
			3	11	TBA	TBA	
			-804	0	0	0	
			597	-623	0	0	
			0	0	0	0	
			0	0	0	0	
			0	0	0	0	
HC&OP	CCG03	<p>Decision Package/Service Description Service Implication Staffing Implications Business Plan implications Impact on other departments Equalities Implications</p> <p>Access & Assessments and Commissioning</p> <p>Review the contribution towards ICES pool The joint equipment pool with the PCT is overspending as the pool has not taken account of demographic increases in recent years. None None None None</p>	73				GNS1
Total Healthier Communities and Older People Growth for 2011-2015			73	0	0	0	0

Cabinet

Date: 13 December 2010

Agenda item:

Subject: Budget 2011/12 and MTFS 2011-15

Lead officer: Caroline Holland

Lead member: Councillor Mark Allison

Key Decision Reference Number: This report is written and any decisions taken are within the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules as laid out in Part 4-C of the Constitution.

Contact officer: Andy Wood

Urgent report:

Reason for urgency: The chairman has approved the submission of this report as a matter of urgency as it provides the latest available information on the Budget 2011/12 and requires consideration of issues relating to the Budget process and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015. It is important that this consideration is not delayed in order that the Council can work towards a balanced budget at its meeting on 2nd March 2011 and set a Council Tax as appropriate for 2011/12.

Recommendations:

1. That Cabinet considers the latest information in respect of the Budget 2011/12 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015, and approves the latest package of budget proposals and draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 and refers them to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Panels for comment.
2. That Cabinet notes that the two savings for which decisions were held in abeyance following Cabinet on 8 November (i.e. Page 55 of the printed agenda – Ref: CSF15 Reducing of Financial Support to Merton Music Foundation; and Page 79 of the printed agenda – Ref: CC22 Direct Provision, Closure of Taylor Road”) will be considered again in January 2011.
3. That Cabinet considers the draft Capital Programme 2011-15 and confirms the draft programme to refer to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Panels for comment.
4. That Cabinet notes that there will be a review of the Capital Strategy to ensure that the funding of the programme and the debt outstanding of the authority can be optimised.
5. That Cabinet recommends that Council approves the addition of the Sure Start- Childrens Centres scheme, estimated to cost £0.612m, to the

Capital Programme, and approves a new capital scheme relating to the technical costs of joining the London Libraries Consortium.

6. That Cabinet notes the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on the initial package referred to it by Cabinet on 8 November 2010 and the responses as set out in a separate report on this agenda.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides an update to Cabinet on the progress made so far towards setting a balanced revenue budget for 2011/12 and a fully funded capital programme for 2011-15.

- 1.2 The information in this report will be subject to scrutiny by Panels and the Overview and Scrutiny Commission in the January and February 2011 cycle of meetings.

- 1.3 A report on progress on the Budget 2011/12, MTFS 2011-15 and Capital Programme 2011-15 was considered by Cabinet on 8 November. Cabinet agreed the recommendations in the report , with the exception that:-

“it was agreed that, in order to allow for further discussion, the following matters are held in abeyance to the December meeting of Cabinet:

_ Page 55 of the printed agenda – Ref: CSF15 Reducing of Financial Support to Merton Music Foundation

_ Page 79 of the printed agenda – Ref: CC22 Direct Provision, Closure of Taylor Road”

The report to Cabinet on 8 November was referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission for their consideration. The comments from the Commission, with responses to the points raised, are set out in a separate report on the agenda for this meeting.

- 1.4 In particular, this report provides details of the second phase of departmental savings proposed as part of addressing the targets set. The savings agreed by Cabinet on the 8th November (Phase 1) are also included to give an overall position as at 13 December 2010.
- 1.5 Details of initial departmental growth proposals are also set out in the report.
- 1.6 An update on progress towards preparing a draft Capital Programme 2011-15 is also given.

2. DETAILS

2.1 Revenue - Introduction

2.1.1 The MTFs previously reported has identified that there will need to be savings over the next four years estimated at £70.557m

	Forecast 2011/12 £m	Forecast 2012/13 £m	Forecast 2013/14 £m	Forecast 2014/15 £m	
Revised Gap (after savings/income and growth) & four year cumulative total	23.673	18.407	14.713	13.764	£70.557m

2.1.2 Initial targets, totalling £14m, were allocated to each department and this was the focus of attention in the report to Cabinet on 8 November. All of the savings previously agreed by Cabinet are included in this report. Further work has been undertaken and details of additional savings proposals are provided in Appendix 1.

2.1.3 In addition, Government funding cuts to Area Based Grants in 2010/11 will be continued into 2011/12 and progress on savings to fund these cuts is included in this report.

2.1.4 It has been decided to delay decisions with regard to those items previously held in abeyance by Cabinet on 8 November 2010 (i.e.CSF15 (Merton Music Foundation) and CC22 (Closure of Taylor Road)) until January 2011. The progress is as follows:-

General Fund Savings:

	SAVINGS TARGET 2011/12 £000	Reported to Cabinet 8 th November 2011/12 £000	Additional Savings identified (Phase 2) £000	SHORTFALL/ (SURPLUS) 2011/12 £000
Chief Executive's Corporate Services	387 } 3,031 }	3,581	0 }	(163)
Environmental Services	4,702	2,724	1,530	448
Children, Schools and Families	1,422	(Note 1) 492	717	213
Community and Housing	4,458	(Note 2) 2,654	1,096	708
Total	14,000	9,451	3,343	1,206

Note 1: Excludes CSF15: Reducing of Financial Support to Merton Music Foundation (£0.072m in 2011/12) held in abeyance until January 2011.

Note 2: Excludes CC22: Closure of Taylor Road (£0.022m in 2011/12) held in abeyance until January 2011.

ABG Savings:

	ABG LOSS £000	Reported to Cabinet 8 th November £000	Additional Savings identified (Phase 2) £000	SHORTFALL/ (SURPLUS) £000
Chief Executive's Corporate Services	66 0	66 0	0 0	0 0
Environmental Services	22	0	0	22
Children, Schools and Families	919	789	120	10
Community and Housing	106	10	96	0
Total	1,113	865	216	32

- 2.1.5 The details of all savings (Phase 1 and Phase 2) are attached for consideration and decision.
- 2.1.6 The savings so far presented have been analysed by type and level of risk and this analysis is included in Appendix 1.
- 2.1.7 The detailed budget summary analysis, including the overall numbers of staff by division as well as a detailed analysis of staff affected and potential redeployments/redundancies together with associated costs and funding, are included in Appendix 6 **(TO FOLLOW)**.

2.2 Growth

- 2.2.1 There will be a need for some additional growth in 2011/12 and future years as a result of pressures/new legislation and the ongoing impact on any expenditure commitments made in 2010/11 for which no base budget currently exists (e.g. bulky waste initiative). The MTFS currently includes provision for growth of £3.245m. Details of proposals for growth are provided in Appendix 2 and summarised in the table below:-

	2011/12 £m	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m	2014/15 £m
Chief Executive's } Corporate Services }	0.180	0.250	0.000	0.000
Environmental Services	0.221	0.089	0.000	0.000
Children, Schools and Families	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Community and Housing	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total	0.474	0.339	0.000	0.000
Less: Growth included in MTFS	3.245	0	0	0
Net surplus/(deficit)	2.771	(0.339)	0.000	0.000

- 2.2.2 Of the growth set out above a sum of £0.221m is included within the overall growth provision of £3.245m. There may be a need for further growth and this will be brought forward to the January meeting of Cabinet along with a review of corporate and technical adjustments.

2.3 Update in Budget Gap

- 2.3.1 Taking into account the latest savings and growth proposals discussed in this report, the latest budget gap identified in the MTFS is as follows:-

	Forecast 2011/12 £m	Forecast 2012/13 £m	Forecast 2013/14 £m	Forecast 2014/15 £m	
Revised Gap (after savings/income and growth) & four year cumulative total	23.673	18.407	14.713	13.764	£70.557m
Draft Savings Proposals (Phases 1 and 2)	(12.794)	(0.058)	(0.015)	0.000	(12.867)
Growth	0.253	0.339	0.000	0.000	0.592
Revised Budget Gap	11.132	18.688	14.698	13.764	58.282

2.4 Local Government Finance Settlement-Latest position

- 2.4.1 It is expected that there will be a two year Settlement, announced in December.

- 2.4.2 The changes in funding to local government set out in the Spending Review 2010 are summarised in the following table:-

	Baseline 2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Cash growth	Real growth
	£bn	£bn	£bn	£bn	£bn	%	%
Total revenue contributions from Central Government	29.7	27.5	26.3	25.5	24.2	-18.5%	-25.9%
Cumulative Change %		-7.4	-11.4	-14.1	-18.5		
Year on Year change %		-7.4	-4.4	-3.0	-5.1		

- 2.4.3 There are considerable difficulties in estimating likely funding in advance of notification of the settlement as the distribution of grant between nearly 400 local authorities in England is based on a great deal of data and there are potential methodology changes to factor in. It is therefore extremely difficult to predict with any certainty what level of grant Merton will get in 2011/12 and beyond. The MTFS includes a reduction of £7.5m in each of the four years 2011/12 to 2014/15 which equates to approximately 7% p.a. or 28% over the entire period.
- 2.4.4 London Councils has carried out some desk top analysis of potential grant changes in consultation with the Government. The Government has indicated that it intends to reduce the number of revenue grants from more than 90 individual grants to 10 funding streams. Appendix 5 (i) sets out current grants received by Merton and Appendix 5(ii) sets out the initial indications of the new 10 grant streams.

- 2.4.5 Large grants account for about 87% of funding excluding schools, police and fire.

	National Total 2010/11	Merton 2010/11	Merton 2010/11 excluding Schools
	£bn	£m	%
Formula Grant	20.1	67.7	68.0
Grants being rolled into Formula Grant	3.4	9.3	9.3
Sure Start (which is frozen in cash terms)	1.6	5.2	5.2
Working Neighbourhoods Fund (which is being abolished)	0.5	0	0
	22.2	82.2	82.5

- 2.4.6 The remaining 17.5% for Merton grants will either be distributed as Core Revenue grants (i.e. PFI and HB/CT Admin Grant) or else are not specified in the Spending Review.
- 2.4.7 The overall reductions in central government contributions to local authorities are set out in the Spending Review and these contributions are projected to fall by 18.5% in cash terms (or 26% in real terms) over the four years.
- 2.4.8 London Councils estimate that the group of grants described in paragraph 2.4.5 (which accounts for 87% of funding) will fall by 13.3% in 2011/12. However, total contributions to local government only fall by 7.4%. This implies that other grant funding (which currently accounts for 13% of the total) must increase by 33.6%. However, these are national figures so until the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement is announced there will be great uncertainty about the percentage changes in grant on a regional basis and allocations to London boroughs could be significantly different to the average.
- 2.4.9 Some of the grants not specified in the Spending Review will be used to finance the new Council Tax Freeze Reward grant and the New Homes Bonus scheme.
- 2.4.10 Whilst projections show that the new formula grant (i.e. including rolled in grant will decrease significantly (estimated 12.5% in 2011/12) this would be offset by increases in other grants to bring the overall reduction in 2011/12 to around 7.4%, which is similar to the £7.5m reduction built into the MTFs.
- 2.4.11 There are still major unknown factors which at the moment would suggest that no change be made to the grant figures in the MTFs at

this stage given the level of uncertainty and the imminence of the release of firmer numbers in the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement. These include:-

- the level of any “floor” included in the Settlement
- whether there are any methodology changes in the final Settlement
- how the other grants are distributed and the extent to which Merton benefits, if at all, from these grants.

2.5 Review of MTFS

2.5.1 The MTFS reported to Cabinet on 8th November was based on the following:-

- Provision for a pay award of 0.5% in 2011/12 (previously 2.5% included), 0.5% in 2012/13 and 1% in 2013/14 and 2014/15
- Provision for general price inflation of 2% (previously 1.5% included) in 2011/12, and 1.5% for 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15
- A reduction in Central Government funding of approximately 7.5% (formula grant, Area Based Grant and other specific grants excluding DSG) for each of the next four years (cumulative 30% approx.)
- Provision of additional growth of £3.245m for pledges in 2011/12
- No provision has been made to fund a £25 council tax refund in 2011/12, 2012/13, and 2013/14 after the Council decision on 15 September 2010.

2.5.2 Outlook for inflation

The Bank of England published its latest quarterly inflation report on 10th November. The recovery in the UK economy is expected to continue but the large fall in output during the recession means that some spare capacity is likely to remain for some time. Although the outlook for growth is highly uncertain, it is considered that the recovery in output is likely to be maintained, reflecting the stimulus to private demand from monetary policy, assisted by the strengthening of the global economy and the lower level of sterling. CPI inflation is likely to remain above the 2% target throughout 2011, reflecting the forthcoming increase in VAT and upward pressure from import price inflation. The Bank of England report assumes that quantitative easing remains at the £200billion currently issued.

2.5.3 Pay

The Government has previously announced that “a two year pay freeze will be introduced from 2011-12 for public sector workforces,

except for those earning £21,000 or less, who will receive an increase of at least £250 a year”.

Pay Claim 2011/12: The Trade Union Side of the National Joint Council for Local Government Services has submitted (on 13 October 2010) a pay claim for 2011/12. The headline claim is:

”An increase of at least £250 on all salaries and spinal column points for 2011/12 and a joint review of employment condition proposals tabled by the trade unions in 2008/9.” This equates to an increase of approximately 1.2%.

2.5.4 Prices

CPI annual inflation – the Government’s target measure – was 3.2% in October which increased from 3.1% in September. There were upward pressures from fuel and lubricants including the impact of the increase in road fuel duty which took effect from 1 October 2010; financial services; games, toys and hobbies; and alcoholic beverages and tobacco. The largest downward pressure was in food costs, particularly meat and vegetables.

In the year to October, RPI annual inflation was 4.6 per cent, unchanged from September.

The key issue is to try to accurately predict the inflation trend during 2011/12. In order to do this, an analysis has been undertaken of the HM Treasury Forecasts for the UK economy, which offers a comparison of independent forecasts for a range of economic factors, including RPI and CPI. The forecasts suggest the following inflation rates over the next year:-

	Lowest	Highest	Average
2010 (Quarter 4)	%	%	%
- CPI	2.4	3.3	2.7
- RPI	3.0	4.7	4.1
2011 (Quarter 4)			
- CPI	1.9	3.7	2.5
- RPI	2.4	4.9	3.6

2.5.5 Based on the average independent forecasts, the average inflation rate during 2011 is estimated to be around 2.6% for CPI and 3.9% for RPI. The worst case is expected to be around 3.5% for CPI and 4.8% for RPI.

2.5.6 Borrowing, Investment and Debt Management Strategy

On 4 November, the Bank of England’s Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) voted to maintain the official Bank Rate paid on commercial bank reserves at 0.5%. The Committee also voted to maintain the stock of asset purchases financed by the issuance of central bank reserves at £200 billion (Quantitative Easing).

In light of the economic outlook, the MPC judged that maintaining the Bank Rate at 0.5% and maintaining quantitative easing at £200 billion was appropriate to meet the 2% CPI inflation target over the medium term. However, because the prospects for inflation remain highly uncertain, the MPC have indicated that they are prepared to respond with changes to interest rates in either direction as the balance of risks evolves. However, over the remaining months of this financial year it is not anticipated that there will be any significant change.

The short-term market, which influences investment return, remains restrained by a low Base Rate (0.5%), substantial market liquidity, and the prospect of slow economic recovery. It is forecast that the rates available in 2010/11 from appropriate credit worthy counterparties will range from near 0.2% to 0.5% for overnight to week deposits, to near 1.5% for one year. Efforts have been made to exploit the higher rates available for longer periods to the extent that liquidity and concern to be well-placed for 2011/12 investment allow.

The longer-term, capital, market remains concerned by the prospect of future inflation. This affects long-term borrowing costs and debt redemption prospects. Public Works Loans Board (PWLB) borrowing cost for long-term funds remain at c.4.5%, but for 25-50 year funds are c. 5.25%. (These rates include the change in the pricing of PWLB loans announced in October 2010.

The change announced in October to the PWLB rates is of approximately 1% being added to any new loan undertaken, also the naming of the counterparty (i.e. Local Authority taking up any new borrowing).

Merton in the short term will not be exposed to these higher rates because the Treasury Section has followed the approved Treasury strategy, by avoiding borrowing using otherwise invested balances foregoing low investment returns of between 0.5% – 1% compared to the cost of borrowing of 4.5%.

In the first half of 2010/11 the cost of debt has remained stable, and forecasts for the remainder of the year suggest that this situation can be maintained. Investment income is more subject to external influences, but investment strategy has sought to limit the effect of market changes by placing a substantial value of funds on fixed-rate deposit of up to a year's duration. There is, therefore, confidence that treasury activities are on track to deliver budget performance, particularly as the proposed revisions to the capital programme will mean that the level of borrowing in 2010/11 will be significantly lower than planned.

The Centre for Economics and Business Research (CEBR) is forecasting that UK interest rates will stay at 0.5% into 2011 and not reach 2% until 2014. A comparison of independent forecasts for the

UK economy produced by HM Treasury (September 2010) gives the following projections:-

	Lowest	Highest	Average
2010 (Quarter 4)	%	%	%
Bank Base Rate	0.5	1.2	0.5
2011 (Quarter 4)			
Bank Base Rate	0.5	1.3	1.3

3. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2011-15

3.1 The draft Capital Programme 2011/15 is attached for consideration.

3.2 The major item in the programme is the issue of addressing increasing pupil numbers. The figures in the programme reflect the decision reached at Cabinet on 6 December. This item accounts for the majority of the increases in Children, Schools and Families of :-

2011/12 £1.2m

2012/13 £22.4m

2013/14 £10.9m

2014/15 £2.9m

3.3 Other departments' increases in these years are:

2011/12 £1.5m

2012/13 £1.2m

2013/14 £0.4m

2014/15 £0.4m

Savings on hold

3.4 The potential savings placed on hold, as agreed at Council on the 24th November, to fund the proposed wheeled bin scheme have been retained within the draft Capital Programme and not deleted or reduced at this stage pending consideration by Scrutiny of the wheeled bin scheme. No provision has therefore been made within the Capital Programme for the wheeled bin scheme at this stage.

Amendments

- 3.5 In Corporate Services a number of schemes are amended to recognise reductions in cost e.g. DDA works which will achieve 95% compliance in 2010/11. These amendments are listed separately in Appendix 4 (5).

Additional Grants

- 3.6 Since the last report to Cabinet, two additional capital grants have been received in respect of 2010/11 (and included in the draft programme) for Sure Start Children's Centres (£0.612m) and Childcare Quality and Access (PVI) (0.484m), see Appendix 4(6). The former will need to be referred to Council as it is over £500,000. It is planned to bring this to Council on the 2nd February 2011.

Additional Scheme

- 3.7 Significant advantages have been identified in the Merton Library service to joining the London Libraries Consortium – a grouping of 14 London library authorities all sharing the same library computer system. The company providing this computer system manages it for all the consortium members and along with membership gives free access to a range of new enhancements that provide extra customer service (which we could not afford outside of the consortium) and also helps us identify savings within our service. The consortium also attracts discounts on other software that Merton libraries subscribe to, providing further savings. In order to achieve full year savings as of 2012/13, the Library Service needs to have joined the Consortium formally and undertaken a range of technical tasks (data transfer, interface between the council's financial system and stock acquisition software) before April 2011, for which a capital sum of £45,000 is required. This capital sum in 2010/11 will be funded by virements from within the Community and Housing Capital Programme and specifically from the Library Service media fund scheme.

Effects on Revenue

- 3.8 Based on the current capital financing revenue budgets in the MTFs, the draft programme is affordable in the next financial year (2011/12) providing the revenue surplus from 2010/11 is reinvested. In the following years the capital financing revenue budgets are in deficit, which then rise significantly. In the final year of the programme, 2014/15, there is an apparent improvement. However, inevitably as time moves on, new schemes will be recognised that need to be addressed in that year, specifically the contract currently being negotiated by the South London Waste Partnership will have an impact in that year, although its significance cannot yet be quantified. The calculations do not include the use of any capital receipts nor any

capital grants. The capital grants were due to be announced in early December, but there are indications that they may not be announced until February, and at that point may be for only 2011/12, with future years' grants to be announced even later. The capital grants, when announced, may reduce the deficits. London Councils reports that "supported borrowing" is being discontinued from 1 April 2011. This discontinuation has the effect of increasing the cost of borrowing although, in theory, Merton should gain slightly in capital grants as it is a floor authority. This increase in cost is reflected in the figures below.

Draft Revenue Effects of Draft Capital Programme

	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Revenue Effects	19,022	23,770	28,663	30,770
Budget allowed in MTFS	20,607	23,107	24,927	25,796
Surplus	* (1,585)			
Deficit		663	3,736	4,974

* Due to slippage in the current programme.

- 3.9 The rapidly increasing deficit occurs because the main impact of capital spending is in the year following the capital spend. Based on an even capital spend throughout the financial year, in the first year of capital spend there is only half a year's interest charged to the revenue account, but in subsequent years the full year's impact (a full years interest and principal repayment) take effect. This is effectively a 2.5% charge in the first year and a 10.5% charge in the years thereafter. (10.5% is an average rate and will vary dependent upon asset life, but is based on the average rate in 2009/10)
- 3.10 The effect on the authority's underlying borrowings cumulatively of the draft capital programme (excluding capital grants) would be as follows:

	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Underlying debt B/F		151	185	216	267	279
New borrowing less repayments		34	31	51	12	0
Underlying debt C/F	151	185	216	267	279	279

Draft Prudential Indicators

- 3.11 The Prudential Indicators set out in the table below, look at the impact of the draft capital programme on council tax payers in absolute terms without considering the budgets allowed in the MTFS.

	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Increase in capital financing costs arising from the Capital Programme	3.986	4.748	4.893	2.107
Expressed in terms of:				
Effect on Band D Council Tax (£)	£53.68	£63.95	£65.90	£28.38
Effect on Band D Council Tax (%)	4.87%	5.80%	5.97%	2.57%
% of Council Tax spent on debt servicing	23.11%	28.74%	34.66%	37.20%

Review

- 3.12 Although the draft capital programme would be affordable for 2011/12, there will be an increasing problem of rising debt in future years. This will be reduced to the extent of the capital grants due to be announced shortly.
- 3.13 There will be a review of the Capital Strategy to ensure that the funding of the programme and the debt outstanding of the authority can be optimised.

Appendices

- 3.14 Appendix 4(1) summarises all the financial years of the programme.
- 3.15 Appendix 4 (2) sets out the build-up by borrowing and grants of each year of the programme.
- 3.16 Appendix 4 (3) sets out all of the increases/decreases and their full year revenue effects.
- 3.17 Appendix 4 (4) lists the departmental details of the draft programme.
- 3.18 Appendix 4(5) lists the amendments which recognise reduction in costs.

3.19 Appendix 4 (6) lists the additional grants received since the previous Cabinet meeting and the new London Libraries Consortium Scheme funded by virements.

4. **Consultation undertaken or proposed**

4.1 There will be regular update reports throughout the process to keep Chief Officers apprised of the latest position.

5. **Financial, resource and property implications**

5.1 Financial and resource implications are incorporated within the report. There are no property implications arising from this report.

6. **Legal and statutory implications**

6.1 There are no legal and statutory implications arising from this report.

7. **Human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications**

7.1 Equalities Impact Assessments for savings are provided in Appendix 3 **(TO FOLLOW)**. There are no other implications arising from this report.

8. **Risk management and health and safety implications**

8.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

9. **Appendices**

9.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report

Revenue

- Appendix 1: Savings
- Appendix 2: Growth
- Appendix 3: Equalities Impact Assessments **(TO FOLLOW)**
- Appendix 4: Capital
- Appendix 5: Summary of Grants
- Appendix 6: Budget summaries including workforce information **(TO FOLLOW)**

10. **Background Papers**

10.1 The following documents have been relied on in drawing up this report but do not form part of the report

- Budget report to Council 3rd March 2010

11. **Report author**

- Name: Andrew Wood
- Tel: 020 8545 3492
- email: andrew.wood@merton.gov.uk

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for the Restructure of Support Services

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Business Case for the Restructure of Support Services

Outline of proposed savings/growth:

Reduction in the cost of support services by restructuring to bring together support services currently managed in the Chief Executive's and Corporate Services Departments, and consolidating some support services from other departments.

Savings of £2.2 million per annum to contribute to the total required from CE and CS departments for 2011/12 budget process, to be achieved by reduction in staffing numbers.

Restructure implementation to be managed fully in accordance with the council's policy "Framework for Managing Organisational Change and the Redeployment Procedure" (1 November 2007). An equalities impact assessment in relation to staffing has been produced as part of this and is appended to the Business Case.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Support services are primarily inward facing in that they serve internal clients: members, managers and staff across the authority.

Within the Resources Division Policy and Strategy Team as proposed under the restructure, the Diversity and Community Cohesion Manager Post will no longer manage the third sector co-ordinator and will be redesignated Equalities and Community Cohesion Officer. This post will continue to carry out the other duties of the current Diversity and Community Cohesion Manager Post. This post will be the designated deputy post for the Head of Policy and Strategy. This post will continue to undertake work around equality in service delivery and community cohesion.

However, reductions in other posts within this team will mean that the following community cohesion events will not longer be able to be directly supported – the community will need to run these events:

- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Group History Month
- Holocaust Memorial Day
- Peace Week
- International Day of Persons with Disabilities

Job descriptions for all new posts include a requirement for compliance with council policies and procedures, including in relation to equalities and community cohesion.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

The reduction in direct support for community cohesion events represents the continuation of change to the relationship with these community groups, such that the level of direct assistance from council staff is reduced, and assistance is given to them so that they can take on more direct responsibility. Discussions will continue to encourage and support community representatives in taking on this responsibility.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

The proposal is to go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: -----Date -----

Authorised by: Director :----Caroline Holland-----Date -21/10/10----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		✓				
Women		✓				
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people			✓ marginal impact as a result of no direct support for International Day of Persons with Disabilities		Work with the Disabled Go Forum on how they can take responsibility for the event	Groups responsible will keep records of attendance and impact
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities			✓ marginal impact on Jewish people as a result of no direct support for Holocaust Memorial Day		Already working with relevant groups on how they can take responsibility for the event	Groups responsible will keep records of attendance and impact
People of different faiths			✓ marginal impact on people of Jewish faith as a result of no direct support for Holocaust Memorial Day (HMD)		Members of the Interfaith Group may wish to take on the planning of HMD Already working with relevant groups on how they can take responsibility for the event	Groups responsible will keep records of attendance and impact

<p>Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people</p>			<p>✓ marginal impact as a result of no direct support for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Group History Month</p>		<p>Already working with the LGBT Forum on how they can take responsibility for the event</p>	<p>Groups responsible will keep records of attendance and impact</p>
<p>Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households</p>	<p>✓</p>					
<p>People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods</p>	<p>✓</p>					

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Customer Services Review

Outline of proposed savings/growth: - Staffing reductions within the following areas:- Debt Recovery – 3 posts, Housing Benefits 3 posts, Student Support 1 post, Community Engagement 1 post, Registrars 1.19 posts Cash Office 0.5 posts, Translation 1 post, Care Connect 2.37 posts.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Debt Recovery - No impact

Housing benefits – there will be no impact on the equality of opportunity and community cohesion from these changes. The same access to service will be provided as currently.

Student Support – The administration of this function is passing to another body.

Community Engagement – The delivery of services such as Community Forums will change. However, the core values of equality of opportunity and community cohesion will be embedded and pursued within the new delivery mechanisms.

Registrars, - No impact

Cash Office – No impact

Translation – This service will still be offered as before, there has however been a reduction in demand and the adjustment of resources and a move towards generic working reflects this.

Care Connect – This is an information service and the key information portals will be moved to the Council Web site. Support for indirect non statutory activities provided by this section will diminish and statutory activities will be undertaken elsewhere in the Council.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

The changes have been made within the following criteria, High- the protection of income generation sources, 2 - the protection of direct customer services to people who may be vulnerable – e.g. Housing Benefits, Translation, 3 - other services, non statutory or loss making.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Where a negative impact has been identified, an alternative albeit different access route has been identified.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Yes - Community Forums operated differently and less frequently, Care Connect Services to be operated via Merton's web site, the Link and other departments.

Completed by: Head of Service: **Date**

Authorised by: Director **Date**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		✓				
Women		✓				
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓		Housing Benefit surveys have not revealed that any particular grouping is disproportionately represented in the administration of these services.		
Disabled people		✓		As above		
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓		As above		Merton's performance indicators for Housing Benefits and other services.
People of different faiths		✓		As above		Residents survey results
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓		As above		
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓		As above		
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓		Some services are disproportionately used by people in some wards. This will not change.		

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Merton's Medium Term Financial Strategy

Outline of proposed savings/growth: - (i) HR savings of £100,000 full year savings to be delivered for year 2011/12 from contract re-procurement and reorganisation of staffing structures (ii) Temporary agency workers re-procurement - £150,000 savings for full year 2011/12

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

- (i) The proposals do not have an immediate impact on equalities issues – approximately 30% of the savings will be achieved through the re-procurement of occupational health and employee assistance programmes. The remainder of the savings will be achieved by staffing reductions – the detail of those reductions in terms of equalities impact has, at this stage, not been finalised as we are at an early period of consultation.
- (ii) The proposals approved by Cabinet will see the contract for the supply of temporary agency workers pass from Hays to Manpower from December 2010. There are no immediate equalities issues as the temporary agency workers concerned will TUPE transfer from Hays to Manpower

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified? Not applicable

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified? Not applicable

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

The proposal will go ahead

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Completed by: Head of Service: -Dean Shoosmith-----Date 1/11/10-----

 Authorised by: Director :-----Date -----

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Outline of proposed savings/growth: Reduction of £66,000 in the Preventing Violent Extremism Area Based Grant -----
Summary information

Merton's original 2010/11 ABGPVE allocation was £246,000 and has been reduced by the Government by £66,000. The fund is aimed at strengthening community cohesion and reducing the threat of terrorism by supporting vulnerable sections of the community to become better integrated and therefore less vulnerable violent extremism.

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

The reduction in funds will have an impact on our ability to fund projects to engage with sections of the population most at risk within the borough particularly young males and females from minority ethnic groups.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Supporting community cohesion work in Primary and Secondary schools. Also continued partnership working and targeting resources on group identified as being vulnerable to violent extremism-----

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Some of the remaining budget will be used to target service improvements for young males and females from minority ethnic groups.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead.

Completed by: Head of Service: Ben Harris

Date 29 October 2010

Authorised by: Director

Date -----
Date -----

Group	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S Positive Impact	Neutral CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY Impacts	Negative CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY Impacts	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men			✓	Cronem Report on PVE	Spend funds on projects to support better integration.	Using Community Tension Monitoring and working in partnership with other agencies to gather information and develop activities to deliver positive outcomes.
Women			✓	Cronem Report on PVE	Spend funds on projects to support better integration	Ditto
Boys			✓	Cronem report and evidence from Merton's Youth Service	Fund projects that engage young boys in youth services activities	Ditto
Girls			✓	Cronem report, information from Merton's Youth Service	Fund projects that engage young girls in youth services activities	Ditto
People of different age groups			✓	Cronem Report on PVE	Do more intergenerational work – look for bids to support this from the remaining grants fund	Ditto
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities			✓	Cronem report on PVE	Use remaining funds on projects to support better integration especially of newly arrived migrants.	Using Community Tension Monitoring and working in partnership with other agencies to gather information and develop activities to deliver positive outcomes.
People of different faiths			✓	Cronem report on PVE	Encourage more Inter Faith activities through the inter faith forum.	Ditto
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods			✓	Cronem report and information from Community Tension Monitoring meetings.	Undertake community mapping to get a better understanding of the issues in particular wards using some of the remaining.	Using Community Tension Monitoring and working in partnership with other agencies to gather information and develop activities to deliver positive outcomes.

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: C&YP CSF 1, CSF 2, CSF 3, CSF 4

Outline of proposed savings: Cease central LA co-ordination of Health Schools Programme; Extended Services in schools; school travel plans.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Removal of central co-ordination but no direct impact as responsibility for continuing specific programmes transferred to schools

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Responsibility for continuing programmes moved to schools.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

None needed re service delivery.
Staffing implications to be considered through use of managing organisational change policy.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Jan Martin

22/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service: -----**Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Yvette Stanley

22/10/10

Authorised by: Director

:Date

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

CSF5

Report and Budget Title: -----
Decommissioning of Early Intervention and Prevention services for children, young people and families

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Risk of reducing supportive services to children, young people and families from specific equalities groups

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Analysis of referrals to and take up of services will be undertaken by Children's Trust partnership decommissioning group prior to decommissioning decisions being taken. One of the established criteria for decommissioning will be to minimise negative impact on specific equalities groups, although some reduction in service is inevitable from this savings proposal.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

See above. CSF is currently undertaking major review of preventive services commissioned externally and provided by in-house services. Although thresholds for accessing services will inevitably rise as a result of this savings proposal and anticipated loss of further grant income, sharper targeting of remaining preventive services will mitigate impact on equalities groups.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: -----Paul Ballatt-----**Date** -20/10/10----

Authorised by: Director :-----Yvette Stanley-----**Date** --
21/10/10-----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys						
Girls						
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households			Yes	Analysis of users of commissioned EIP services	Sharper targeting of residual EIP services	Part of routine SLA monitoring/contract compliance
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 6

Outline of proposed savings: Cease one post from the current child and adolescent mental health provision for looked after children and care leavers for in year savings of £20k and an additional £20 k savings in 2011-12.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Central Government are based grant funding has ceased so a vacant post in this service has been identified for deletion to save 40k.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

The remaining Camhs team for looked after children will be reconfigured to continue to provide a service to care leavers.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Completed by: Head of Service: -----

Date -----

Authorised by: Director :-----

Date -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 7

Outline of proposed savings: Cease some funding for administrative support to the Child Death Overview Panel

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Central Government funding area based grant has ended, so £5k of the current provision for administrative support to the Child Death overview Panel will cease. This Panel is shared with Sutton and meets requirements to examine all child deaths across the two boroughs. In 2011-12 an additional £5k will be saved from the same budget.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

It is considered that the remaining financial support available to the CDOP would be sufficient for effective administration of the Panel to continue.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

No negative impact identified.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Completed by: Head of Service:Date

Authorised by: Director :Date

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 8

Outline of proposed savings: Reduction of investment in Connexions service

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Reduction in contract for provision of careers advice and guidance service for young people

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Retain targeted work that focuses on the most vulnerable.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Contract negotiations with commissioned provider re their new staffing model and retaining central staff targeted at need

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Melissa Caslake

22/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service: -----**Date** -----

Authorised by: Director : Yvette Stanley Date 22/10/10

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys			✓		Taken into consideration in the proposal – only a young people service	Contract monitoring
Girls			✓		Taken into consideration in the proposal – only a young people service	Contract monitoring
People of different age groups			✓		Taken into consideration in the proposal– only a young people service	Contract monitoring
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 9

Outline of proposed savings: Reduction of positive activities for young people

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Central Government funding reduced by 25% for provision of positive activities for young people including those vulnerable to poorer outcomes. Will impact on Merton's capacity to commission positive activities.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

More work will need to be accommodated by targeted youth staff.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Work reallocated within targeted youth team.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: **Melissa Caslake** **22/10/10** **Date**

Authorised by: Director : **Yvette Stanley** **22/10/10** **Date**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls			✓		2 girls schools have no targeted youth worker Restructure of adolescent team to replace current structure in 2011	Adolescent targeted service review.
People of different age groups			✓		Young people based service targeting need – less service available	Adolescent targeted service review.
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 10 and 11

Outline of proposed savings: Reduction in commissioned substance misuse and teenage pregnancy services

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Reduction in services to young people vulnerable to poorer outcomes

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

New more targeted model in new service for commissioned substance misuse. Restructure of Teenage pregnancy support team in PCT to cover TP and substance misuse.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Team more targeted at need.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Melissa Caslake

22/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service: -----**Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys	✓					
Girls	✓					
People of different age groups			✓		Young people based service targeting need – less service available	Contract monitoring
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Yvette Stanley

Authorised by: Director

Date 22/10/10

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

CSF 12

Report and Budget Title: -----
Savings from LSC Transfer Budget -----
Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

No impact

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

None required

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

None required

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Paul Ballatt

20/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service: ----- **Date** -----

Authorised by: Director :----- **Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys						
Girls						
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

CSF 13

Report and Budget Title: -----

Restructure of R+I Team in CSF and deletion of management post

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

No Impact

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

No actions required

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

No actions required

Staffing implications to be considered through use of managing organisational change policy

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Paul Ballatt

20/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service: ----- **Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys						
Girls						
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Authorised by: Director

:Date

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

CSF 14

Report and Budget Title: -----

Deletion of post in School Admissions Team

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

No impact

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

No actions required

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

No actions required

Staffing implications to be considered through use of managing organisational change policy

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Paul Ballatt

20/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service: ----- **Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys						
Girls						
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Authorised by: Director

:Date

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 16

Outline of proposed savings: Cease funding for Playing for Success Initiative

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Central Government funding ending March 2011, so current provision for additional support for nominated pupils at 2 Playing for Success Centres will cease.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Discussions with 2 Centres to consider use of Council assets.
Staffing implications to be considered through use of management of change policy.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Not yet known.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: -----

Jan Martin

Date -----

22/10/10

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Yvette Stanley

22/10/10

Authorised by: Director

:Date

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 17, 22 and 23

Outline of proposed savings: Cease the Family Support Co-ordinators function in Children's Social Care Service and associated administrative support. Reduce day care budget.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

These savings come from ceasing two family support co-ordinator posts; one full time administrative post that supports the function and reducing daycare procurement budget. Posts currently identify and broker child minding, day care and after school places for children in need, that is open to the social care service.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Discussions with the Early Years service have started with a view to this function being done within early years as an alternative provision. There should be no impact on children currently placed with day care services and support for the most vulnerable will continue but be monitored and arranged through early years services.

Staffing implications will be considered through use of managing organisational change policy

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?
See above

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: **Melissa Caslake** **22/10/10**
Authorised by: Director **Yvette Stanley** **22/10/10**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 18

Outline of proposed savings: Staffing reduction in Education Welfare Team

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Less support for schools to improve attendance and reduce persistent absence.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Work re- allocated within existing team

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Work re-allocated within existing team
Staffing implications to be considered through use of managing organisational change policy

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Melissa Caslake

22/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service: -----**Date** -----

Authorised by: Director : Yvette Stanley Date 22/10/10

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups			✓		Young people based service targeting need – less service available	Attendance in monitored daily in schools and annually in the school attendance report. This is reviewed through quarterly monitoring reports.
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 19

Outline of proposed savings: Restructure Youth Service

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Less youth work will be commissioned from the voluntary sector, less funding available for project work and a reduction in accreditation by young people

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Decommissioning process will involve vol. sector and young people to ensure user involvement in decommissioning. Decommissioning may affect groups supporting targeted young people, as that is what is currently commissioned – however criteria for decommissioning will look at overall impact. Accreditation work will be managed by centre managers. Families will be expected to pay for events – or fund raising by young people – less expensive activities planned.

Staffing implications will be considered through use of managing organisational change policy

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Fair decommissioning process involving users.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Melissa Caslake

22/10/10

Completed by: Head of Service:

Date

Yvette Stanley

22/10/10

Authorised by: Director

Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys			✓		Young people based service targeting need – less service available	Young residents survey Participation data
Girls			✓		Young people based service targeting need – less service available	Young residents survey Participation data
People of different age groups			✓		Young people based service targeting need – less service available	Young residents survey Participation data
Disabled people			✓		Potential for decommissioning – fair process set up with young people	
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people			✓		Potential for decommissioning - - fair process set up with young people	
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households			✓		Low income households affected by charging – off set by fund raising collectively by young people or running less expensive activities	
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods			✓		Potential for decommissioning – fair process set up with young people	

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: C&YP CSF 20, Early Years Reduction of Training Grant

Outline of proposed savings: Reduce free training offer to EYFS in schools and settings.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

None.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

None needed

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

None needed.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: -----

Jan Martin

22/10/10

Date -----

Yvette Stanley

22/10/10

Authorised by: Director :-----

Date -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.
CSF21

Report and Budget Title: -----

Reduce Staffing supporting young people's participation

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Reduction of one post promoting the participation of young people in local decision-making

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Overall work of the team will be reorganised and reallocated with focus on ensuring ongoing engagement of young people from specific equalities groups eg young people looked after; yp with disabilities

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

See above
Staffing implications to be considered through use of managing organisational change policy

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: -----Paul Ballatt-----**Date** -20/10/10----

Authorised by: Director :-----Yvette Stanley-----**Date** -
21/10/10-----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys			Yes		Sharper targeting of residual participation services	Via participation steering group
Girls			Yes		Sharper targeting of residual participation services	Via participation steering group
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities			Yes		Sharper targeting of residual participation services	Via participation steering group
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people			Yes		Sharper targeting of residual participation services	Via participation steering group
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households			Yes		Sharper targeting of residual participation services	Via participation steering group
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF 24

Outline of proposed savings: Reduce Section 17 budgets for children in need open to the children's social care service.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

The Section 17 budget will reduce by 15k in 2011-12. This money will be taken from all the social care teams in small amounts and will therefore reduce their capacity to use the budget to purchase items for needy families such as white goods or baby items, or to enable for example care leavers to access activities that are financially costly.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

We will develop stronger knowledge of alternative providers for example voluntary sector agencies providing second hand goods, and assist families to apply for crisis loans from the benefits agency.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Policy to be developed regarding when it would be reasonable for family or parent expenses to be funded and when it is not reasonable for example further work done with courts to avoid children's social care being asked to supervise family contacts due to family conflict at our expense when we do not have parental responsibility for the children.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned? Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: ----- **Melissa Caslake** ----- **22/10/10**
Authorised by: Director :----- **Yvette Stanley** ----- **22/10/10**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Primary /Secondary Strategy Central Co-ordination C&YP CSFD1

Outline of proposed savings: Team restructure through loss of Government Grant

Summary information:**How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:**

The central team providing support to schools will be significantly reduced due to grant fall out and therefore there will be a reduction in service. However the remaining service will be targeted at areas of greatest need and will not impact on community cohesion.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Schools are already aware of potential equality opportunities issues identified in their data and have plans in place to address them
School to school support is being developed and most of the interventions needed to ensure equality of opportunity will be offered through the local school and SWLSEP networks. LA officers will continue with desk top monitoring of schools' data

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Should any issues come to light which have equality or community cohesion implications the SSQ manager will ensure appropriate challenge to the school leadership is provided and if necessary the brokering of support.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

This proposal has to continue as there is no further funding for this service

Jan Martin

06/12/10

Completed by: Head of Service: -----**Date** -----

Authorised by: Director :-----Yvette Stanley-----Date -06/12/10-----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		y				
Women		y				
Boys		y				
Girls		y				
People of different age groups		y				
Disabled people		y				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities			y		The proposal cannot be amended	There will be a particular focus from LA officers on the attainment and progress of these groups
People of different faiths		y				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		y				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households			y		The proposal cannot be amended	There will be a particular focus from LA officers on the attainment and progress of these groups
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods			y		The proposal cannot be amended	There will be a particular focus from LA officers on the attainment and progress of groups in some areas of deprivation

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Special Educational Needs C&YP CSFD2

Outline of proposed savings: Service Efficiencies and rationalisation of budgets

Summary information:**How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:**

No impact is expected as the training offer is being developed jointly with Sutton to increase access to wider range of training and courses and reduce delivery costs.

The demand for the service indicates that further income generation is achievable.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

NA

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Training and income generation activities are monitored and evaluated as part of current quality assurance processes.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Jan Martin

20.11.10

Completed by: Head of Service:

Date

Yvette Stanley

06/12/10

Authorised by: Director

Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		y				
Women		y				
Boys		y				
Girls		y				
People of different age groups		y				
Disabled people		y				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		y				
People of different faiths		y				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		y				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		y				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		y				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

CSFD3

Report and Budget Title: ----- Reduce Budget for SEN Transport

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

The council is required through regulation to provide transport to enable children with SEN to attend school. This inherently supports and promotes their equality of opportunity. In order to achieve the savings proposed, a review will be completed of the policy Merton has in place relating to a child's eligibility for access to transport and their need for escorting.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Officers need to engage parent groups at an early stage of review of policy framework and ensure that implementation of policy in individual cases does not disadvantage children with SEN or impact negatively on their safety when travelling to and from school.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Two parent/user groups – Kids First and Mencap – have agreed to be part of policy review group. Consideration will be given to re-investing some potential savings in an independent travel training scheme for individual young people. New models of providing escorts – including through volunteering – will be explored.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Paul Ballatt

2/12/10

Completed by: Head of Service: -----

Date -----

Yvette Stanley

07/12/10

Authorised by: Director :-----

Date -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys			√	Client information	Impact of proposal to be mitigated through eg independent travel training	Management review – SEN Service Manager
Girls			√	Client information	Impact of proposal to be mitigated through eg independent travel training	Management review – SEN Service Manager
People of different age groups						
Disabled people			√	Client information	Impact of proposal to be mitigated through eg independent travel training	Management review – SEN Service Manager
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

CSFD4

Report and Budget Title: -----

Reduction in council's annual revenue funding of London Grid for Learning (LGfL)

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information**How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:**

LgFL provides a regional ICT platform for schools to use in delivering the educational curriculum to children and young people. The proposed saving will be achieved through reducing the council's match funding of government grant and establishing buyback arrangement with schools for the LA support and consultancy provided. No specific impact on the council's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity is anticipated.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

None necessary.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

None necessary

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: **Paul Ballatt** Date **2/12/10**

Authorised by: Director : **Yvette Stanley** Date **7/12/10**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		√				
Girls		√				
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Integrated Service C&YP CSFD5

Outline of proposed savings: Service Efficiencies and Review of Brightwell

Summary information**How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:**

There is a review of the provision at Brightwell currently underway and proposals are shortly to be considered by CSF DMT. It is expected that the revised offer to families will be more inclusive and wider ranging than the current provision at Brightwell. There will further consultation on the proposals with families, family groups and voluntary sector partners. The action plan which will be developed once the proposals are agreed will address EQIA issues and changes will be introduced gradually.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

It is possible that there could be a negative impact for a few families if the residential offer is different but every effort will be made to work with those families to ensure some respite provision and other services.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

The new offer will be closely monitored and the views of service users sought very regularly

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

7/12/10

Jan Martin

Completed by: Head of Service:

Date

Yvette Stanley

7/12/10

Authorised by: Director

Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		y				
Women		y				
Boys		y				
Girls		y				
People of different age groups		y				
Disabled people			y	The service is only used by families with disabled children	We will work with each family individually to develop an appropriate package of support	All services will be kept under regular review and the views of parents and young people sought
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		y				
People of different faiths		y				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		y				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		y				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		y				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF D6

Outline of proposed savings: Restructure of the Strategy and Development unit within children's social care.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

This restructure will take out 3 full time posts that currently undertake quality assurance work of the reviewing and conferencing team, work associated with training and development of the Common Assessment Framework and Merton's Child and Well-being Model, and an associated business support post. The quality assurance work will be picked up through increased expectations of current social care managers including the recently created training manager post. Some Caf work will continue and we are currently in discussion with NHS Sutton and Merton about how to take forward CAF work across the Children's Trust. It is therefore the case that Merton Children's Social Care will continue to promote the use of the well-being model to ensure that vulnerable children are identified and services provided but it is likely that more of this work and its awareness raising will be done across the Children's Trust in partnership with Children's Social Care.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

As above. We are also seeking to start work with Sutton and other boroughs to see if we can develop closer alignment of the use of the CAF in conjunction with NHS Sutton and Merton.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above. Work is underway to mitigate the impacts of these proposed savings and ensure that Merton’s Child Well-being Model continues to be used to identify and provide services to children across the borough. A new Quality Assurance Framework is underway in social care which will include being embedded and rolled out across the existing management structure.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: ----- **Melissa Caslake** ----- **7/12/10** -----
Authorised by: Director :----- **Yvette Stanley** ----- **7/12/10** -----
Date ----- **Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF D7 and D8

Outline of proposed savings: Delete 1.5 FTE posts at Assistant Team Manager level in Children's Social Care.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

This proposal to delete 1.5 FTE management posts in children's social care will delete one post in the Fostering Team and one half post in the Family Support Team. This will result in some reduced management capacity within children's social care.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

The Fostering Team has recently been Leaned which has identified some new ways of working to reduce waste. The Access to Resources Team will take on two fostering social workers to undertake assessments of prospective foster carers and this function will be managed and supervised within the ART. This will therefore reduce the need for management capacity within the existing Fostering Team and the post was vacant due to a retirement.

The Family Support Team has also made savings proposals to reduce its Family Support Co-ordinator posts and transfer the function to the Early Years Service. This means that less management capacity is required within the Family Support Team as a whole. The current postholder is acting as Team Manager and therefore will continue to occupy a management post in the service reducing the negative impact of the change.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

7/12/10

Melissa Caslake

Completed by: Head of Service:

Date

Yvette Stanley

7/12/10

Authorised by: Director

Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSF D9

Outline of proposed savings: Delete 1 FTE Contact Supervisor post in children's social care.

Summary information**How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:**

This proposal will delete one FTE out of a current team of 6 contact supervisors. Work has been done to identify why Merton has been required to deliver high rates of supervised contact for its children in care. We are obliged to deliver contact when ordered through court proceedings and the levels are set within court orders. However there are significant numbers of contacts taking place outside the court arena.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

We have identified a good practice guide for social workers to use when preparing care plans for court to assist them in arguing the case for less intensive levels of supervised contact where appropriate. We are also identifying the use of foster carers to supervise contact as part of their commitment to fostering, and using family members wherever possible to reduce the need for social care supervision.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: Melissa Caslake 7/12/10 Date
 Yvette Stanley 7/12/10
 Authorised by: Director : Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: CSFD10

Outline of proposed savings: Youth Justice

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Reduced funding will increase case loads of case workers dealing with offenders and through the recontracting of Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme ISSP we will look to reduce costs. Risk of increased reoffending and custody placements, as ISSP is a prevention of custody programme.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Work reallocated to team, reviewing cases going to ISSP and preventing court "up tarring" young offenders

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

1. Setting up a high risk panel process with police and probation.
2. Employing a higher level case manager to oversee quality and risk.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: ----- **Melissa Caslake** ----- **7/12/10**
Authorised by: Director :----- **Yvette Stanley** ----- **7/12/10**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men			✓	Young offenders are disproportionately male	Actions 1+2 above	Youth crime board and exec monitoring
Women		✓				
Boys			✓	Young offenders are disproportionately male	Actions 1+2 above	Youth crime board and exec monitoring
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups			✓	Young people based service targeting need – less service available	Actions 1+2 above	Youth crime board and exec monitoring
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households			✓	Young people based service targeting young offenders a vulnerable group – less service available	Actions 1+2 above	Youth crime board and exec monitoring
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

CSFD11

Report and Budget Title: -----

Access to Resources Savings in Placement Costs

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -----

Summary information**How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:**

CSF plans to establish an Access to Resources Team from April 2011 which will be responsible for the procurement of independent sector care and educational placements for looked after children and children with SEN. Evidence from other LAs implementing this model shows that savings from improved and more robust procurement can be achieved as well as improved quality assurance of placements provided. The model thus has the potential to impact positively on outcomes for these key equalities groups.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

No specific negative impact anticipated

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

None necessary

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Completed by: Head of Service: **Paul Ballatt** Date **2/12/10**

Authorised by: Director : **Yvette Stanley** Date **7/12/10**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys		√				
Girls		√				
People of different age groups						
Disabled people		√				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: ----- CSFD12 -----

Outline of proposed savings/growth: ----- Reviewing of Supplies and Training Budgets -----

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

----- No specific impact identified -----

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

----- None necessary -----

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

----- None necessary -----

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

----- Go ahead -----

Completed by: Head of Service: **Paul Ballatt** Date **2/12/10**

Authorised by: Director **Yvette Stanley** Date **7/12/10**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		√				
Women		√				
Boys						
Girls						
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: ER29

Outline of proposed savings/growth: ---Increase in various Parking Charges and changes to enforcement policy and practice in respect of observation times

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

N/A

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

N/A

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

N/A

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at 13th Dec Cabinet

Completed by: Head of Service John F. Hill

Date 30/11/2010

Authorised by: Director :

Date Nov 2010

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: **ER30** Building Control Commercialisation

Outline of proposed savings/growth: Commercialise Building Control by offering services to other Council's/Stakeholders

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

N/A

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

N/A

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

N/A

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at the 13th December Cabinet

Completed by: Head of Service: John F. Hill
Authorised by: Director

Date 30/11/2010
Date Dec 2010

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: ER31

Outline of proposed savings/growth: Parks operational restructure

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Loss of 3.8 FTEs

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Full consultation will take place with staff and unions

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at the 13th Dec Cabinet

Completed by: Head of Service:

Authorised by: Director

Nov 2010

Nov 2010

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: ER32

Outline of proposed savings/growth: Cemeteries Service restructure

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Loss of 3 FTEs

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

N/A

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

2 of the posts are currently vacant

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at Cabinet 13th Dec

Completed by: Head of Service
Authorised by: Director

Date Nov 2010
Date Dec 2010

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: **ER33** Sustainable Communities savings– Future Merton

Outline of proposed savings/: --Transforming the Spatial Planning, Physical Regeneration and Transport Planning teams into one team (Future Merton), proposed saving of £150,000

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Reductions in resources will mean a new level of service to customers commensurate with the resource allocation, though this will not impact disproportionately on any one group

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Use of accurate project planning and reporting to anticipate demands and manage expectations of service delivery. Use of alternative sources of income to supplement performance where appropriate

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

See above

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at Cabinet 13th Dec

Completed by: Head of Service:

Authorised by: Director :

Date **Nov 2010**

Date **Dec 2010**

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Environment & Regeneration, Savings 2011-15, Waste Services, Waste Disposal

Outline of proposed savings/growth: **ER34** Savings in Landfill Costs

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

There will be neither a positive nor a negative impact upon Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified? N/A

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified? N/A

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at 13th Dec Cabinet

Completed by: Head of Service: Cormac Stokes
Authorised by: Director : Chris Lee

Date November 2010
Date: November 2010

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/15

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: **ER35** Waste Services, Commercial Waste

Outline of proposed savings/growth: Increase in volume of commercial waste business through marketing of service.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

There will be neither a positive nor a negative impact upon Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified? N/A

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified? N/A

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at Cabinet 13th Dec

Completed by: Head of Service: Cormac Stokes
Authorised by: Director : Chris Lee

Date: November 2010
Date: November 2010

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: ER36 Staffing reductions within Highways and Traffic Services

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -- Merger of RASWA Manager and Network Coordinator posts. Reduction of Autocad Engineer post from 1 to 0.5. Deletion of one other manager's post.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

It is not expected to have an effect

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

N/A

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

N/A

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be considered at the 13th December Cabinet meeting

Completed by: Head of Service: Date
Authorised by: Director Date

Nov 2010
 Nov 2010

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X				
Women		X				
Boys		X				
Girls		X				
People of different age groups		X				
Disabled people		X				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X				
People of different faiths		X				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		X				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Adult Social Care: Amendments to Fairer Charging Policy (CC13, CC14)

Outline of proposed savings/growth: Projected £85k additional income from introducing a standard disregard of £10, setting a maximum attendance allowance of £47.80 and changing the maximum homecare charge from £395.30 per week to having no maximum limit.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Whilst older people are the highest user group of services, there is no evidence that the introduction in charges will disadvantage these individuals more than any other service user group. The consultation process undertaken as part of determining the changes has enabled service users and carers to express their views. Full details of the potential impact are included in the appendices to the Fairer Contributions Policy report, which is going to Cabinet in December.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

There are safeguards within the charging system as set out in Merton's Fairer Contributions Policy that protects people on low incomes. The Council ensures that benefits advice is provided to all users at the time of the comprehensive financial assessment in order to maximise service users' benefits. This is backed up by communication support such as interpretation in community languages or British Sign Language if required.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

The proposal is subject to Cabinet approval.

Completed by: Head of Service: ----Hilary Di Salvo on behalf of Helen Cook-----**Date** --27th October 2010--

Authorised by: Director :-----**Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		✓				
Women		✓				
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓	✓	Local research as set out in appendices 4 and 5 of the report going to Cabinet.		<p>The policy will be reviewed annually whilst we are in the early stages subject to feasibility.</p> <p>Performance information we will aim to keep includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer numbers and service levels • Customers refusing/cutting down on services as a result of charging • Customers asking for charges to be reviewed • Levels and reasons for arrears • Levels of customer incomes, in particular the take up of different benefits • Cost of collection as a percentage of income

Disabled people		√	√	As above	As above
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		√			
People of different faiths		√			
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		√			
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		√			
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		√			

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Adult Social Care: Commissioning savings (CC01, CC02, CC03, CC04, CC05, CC06, CC07, CC08, CC09, CC14, CC15, CC16, CC17, CC18, CC19, CC20, CC23)

Outline of proposed savings/growth:

The savings proposed relate to achieving value for money on commissioned services in adult social care and re-shaping the provider market to deliver the personalisation agenda.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

The proposed savings do not impact on Merton's responsibilities as access and eligibility to these services will not be affected. The services will continue to operate with improved efficiencies.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

All commissioned services are subject to the regular contract monitoring process which will highlight any negative impact or trends so that they can be addressed.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Improvement action plans are built in within the contract monitoring processes to deal with and reduce any negative impacts when identified.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Go ahead

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		✓		Contract monitoring data including usage data, Care Funding Calculator Tool, Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Commissioning strategy consultation, consultations on service specifications with users and providers, census, carer and user surveys.	Improvement action plans are built in within the contract monitoring processes to deal with and reduce any negative impacts when identified.	All commissioned services are subject to the regular contract monitoring process which will highlight any negative impact or trends so that they can be addressed.
Women		✓				
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Completed by: Head of Service: Rahat Ahmed-Man

Date 27.10.10

Authorised by: Director :-----Date -----

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality.

By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Adult Social Care: Direct Provision savings (CC10, CC11, CC12, CC21)

Outline of proposed savings/growth: --These savings relate to generating income via Mascot Telecare, staffing in Direct Provision services, and use of Merton transport.

With Mascot some customers will find an increase to their service charges.

Staffing will affect some managerial and administrative functions, with front line staff posts being retained.

Reductions in transport services will mean some customers having longer journey times or seeking alternative modes of travel.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Maximising revenue via Mascot is seen in the context of fairer charging, whereby customers are treated equally and pay true costs which are set in a transparent way. Customers who are assessed as being exempt from payment or pay reduced charges will continue as at present. Staff reductions are part of the process to reduce council spending, and as noted effort has been made to focus on managerial and admin staff to preserve 'hands on' staff.

Customers receive transport support in a number of ways and people will be increasingly encouraged to use alternative provision.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

As noted, customers who are eligible will be financially assessed and charged only what they can afford. We are not aiming to reduce the range of services available to customers or to reduce the number of customers accessing services. Customers who require specialist transport to attend a day service will continue to have this provided.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As noted, customers eligible for services will be financially assessed to ensure they pay what they can afford. Reductions in staffing should not impact on front line delivery of services, although some day service sessions might be reduced in terms of variety available. All Community Care customers are able to take up a personal budget which should enable them to have more control of the choice of services.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?



Completed by: Head of Service: -----Andy Ottaway-Searle-----**Date** --
26/10/2010-----

Authorised by: Director :-----**Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		x		Services are not aimed specifically at gender		
Women		x		As above		
Boys	N/A					
Girls	N/A					
People of different age groups		x		Services are accessed by people of all ages; our specialist older people's service is not affected		
Disabled people			possibly	Services to disabled people will be affected by transport reductions and some lessening of choice in day services.	Support to individuals to access personal budgets, and/or alternative modes of transport.	Via customer reviews, user and carers group meetings
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		x				
People of different faiths		x				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		x				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		x				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		x		Services are borough wide		

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Housing savings (HO01, HO02)

Outline of proposed savings/growth: -Savings: Package being proposed is a reduction of staff which includes 2 0.5fte vacant posts and the cessation of a South London Somali Community Association grant.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

---Current proposals includes a reduction of staffing levels but following the reconfiguration of the Housing Needs and Enabling Service in March 2010 and a focus upon homeless preventions, housing options and housing choice current services continue to promote equalities and community cohesion . The type of support offered by the South London Somali Community Association grant is no longer a critical success factor for homelessness prevention and housing advice activities and users will be able to access other housing advice services both from the voluntary and statutory sectors

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

For the proposals currently being put forward there are no negative impacts .

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

NA at this stage

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Completed by: Head of Service: -----Steve Langley-----Date 26/10/10--

Authorised by: Director :-----Date -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		X		Housing Register , Housing and Homelessness Strategies.		
Women		X		Same as above		
Boys		X		Same as above		
Girls		X		Same as above		
People of different age groups		X		Same as above		
Disabled people		X		Same as above		
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		X		Same as above		
People of different faiths		X		Same as above		
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		X		Same as above		
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		X		Same as above		
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		x		Same as above		

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Adult Social Care: Commissioning savings (CC24, CC25, CC27, CC28, CC29, CC30, CC31, CC33, CC34, CC35)

Outline of proposed savings/growth:

The savings proposed relate to achieving value for money on commissioned services in adult social care and re-shaping the provider market to deliver the personalisation agenda.

Summary information**How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:**

The proposed savings do not impact on Merton's responsibilities as access and eligibility to these services will not be affected. The services will continue to operate with improved efficiencies.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

All commissioned services are subject to the regular contract monitoring process which will highlight any negative impact or trends so that they can be addressed.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Improvement action plans are built in within the contract monitoring processes to deal with and reduce any negative impacts when identified.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Completed by: Head of Service: Rahat Ahmed-Man

Date 23.11.10

Authorised by: Director :-----Date -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		✓		Contract monitoring data including usage data, Care Funding Calculator Tool, Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Commissioning strategy consultation, consultations on service specifications with users and providers, census, carer and user surveys.	Improvement action plans are built in within the contract monitoring processes to deal with and reduce any negative impacts when identified.	All commissioned services are subject to the regular contract monitoring process which will highlight any negative impact or trends so that they can be addressed.
Women		✓				
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Adult Social Care: Amendments to Charges (CC36, CC37)

Outline of proposed savings/growth: Projected £204k additional income from increasing charges by 2%; projected additional £41k income from charging for both carers where two carers are required to support a customer at the same time.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Whilst older people are the highest user group of services, there is no evidence that the introduction in charges will disadvantage these individuals more than any other service user group.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

There are safeguards within the charging system as set out in Merton's Fairer Contributions Policy that protects people on low incomes. The Council ensures that benefits advice is provided to all users at the time of the comprehensive financial assessment in order to maximise service users' benefits. This is backed up by communication support such as interpretation in community languages or British Sign Language if required.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

The proposal is subject to Cabinet approval.

Completed by: Head of Service: ----Hilary Di Salvo on behalf of Helen Cook

Date --30th November 2010

Authorised by: Director :

Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		✓				
Women		✓				
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓	✓	Local research as set out in appendices 4 and 5 of the report going to Cabinet.		The policy will be reviewed annually whilst we are in the early stages subject to feasibility. Performance information we will aim to keep includes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer numbers and service levels • Customers refusing/ cutting down on services as a result of charging • Customers asking for charges to be reviewed • Levels and reasons for arrears • Levels of customer incomes, in particular the take up of different benefits Cost of collection as a percentage of income As above
Disabled people		✓	✓	As above		
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		✓				
Londoners arrived October 2010						

People of different faiths		✓					
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓					
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓					
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓					

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Adult Social Care: Direct Provision savings (CC32)

Outline of proposed savings/growth: These savings are additional amounts and will widen the earlier staff restructure in Direct Provision.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Staff reductions are part of the process to reduce council spending, and effort has been made to focus on managerial and admin staff, preserving 'hands on' staff posts.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

We are not aiming to reduce the range of services available to customers or to reduce the number of customers accessing services.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

Reductions in staffing should not impact on front line delivery of services, although some day service sessions might be reduced in terms of variety available. All Community Care customers are able to take up a personal budget which should enable them to have more control of the choice of services.

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

Completed by: Head of Service: -Andy Ottaway-Searle

Date 23/11/2010

Authorised by: Director :

-----**Date** -----

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		x		Services are not gender specific		
Women		x		As above		
Boys	N/A					
Girls	N/A					
People of different age groups		x		Services are accessed by people of all ages; our specialist day service is not affected		
Disabled people			Potentially	Services to disabled people will be affected by transport reductions and some lessening of choice in day services	Support to individuals to access personal budgets, and/or alternative modes of transport	Via customer reviews, user and carer group meetings
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities		x				
People of different faiths		x				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		x				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		x				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		x		Services are borough wide		

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Libraries and Heritage

Outline of proposed savings/growth: LI01 - Revised opening hours, restructure of staff front line; increased work with partner agencies and volunteers, security guard presence at specified times – identified gross saving of £141k. –Against this growth has been identified of £23k delivering a net saving at present of £118k

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

Current package includes a reduction in staffing but increase in partner agencies and volunteers supporting our primary services. These services are those that address children's activities, skills for life activities, health awareness etc, that target individual groups or groups at risk. As such, they continue to promote equalities and community cohesion and do not subtract from current services, may possibly add to them.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

-For the proposal currently being taken forward there are no negative impacts, indeed the proposal aims to maintain if not improve equalities.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

N/a at this stage

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

-The current proposal is being actioned now

Completed by: Head of Service: Ingrid Lackajis-

Authorised by: Director :

Date 30/11/10

Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men						
Women						
Boys						
Girls						
People of different age groups						
Disabled people						
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities						
People of different faiths						
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people						
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households						
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods						

Initial Equality Impact Assessment for Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Savings/Growth Proposal 2011/12

Merton's Corporate Equality Scheme sets out the Council's approach to valuing diversity and promoting equality. By mainstreaming equality issues into the proposed budgets for savings/growth helps Merton identify areas that might have a positive or negative impact on particular groups in the community.

Report and Budget Title: Libraries and Heritage

Outline of proposed savings/growth: L103- Restructure of the libraries management team: enabled by a post becoming vacant in April 2011, the responsibilities of the senior management team are to be reviewed and redefined, resulting in a reduction in some areas of activity. The target saving is £81k, but as job descriptions are still not evaluated the final costings are not available at this stage.

Summary information

How does the proposal for savings/growth impact on Merton's responsibility to promote equality of opportunity and community cohesion:

The current team undertakes activities that go wider than just the library service, participating in Merton Partnership activities, and actively inputting to membership drives and marketing campaigns to increase the service's reach into the community. The proposal will see a reduced capacity and therefore will not be able to play a part in supporting Healthier Citizens Thematic Partnership and will be reducing its outreach work and campaigns.

While this will impact on the service's overall performance indicators, it may not show any obvious impact on equalities.

What actions, to address any negative impact have been identified?

Current activity is in place to increase partnership working – particularly for skills for life (which supports people with literacy or numeracy needs wishing to improve their life chances) and volunteer support (which will help support children's activities thus addressing a target group, and people in need of IT skills). Volunteers will be welcomed to deliver a wide range of activities some of which will target minority groups.

What actions will be taken to mitigate and reduce the negative impact that has been identified?

As above

Is the proposal to go ahead/be amended (give details) or abandoned?

To be agreed still by Cabinet

Completed by: Head of Service: Ingrid Lackajis

Date 30 Nov 2010

Authorised by: Director :

-Date

Group	Positive impact	Neutral	Negative impact	Evidence used, e.g. census, user surveys, local research etc	How might the proposal be amended to address any negative impact?	How will any potentially negative impact of the proposal be monitored and reviewed?
Men		✓				
Women		✓				
Boys		✓				
Girls		✓				
People of different age groups		✓				
Disabled people		✓				
People of any ethnic group including both settled and newly arrived communities			slight			
People of different faiths		✓				
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) people		✓				
Vulnerable people e.g. looked after children, or low income households		✓				
People living in particular wards or neighbourhoods		✓				

**CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2013
SUMMARY OF OVERALL POSITION**

CURRENT PROGRAMME PERIOD 2010/13

Department	New 2010/11 Total budget - after reprofiling	Revised 2011/12 before Changes	2011/12 Increases/ Decreases	Revised 2011/12 including Changes	Revised 2012/13 before Changes	2012/13 Increases/ Decreases	Revised 2012/13 including Changes
	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Corporate Capacity	8,987	8,438	191	8,629	7,780	-	7,780
Children and Young People	39,216	18,665	1,200	19,865	10,264	22,445	32,709
Sustainable Communities	25,157	24,003	1,291	25,294	25,976	1,220	27,196
Healthier Communities and Older People	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	73,360	51,106	2,682	53,788	44,020	23,665	67,685

ADDITIONAL YEARS 2013/14 & 2014/15

Department	Continuation of existing schemes 2013/14	2013/14 Increases/ Decreases	Proposed Schemes 2013/14	Continuation of existing schemes 2014/15	2014/15 Increases/ Decreases	Proposed Schemes 2014/15
	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Corporate Capacity	2,555	-	2,555	2,095	-	2,095
Children and Young People	-	10,925	10,925	-	2,920	2,920
Sustainable Communities	7,959	375	8,334	7,959	370	8,329
Healthier Communities and Older People	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	10,514	11,300	21,814	10,054	3,290	13,344

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2015

Sustainable Communities	2010/11 Budget incl slippage £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2010/11		New 2010/11 Total budget - after reprofiling £000s	2011/12 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2011/12		Revised 2011/12 £000s	2012/13 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2012/13		Revised 2012/13 £000s	Proposed 2013-14 Budget £000s	Proposed 2014-15 Budget £000s
		£000s	£000s			£000s	£000s			£000s	£000s			
Community and Housing														
Scheme Description														
Media Fund	287			287	287			287	287			287	287	287
Works to Merton Adult Education Centre to facilitate expansion of Joseph Hood School	350			350	110			110	150			150		
Day Centre Kitchen/ Toilet/IT Upgrades					100			100	200			200		
Refurbishment of West Barnes Library														
Refurbishment of other libraries														
Gypsy/Travellers site	7			7										
Improving Information Management	10			10										
Mesopham Road	970			970										
Affordable Housing Fund	210			210										
Regeneration	16			16										
5 Cliford Avenue - Contribution from Sutton & Merton PCT	450			450										
St Catherine's School	1,963			1,963										
Housing HRA	28			28										
JMC LD Day Centre	46			46										
Libraries														
TOTAL - Community and Housing	4,336			4,336	497			497	637			637	287	287
Environment and Regeneration														
Scheme Description														
Earmarked Schemes - Transport for London	4,447	(2,200)		2,247		2,200		2,200						
Leisure Services Condition of Parks, Open Spaces & Buildings	644	(300)		344	270	300		570						
CCTV and Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)														
Crime Reduction, ASB & Drugs - funded by the Home Office	109			109	58			58						
CCTV	290	(50)		240	100	50		150	100			100		
Mobile speed cameras	40			40	20			20	20			20		
Environmental Health														
Disabled Facilities Grant	1,243	(300)		943	700	300		1,000	700			700	724	724
Private Sector Housing Programme	410			410	40			40	40			40	40	40
Grass Cutting and Tree Maintenance														
Highway trees inspection, data update and works	97			97	25			25	25			25	25	25
Greenspaces														
Bank reinstatement at Havelock Allotments	400			400										
Boundary fencing and painting to raise the standard of Parks to Greenflag level for priority sites	33			33	10			10	10			10	10	10
Bridge inspection surveys in Parks	16			16										
Cemeteries	372			372	47			47						
Groundwork Trust	47			47										
New pavilion at Abbey Recreation Ground	156			156	250			250	250			250	250	250
Parks Investment	250			250										
Refurbishment of London Road public, staff and disabled toilets	55			55										
Repairs and replacement Lighting in Parks	10			10										
Upgrade access paths around the main routes at Cannizaro Park	40			40										

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2015

Sustainable Communities	2010/11 Budget incl slippage £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2010/11 £000s	New 2010/11 Total budget - after reprofiling £000s	2011/12 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2011/12 £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2011/12 £000s	2012/13 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2012/13 £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2012/13 £000s	Proposed 2013-14 Budget £000s	Proposed 2014-15 Budget £000s
Wall repairs at Church lane playing fields and John Innes Park	10		10										
Wimbledon Park drainage improvements	100		100										
Works to prevent access by Travellers onto Parks and Open Spaces	10		10										
Trees for Cities Programme (& Other Tree Planting/Nature Conversation)				25			25						
Highway Maintenance													
Bridge Inspection	39		39	31			31	58			58	58	58
Bridge Repairs General	60		60	50			50	70			70	70	70
Bushey Road bridge repair	270	(100)	170	10			10	25			25		
Demand for Surface Water Drainage - Flooding	61		61	59			59	62			62	62	62
Highways bridges and structures improvements	195		195	268			268						
Highways Maintenance	1,543		1,543	1,570			1,570	1,884			1,884	1,884	1,884
Maintenance Anti-Skid and Coloured	75		75	78			78	90			90	90	90
Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan	20		20	20			20	20			20	20	20
Repairs to Footways	502		502	1,046			1,046	1,255			1,255	1,255	1,255
Replacement of Structures	5		5	26			26	28			28	30	30
Selby bridge treatments	52		52	206			206						
Wimbledon Bridge	206		206										
B340MOSS Tpt (land Rutlish Rd)	4		4										
B49/78 Lombard Rd Improvements	54		54										
B501 Langley Rd resurfacing	14		14										
River Wandie Footbridge	51		51										
Church Walk/Fairway	5		5										
Leisure Centres													
Replacement of Leisure Centre Plant and Machinery including accelerated schemes in 2009/10	177		177	600			600	350			350	300	300
Leisure Centres	156		156	156			156						
Plant and Ceiling Works (all Leisure Centres)	14		14										
Morden Pool Park and Leisure Centre Investment				1,000			1,000	10,000			10,000		
Leisure Facilities and Support Services													
Decorating Gap Road Chapel													
Heritage/Culture	100		100	200			200	700			700		
Wimbledon Theatre Refurbishment	550		550										
Raynes Park Sports Ground	7		7										
Public Art Work	20		20										
Big Lottery Play Areas	27		27										
Vestry Hall	1		1										
On and Off Street Parking													
Parking management - CPZ; disabled parking bays & waiting restrictions	380		380	380			380						
Resurfacing of Peel House Upper Car Park	290		290										
Improved parking for shop parades (dropped kerbs, machines, etc)	100		100	100			100	100			100		
Parking	191		191	191			191						
Handheld Terminals - Parking	120		120	20			20						
Plans and Projects													
Climate Change Initiatives	293		293	140			140	140			140	140	140
Mitcham Market Garden Project	40		40										

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2015

Sustainable Communities	2010/11 Budget incl slippage £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofitting 2010/11 £000s	New 2010/11 Total budget - after reprofiling £000s	2011/12 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofitting 2011/12 £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2011/12 £000s	2012/13 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofitting 2012/13 £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2012/13 £000s	Proposed 2013-14 Budget £000s	Proposed 2014-15 Budget £000s
Property Management and Review													
WCA investment	50		50										
Acquisitions Programme	900		900										
Invest to Save	50		50	140			140				140		140
Minor Land Purchases (Rookwood Avenue)	5		5										
P3 Site	25		25										
Regeneration Partnerships													
Investment in Deprived Areas - East Meriton.	267		267	80			80				80		
Investment in industrial estates to create high-tech industrial park for key sectors	250	(200)	50	250	200		450	250			250		
Regeneration	216		216										
Town Centre Improvements	671	(567)	104	420	567		987	450			450		
Town Centre Investment	250		250	250			250	250			250		500
Mitcham means Business	250	(100)	150				100						
Queensmere Road	5		5										
Street Scene													
Street Scene Improvement Programme	1,830		1,830	1,250			1,250	1,250			1,250		1,250
Street tree programme (25 year programme)	125		125	125			125	125			125		125
Street Lighting													
Street Lighting Replacement Programme	211		211	245			245	269			269		269
Traffic and Parking Management													
20's Plenty & Area Traffic Calming	90		90	96			96	86			86		
Area Traffic calming measures/investigation	260		260	90			90	100			100		90
Boroughwide waiting restrictions	27		27										
Footway parking - policy/pilot schemes	50		50										
Minor traffic / danger reduction measures	31		31	100			100	120			120		120
Traffic surveys & investigations	10		10	30			30	30			30		30
Traffic surveys and safety measures/investigations	80		80	46			46	56			56		70
Traffic Lights	459		459	186			186						
Wimbledon Area Traffic Study	98		98										
Updating Existing 20MPH Zones	89		89										
Church Road/Liberty Avenue Traffic Consultation	75		75										
Transport Planning	10		10										
Transportation enhancements in Wimbledon, Morden and Mitcham town centres				5,000			5,000	5,000			5,000		
Transport and Plant													
Replacement of Fleet Vehicles	1,161		1,161	500			500						
Morden Town Centre - Highway Improvements													
Durnsford Road Works	5		5										
Public Transport Infrastructure	531	(200)	331		200		200						
Portacabin Accommod Garth Road	16		16										

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2015

Sustainable Communities	2010/11 Budget incl slippage £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2010/11 £000s	New 2010/11 Total budget - after reprofiling £000s	2011/12 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2011/12 £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2011/12 £000s	2012/13 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling 2012/13 £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2012/13 £000s	Proposed 2013-14 Budget £000s	Proposed 2014-15 Budget £000s
Waste Operations													
Alley Gating Scheme - Fly Tipping	57		57	50			50	50			50	50	50
Barrows and Bins Replacement Programme	6		6	60			60	60			60	60	60
Extension of kitchen waste collection to entire borough	500	(500)			500		500						
Kitchen waste containers replacement													
Planned Maintenance of Re-use/recycling Sites	43		43	40			40	40			40	40	40
Street Waste Collection Machines	200		200										
Waste Phase B requirements - Replace Large Waste Collection Vehicles and Purchases	2,089		2,089	2,465			2,465	990			990		
Litter Bin Replacement + Dog Bin Replacement	5		5										
Waste Services	290	(100)	190		100		100						
Other													
Completion of the mobile working initiative	50		50										
50 Montgomery Close	15		15										
Rathbone Training Centre	20		20										
Haydons Road	1		1										
Recycle a Cycle	5		5										
Wayfinding Schemes	4		4										
Sports Initiative	80		80										
Demolition and rebuild of changing rooms at Morden Park				110			110						
John Innes Park Zaun fencing around the Recreation Ground								40			40		
New Projects E&R	20		20										
Wheeled Bin scheme - subject to Scrutiny Review													
TOTAL Environment and Regeneration	25,671	(4,850)	20,821	18,656	4,850		23,506	25,339			25,339	7,672	7,672
Total Sustainable Communities	30,007	-4,850	25,157	19,153	4,850		24,003	25,976			25,976	7,959	7,959

Investment in joining a consortium
 Marlborough Hall Refurbishment
 Climbing wall
 Merton Energy Loan Fund
 Highway Asset Management
 Street Lighting Energy Reduction
 CCTV - Safer Merton & Parking
 Bushey Road Bridge
 Additional Bridges Improvement
 Wimbledon Park Watersports Centre
 Workshop - Fleet Maintenance
 Haydons Road - Puffin Crossing

Total growth items

TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET

45	45
138	138
30	30
50	50
75	75
400	400
50	50
120	120
305	305
28	28
50	50
1,291	1,291
1,291	1,291
1,220	1,220
27,196	27,196
8,334	8,334
8,329	8,329

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2015

Children and Young People	2010/11 Budget incl slippage £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling £000s	New 2010/11 Total budget - after reprofiling £000s	2011/12 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2011/12 £000s	2012/13 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2012/13 £000s	Proposed 2013-14 Budget £000s	Proposed 2014-15 Budget £000s
Scheme Description													
Aragon Expansion	135		135										
Benedict Expansion	775		775										
Bishop Gilpin New Classroom	250		250										
Cranmer Expansion	456		456										
Hollymount Permanent expansion	2,441		2,441										
Joseph Hood Permanent expansion	985		985										
St Thomas of Canterbury expansion	829		829										
North Wimbledon new primary school	4,500	(3,000)	1,500										
Temp classrooms for 5 schools													
St Ann's Primary Phase	40		40										
Garden PCP	201		201										
Links PCP	300		300										
St Mark's Primary PCP	500		500										
SS Peter & Paul PCP	100		100										
William Morris PCP	100	-50	50										
Wim College catering classroom	345		345										
West Wimbledon SEN project p2	247		247										
Bond electric wks/asbestos rmovl	220		220										
Gorringe Park repointing	15		15										
Hatfield playground works	15		15										
Hillcross boiler renewal	105		105										
Lonesome heating & playground	40		40										
Merton Abbey rewiring	40		40										
Palham rewiring	10		10										
Stanford roofing & tarmac	60		60										
West Wimbledon repointing	25		25										
Cricknet Green fascia board	85		85										
Melrose pitched roof renewal	30		30										
School Expansion/PCP feasibility	130		130										
Condition surveys	35		35										
Retention	93		93										
Benedict	7		7										
Haslemere	5		5										
St Anns	40		40										
Modernisation	77		77										
Devolved Formula Capital	3,726		3,726										
St Ann's new build (plus new targeted capital)	6,628		6,628										
Wimbledon Chase Expansion	3,746		3,746										
Holy Trinity Expansion	2,517		2,517										
Bond PCP	241		241										
Poplar PCP	233		233										
6th Forms	7,198		7,198										
New Pupil Places - Garfield	111		111										
Extended schools	271		271										

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2015

Children and Young People	2010/11 Budget incl slippage £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling £000s	New 2010/11 budget - after reprofiling £000s	2011/12 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2011/12 £000s	2012/13 as per Capital Programme £000s	Changes as a result of Reprofiling £000s	Increases/D decreases £000s	Revised 2012/13 £000s	Proposed 2013-14 Budget £000s	Proposed 2014-15 Budget £000s
Scheme Description													
Schools Access Initiative Inclusion	83		83	70			70	70					
Intergenerational Centre	245		245										
Aiming High	97		97										
8-13 Play Spaces	94		94										
Adventure Playground	45	337	382										
OLM Additional Software Licences	60		60										
ICT Harnessing Technology Grant	728		728										
Building School for the Future (BSF) feasibility work	663	(650)	13	1,300	(1,300)			1,250	(1,250)				
S106 Aragon School gates	1		1										
St John Fisher Governor's 10%	1		1										
Youth Capital Fund	98		98										
Youth Centre Buildings	51		51										
School Meals Kitchens	6		6										
SEN - Melrose	23		23										
Raynes Park Sports Pavilion	391		391										
SEN													
Cricket Green Site	100		100										
Items not yet allocated to a particular scheme													
Childrens Centres	812		812										
Modernisation - Other	43		43										
Primary Capital Programme	132		132										
Pupil Growth - Other	3,651	(3,651)	0	14,515	(14,515)			4,710	(2,501)		2,209		
Pupil Growth - Holy Trinity/Wimbledon	0		0										
Pupil Growth - School Expansions													
PVI 2010/11	1,000		1,000										
Primary Expansion Expenditure to be allocated													
TOTAL - Children and Young People	46,230	(7,014)	39,216	15,885	2,780		18,665	6,030	4,234		10,264		

Primary places additional growth													
Schools Modernisation & Access Initiative			-490				-490				20,265	9,725	1,450
Primary school autism unit			900				900				900	870	870
Secondary school expansion			470				470				400	30	
Brightwell			100				100				100	100	500
Community centre re-provision			110				110				390	200	100
Youth centre re-provision			110				110				390		

Total growth items	1200	1200
---------------------------	------	------

TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET	1,200	19,865
------------------------------	--------------	---------------

	22,445	22,445
--	--------	--------

	22,445	32,709
--	---------------	---------------

	1200	1200
--	------	------

TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET	1,200	19,865
------------------------------	--------------	---------------

CORPORATE CAPACITY

CAPITAL BUDGETS 2010-2015

Corporate Capacity	2010/11 Budget incl slippage	Changes as a result of Reprofiling	Amendments 2010-11	New 2010/11 Total budget - after reprofiling	2011/12 as per Capital Programme	Changes as a result of Reprofiling	Amendments 2011-12	Revised 2011/12	Revised 2012/13	Proposed 2013-14 Budget	Proposed 2014-15 Budget
IT											
Connect to N3 Network NHS Spine	150		(120)	30							
Corporate mobile working	213		(213)	0	64		(64)				
CRM / Self Service	300	(84)	(135)	81		44		44	40	45	
Disaster recovery (IT Generator)	483	(107)		376		107		107			
Document Management - Contractual	251			251							
e-procurement	236	(136)		100		136		136			
IT Equipment	777	(284)		493	565	284		849	620	350	350
IT Strategy	973	(300)	(22)	651	460	(410)		50	710		
Liveline Updated	99	(99)				99		99			
PABX	305	(80)		225		80		80			
Replace Providerlink / Homecare Rostering / Scheduling	139			139							
Streetworks Permit	52	(52)				52		52			
Transformation (IT)	1,080	(415)		665	2,000	415		2,415	2,000	900	800
Development of shared services through cloud computing	1,000	(650)		350		650		650			
Handheld Terminals - Parking											
R&M											
Capitalisation MTFs includes an equal credit	1,500			1,500	1,500			1,500	1,500		
Civic Centre refurbishment	805	(16)		789	540	16		556	510	360	
Civic Centre Windows									1,600	(see reprofile below)	
Energy Utilities Invest to Save	106			106	100			100	100	100	100
Invest to Save schemes - General	150			150	100			100	100	100	100
Redundancy Payments	1,000			1,000	1,000			1,000			
Repair and Maintenance	1,207	(86)		1,121	700			700	700	700	700
DDA - Access to Buildings	504	(195)		309							
CHP Equipment	650			650							
2009/10 Overspends	0			0							
TOTAL - Corporate Capacity	11,981	(2,223)	(771)	8,987	7,029	1,473	(64)	8,438	7,780	2,555	2,095

Roadway within Chapel Orchard and Worfold House	66										
Replacement of air conditioning equipment	50										
IT Equipment Room Air Conditioning	75										

Total growth items	191							191			
---------------------------	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----	--	--	--

TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET	191	8,629	7,780	2,555	2,095
------------------------------	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------

Proposed New Capital Schemes in Panel Order.

Appendix 9(v)

		2011/12	2012/13	2013-14	2014-15	Full Year
		Increases/ Decreases	Increases/D ecreases	Increases/D ecreases	Increases/D ecreases	Revenue Effects
		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Scheme Description						
Corporate Capacity	Roadway within Chapel Orchard	66				7
	Replacement of air conditioning e	50				5
	IT Equipment Room Air Condition	75				8
Children and Young People	Primary places additional growth	-490	20,265	9,725	1,450	3,250
	Schools Modernisation & Access	900	900	870	870	372
	Primary school autism unit	470	400	30		95
	Secondary school expansion			100	500	63
	Brightwell	100	100	200	100	53
	Community centre reprovision	110	390			26
	Youth centre re-provision	110	390			26
Sustainable Communities	Climbing wall	30				Invest to Save
	Merton Energy Loan Fund	50	50			5
	Highway Asset Management	75	75			16
	Street Lighting Energy Reduction	400	400	150	150	Invest to Save
	CCTV - Safer Merton & Parking	50	50			Invest to Save
	Bushey Road Bridge	120	45	65	60	30
	Additional Bridges Improvement	305	250	160	160	92
	Wimbledon Park Watersports Centre	28				3
	Workshop - Fleet Maintenance		300			32
	Haydons Road - Puffin Crossing	50	50			11
	Marlborough Hall Refurbishment	138				Invest to Save
	Investment in joining a consortium	45				Invest to Save
Total Increase/Decreases	2,682	23,665	11,300	3,290	4,094	

Committee: Cabinet**Date: 13 December 2010**

Agenda item: 3

Wards:

Subject: Reference from the Overview and Scrutiny Commission– Pre decision scrutiny of the Budget 2011-2012 and the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011- 2015

Lead officer: Julia Regan, Scrutiny Manager

Lead member: Councillor Peter Southgate, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Forward Plan reference number: 986

Contact officer: Julia Regan, Scrutiny Manager, 020 8545 3864

Reason for urgency – the Chair has approved the urgent submission of this item in order that Cabinet may have regard to the outcome of scrutiny when considering the substantive item found elsewhere on this agenda.

Recommendations:

- A. That Cabinet considers the views and recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on the Budget 2011-2012 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 and the outcomes of consideration of savings proposals CS2 and CS3 by the Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel;
- B. That Cabinet notes that the Overview and Scrutiny Commission does not object to individual savings being brought forward, except for those savings where concerns have been recorded;
- C. That Cabinet note Members' thanks to officers for their work to date in identifying savings deemed to be sensible in difficult financial times.

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. To inform Cabinet of the recommendations and comments resulting from pre decision scrutiny of the Budget 2011-2012 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 18 November and by a special meeting of the Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 8 December 2010.

2 DETAILS

- 2.1. At its meeting on 18 November the Overview and Scrutiny Commission discussed the latest information on the Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy and agreed to forward a response for consideration by Cabinet at its meeting on 13 December. This response is set out in Appendix A.
- 2.2. The Overview and Scrutiny Commission agreed to delegate consideration of two savings proposals (CS2 – restructure of support services – and CS3 – restructure of customer services) to a special meeting of the Corporate

Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 8 December. A report of the Panel's discussions and recommendations is set out in Appendix B (to follow).

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 3.1. Cabinet is required under the terms of the constitution to receive, consider and respond to recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED.

- 4.1. The Constitution outlines the requirements for consulting scrutiny on the budget.

5 TIMETABLE

- 5.1. Round one of scrutiny of the budget was undertaken as follows:
- Overview and Scrutiny Commission 18 November 2010
 - Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel 8 December 2010

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. None for the purposes of this report.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. None for the purposes of this report.

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. None for the purposes of this report.

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. None for the purposes of this report.

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1. None for the purposes of this report.

11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

- Appendix A – Report of discussion and comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 18 November 2010
- Appendix B – Report of discussion and comments from the Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 8 December 2010

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 12.1. None

Appendix A

Report of discussion and comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 18 November 2010

General comments and priorities

The Commission identified some key concerns and strategic level comments that it wishes the Cabinet to take into account when making decisions in relation to the 2011/12 Budget:

- a) To be aware of the impact of withdrawing services to pre-school children, particularly in terms of additional costs in the medium to long term, which would be incurred by the Council and partner organisations
- b) To note the harm done by lack of continuity in service provision, particularly by starting and then discontinuing initiatives that had been funded through specific grants
- c) To be aware of the need to proceed carefully on proposals relying on the assumption of a greater reliance on volunteers, particularly in the light of reductions in grant funding to voluntary organisations
- d) To note concerns about the impact that staff cuts will have on the cleanliness of Merton's street scene
- e) To note concerns that staff reductions will impinge on the Council's ability to enforce planning policies effectively
- f) The Commission is broadly supportive of the proposed restructure of support services but has concerns relating to reduction in audit and scrutiny activity, the implications of withdrawing legal support to planning and licensing committees and the proposals relating to financial monitoring. These will be discussed at a meeting of the Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 8 December 2010.
- g) To examine further information setting out the impact of savings proposals CC13 and CC14, including the number of customers who will be worse off and by how much.
- h) To re-examine the inflation assumption behind proposal CC02 for a 0% increase to providers – the Commission is concerned that this proposal will not be viable in practice
- i) To identify other ways of engaging with citizens if the Community Forums are scaled back and to recognise the importance of ward councillors taking a central role in such engagement.

Comments on the Capital Budget

The Commission identified questions to be addressed when updated information is provided to Cabinet:

- whether the kitchen waste pilot will be extended borough wide
- the impact that specific capital projects will have on revenue budgets in future years
- capital project savings should be identified by type and categorised as underspend, deletion, procurement saving etc.

Comments on the Medium Term Financial Strategy

The Commission requested that the impact of under and over spends in 09/10 and the impact of VAT changes be built into the report that is presented to Cabinet and scrutiny in January.

2011/12 Budget – specific comments

Healthier Communities and Older People

<i>Savings Reference</i>	<i>Comments</i>
CC02 – Access and Assessments and Commissioning – 0% inflation increase on all providers	Members asked for a re-examination of the inflation assumption behind the proposal for a 0% increase to providers. Members are concerned that this will not be viable in practice. The Director of Community and Housing stated that, whilst it would be challenging, providers should be able to absorb this saving – they are benefiting from a number of factors, including capital borrowing rates being at an all time low.
CC1 1 – Direct Provision – reduction in transport cost	Members were assured that the reduction in the number of vehicles would not impact on eligibility criteria and there would be no significant changes in provision at this stage.
CC03 – Access and Assessments and Commissioning – negotiate a single hourly rate for homecare CC13 – all sections – changes to Fairer Charging Policy CC14 – all sections – changing maximum homecare charge	Members asked to examine further information setting out the impact of savings proposals CC13 and CC14, including the number of customers who will be worse off and by how much. The Director undertook to provide Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender with these details. He added that the changes were considered to be of benefit to those with personal budgets and to be a fairer system as ceilings had the effect of distorting choice.
Access and Assessments and Commissioning: CC03 – negotiate a single hourly rate for homecare CC15 – renegotiate hourly rate in Crossroads contract CC16 – contract for LD advocacy service CC18 – contract for provision of BME and adult mental health services	Members asked why the proposals for renegotiating rates for homecare (CC03) were more ambitious than for the other contracts as the opportunities for reducing costs are greater where the workforce comprised self employed or agency staff than for salaried staff.
CC18 – Access and Assessments and Commissioning – contract for	In response to a suggestion by Members that the BME provision could be integrated rather than a separate service, the Director said that evidence

provision of BME and adult mental health services	relating to the ethnic profile of those detained under the Mental Health Act or resident in mental health facilities pointed to a need for separate day care provision for BME communities, particularly for men.
CC20 - Access and Assessments and Commissioning – respite provision at Trellis House	Members asked the reason for this proposal. The Director explained that respite provision at Trellis House would reduce spending on respite elsewhere.
CC22 – Direct Provision – closure of Taylor Road	It was noted that Cabinet had agreed to reconsider the proposed closure of Taylor Road.

Sustainable Communities

<i>Savings Reference</i>	<i>Comments</i>
ER03 – Parking Services – increase in various parking charges	Members asked what the impact would be on businesses. The Director of Environment and Regeneration replied that the proposal relates to a limited number of sites and would affect business customers but would not impact on the servicing of premises. Members are concerned that customer numbers may be reduced.
ER06 – Greenspaces – phased reduction in grant to Deen City Farm	Members asked what impact this would have on the farm's finances. The Director replies that there would be a meeting with the Farm in the next few weeks to discuss this.
ER08 – Greenspaces – increase in cemeteries burial fees	Members asked if the increases are in line with the Council's social inclusion and corporate charging policies. The Director replied that the increase is in line with other providers and average charges in London. He undertook to check on situation in relation to the policies. Note – his response has now been provided and is set out immediately below:
<p>Director's response - our charging policy for cemeteries / burial charges does comply with the Council policy on social inclusion and charging. There are Government funded concessions for those who are unable to afford the services available . There are provisions for the low income families to apply for a Funeral Payment from the Social Fund via Direct Gov Web site, the Council also has a link on our own web site to Direct Gov. Council and Funeral Directors also do advise the public that they can apply to the Social Fund if need be.</p> <p>The proposed new fees have been benchmarked against the surrounding Boroughs. The proposed new fee is still on a par with the other Boroughs even at their 2010/2011 prices.</p> <p>We also still provide common graves where the proposed fee would only be £303 for the interment when compared to a private grave/burial of £2401. We provide options for all."</p>	
ER17 – Traffic and Highways – footway maintenance	Members asked if the reduction in non urgent works would lead to more accidents and increased

	number of major works in the future. The Director replied that this is just one of a number of budgets available for footway maintenance and that the proposed savings are consistent with requirements and duties. He undertook to monitor the impact of the reduction.
ER27 – Household Reuse and Recycling Centre – close 35 Weir Road HRRC	Members expressed concern about the impact on recycling levels. Director replied that Weir Road handles roughly 8-9% of the borough's recycling and that Garth Road and the free bulky waste collection will be advertised as alternative provision. In response to a question, the Director said that the cost of collecting additional bulky waste had not been taken into account. He added that, in relation to garden waste, an alternative would be residents composting it themselves.

Overview and Scrutiny Commission

<i>Savings Reference</i>	<i>Comments</i>
ER28 – Safer Merton – deletion of three posts	Members asked whether this is a manageable cut. The Director of Environment and Regeneration replied that there are 30+ staff members in total and that 2 of the 3 posts proposed for deletion are currently vacant.

Children and Young People

<i>Savings Reference</i>	<i>Comments</i>
CSF1 – Healthy Schools And CSF2 - Extended schools start up	Members expressed concern at the impact that discontinuation of central co-ordination might have on schools. The Director of Children Schools and Families explained that the intention of the pump priming grant was that schools would provide the service once established. It is expected that the highest priority work would continue within schools.
CSF 6 – Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services – deletion of specialist post for looked after children and care leavers	In response to Members' concerns, the Director said that provision of mental health support to looked after children and care leavers would continue in consultation with the Mental Health Trust and services would need to be more sharply targeted and priority given to those in greatest need.
CSF 11 – Teenage Pregnancy – deletion of vacant post in PCT	In response to Members' questions, the Director explained that this saving was considered achievable because teenage pregnancy rates had dropped to a relatively

	<p>low level over the years.</p> <p>In response to further questions regarding funding changes and the role of schools in commissioning services, the Director noted that officers would be exploring with schools the potential for them to commission additional services for children and families as increasingly more funding was going directly to schools rather than via the local authority.</p>
CSF15 – School Standards and Quality – reducing of financial support to Merton Music Foundation	<p>The Commission noted that Cabinet had referred the proposed removal of support for the Merton Music Foundation for further consideration. The Director added that officers had met with the Foundation, which also received grant income from central government (on which they are awaiting the outcome of future funding decisions) and fees from pupils.</p>
CSF19 – Youth and Inclusion – restructure youth provision	<p>In response to questions about what this saving entailed, the Director said the savings identified would be achieved by rationalisation of management structures and some activity decommissioning. She added that officers were in discussion with voluntary sector providers about the future direction of the service. She assured Members that the proposal did not make any assumptions regarding reducing the revenue budget for the South Wimbledon Youth Centre.</p>
CSF23 – Community Support and Social Care – reduction in daycare budget	<p>Members expressed concern at the impact on very young children and the potential creation of additional costs in the future. The Director replied that she believes the saving is achievable in the context of other daycare provision available. She assured Members that the most vulnerable children would be prioritised and this may lead to a decrease in the universal offer.</p>

Corporate Capacity

<i>Savings Reference</i>	<i>Comments</i>
CS1 – ABG reduction	In response to questions, the Commission were assured that there is no opportunity for further savings.
CS4 – CHAS – contractors health and safety service	Members asked if there is scope for raising additional revenue and how conservative is the estimate given. The Director of Corporate Services replied that in theory there would be scope but the CHAS growth rate is slowing down, probably due to reductions in the construction industry, and the level of growth proposed is a stretching estimate.
CS5 – HR – reduction in business partner staffing	Members asked why the reputational risk was high. The Director replied that the risk had been overstated and would be adjusted.
CS5 and CS6	Members pointed out that the Equality Impact Assessment form had not been completed for these items.

Reference from Overview and Scrutiny Commission– Pre decision scrutiny of the Budget 2011-2012 and the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011- 2015

Appendix B – Report of discussion and comments from the Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 8 December 2010

At its meeting on 18 November 2010, the Overview and Scrutiny Commission agreed to delegate consideration of two savings proposals (CS2 – restructure of support services – and CS3 – restructure of customer services) to a special meeting of the Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 8 December, with Commission members being invited to attend and speak.

The tables below and overleaf set out a summary of the Panel's discussion, comments and recommendations to Cabinet.

<i>Savings reference CS2 – corporate services and chief executives staffing – restructure of support services</i>	
The Panel discussed the business case impact of the proposals. The Panel:	
1. noted that of the 65 staff savings 40 were vacant positions, but savings would be made by releasing agency and contract staff	
2. is broadly in favour of the restructure proposals but has some areas of concern which it asks Cabinet to take into account.	
Audit	The Panel understands and recognises reasons for a move to risk based auditing but has concerns about potential consequences, particularly for schools and Material purchasing systems, such as Proactis as a high risk area. It was noted however that special budget of £46K for investigations was provided. Cabinet is asked to reconsider the proposals relating to audit, perhaps looking to performance and business planning as areas in which to find alternative savings. If the audit savings go ahead, the Panel propose to monitor the impact of these changes mid-way through the 2011/12 financial year.
Legal	Cabinet is asked to note the Panel's concerns regarding the proposed withdrawal of legal support to the planning and licensing committees. The Panel believes this may lead to increased legal costs in the longer term.
Emergency planning	Cabinet is asked to note the Panel's concerns about the proposed reduction in staffing.
Democracy services	The Panel is concerned about the proposed reduction in scrutiny activity and has set up a member working group to consider the committee structure, taking into account the resources allocated within the proposed restructure. The

	working group will look at all of the Council's committees that members sit on and the implications of the awaited Localism Bill if available and report to the 9 February meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission.
Business partners	Some of the Panel members were not convinced that the proposed business partner arrangements will work.

Savings reference CS3 – corporate services and chief executives staffing – customer services restructure

The Panel discussed each of the elements of the savings proposals. The Panel is broadly in favour of the restructure proposals but has some areas of concern which it asks Cabinet to take into account.

The Panel questioned the need for the budget proposals to be confidential and received assurances that these would be in the public domain at the Cabinet meeting once relevant staff had been made aware of the proposals

Debt recovery	The Panel agrees with the proposed changes.
Housing benefits	The Panel agrees with the proposed changes. Panel has requested further detail on number of posts affected and totals in each section.
Community engagement	Agreed with the proviso that Cabinet note the Panel's wish for scrutiny to be involved in discussing the revised model for community engagement – the member working group will take an initial view on this.
Graphic design	The Panel agrees with the proposed changes.
Registrars	The Panel agrees with the proposed changes.
Cash office	The Panel accepts the proposed reduction and asks Cabinet to note that the customer access scrutiny task group and may have recommendations that will enable further reductions in future years.
Translation services	The Panel agrees with the proposed changes.
Care Connect	The Panel agrees with the proposed changes subject to discussion by the Healthier Communities and Older People Overview and Scrutiny Panel at its meeting on 15 December.

CABINET
13 DECEMBER 2010

TIME: 7.15pm – 7.57pm

PRESENT: Councillor Stephen Alambritis (in the Chair); Councillors Mark Allison, Mark Betteridge, Andrew Judge, Linda Kirby, Edith Macauley, Maxi Martin and Martin Whelton

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Iain Dysart, Suzanne Evans, Samantha George, Gilli Lewis-Lavender, Diane Neil Mills and Peter Southgate

Apologies for absence were received from: Councillor Peter Walker and for lateness from Councillor Mark Allison and Councillor Martin Whelton

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 1)

None advised.

2 REFERENCE FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION – BUDGET 2011/12 AND Medium Term Financial Strategy (Agenda Item 3)

The Chair invited Councillor Peter Southgate to introduce this item.

Councillor Southgate made a number of comments including:

there is a general absence of detail on which to make comment due to the need for the council to make savings in the order of £24m; the transformation process which cuts through the budget process involving a number of complex restructures; and how the funding from central government will or will not be delivered; and

scrutiny is broadly in favour of the restructuring proposals but would like within the resources envelope to consider how the configuration proposals for scrutiny and committee services accord with members interests. Consideration of these matters will be fed into the next scrutiny round without impacting on the overall timetable.

Councillor Andrew Judge referred to Appendix A, 'General comments and priorities' (d) "To note the concerns about the impact that staff cuts will have on the cleanliness of Merton's street scene" and in particular, its association with waste collection services which is to be the subject of a scrutiny review. He hoped that the cleanliness of the streets would be one of the factors considered by scrutiny when recommending proposals for the future.

In addition, he referred to Appendix A 'Comments on the Capital Budget' and with particular regard to the first bullet point "whether the kitchen waste pilot will be extended borough wide" and the fact that this is also within the ambit of the scrutiny review and that this service will also be impacted by the recommendations arising from the review.

The Chair put the recommendations arising from scrutiny to the meeting and it was

1

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library, online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee or by using the contact numbers at the end of this volume.

CABINET
13 DECEMBER 2010

RESOLVED: That

A. the views and recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on the Budget 2011-2012 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 and the outcomes of consideration of savings proposals CS2 and CS3 by the Corporate Capacity Overview and Scrutiny Panel are acknowledged;

B. it is noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Commission does not object to individual savings being brought forward, except for those savings where concerns have been recorded; and

C. it is noted that Members' extend their thanks to officers for their work to date in identifying savings deemed to be sensible in difficult financial times.

3 BUDGET 2011/12 AND MTFS 2011/15 (Agenda Item 4)

Reason for Urgency

The chairman has approved the submission of this report as a matter of urgency as it provides the latest available information on the Budget 2011/12 and requires consideration of issues relating to the Budget process and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015. It is important that this consideration is not delayed in order that the Council can work towards a balanced budget at its meeting on 2nd March 2011 and set a Council Tax as appropriate for 2011/12.

Following introductory comments by Councillor Mark Allison, the Director of Community and Housing referred to page 66 of the printed agenda and saving proposal 'L101 – 'Libraries and Heritage – Revised Library Opening Hours':

this particular saving benefits from a significant amount of detail but which is not provided with the budget report to Cabinet;

there have been requests for the detail and these have been responded to;

he understood that there is a concern that the specific impact on the change of hours with regard to West Barnes and Donald Hope libraries should appear on the public record; and

the changes in opening hours is as a response to public consultation carried out in 2009 and the message from those consulted was that there should be an ending to lunch-time closures.

The Director confirmed that the specific L101 package and the wider detailed opening hours for the council's libraries would be appended to the minutes of this meeting and that the same would also be added to the council's libraries web page.

The Chair invited Councillor Iain Dysart to address the meeting and he made a number of observations including:

2

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library, online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee or by using the contact numbers at the end of this volume.

CABINET

13 DECEMBER 2010

notwithstanding that times are hard the Council needs to provide and prioritise services for key parts of the community including library services;

he welcomed the fact that there was to be an increase overall in library opening hours;

with regard to West Barnes library, he expressed his thanks that the library was not to close but nonetheless expressed his concern at the proposal for a further 1 day closure per week. In particular, the library provides a range of services including computer facilities, loan of books and children's classes and all this will be undermined if hours are reduced;

assumptions in respect of distances to alternative facilities is flawed on the basis that many of the residents are senior citizens and therefore may find it hard to access these;

a petition was presented to Council and those signing the petition cannot all be wrong; and

the administration of 1998 proclaimed an initiative 'Lifelong Learning and Economic Regeneration' and in which libraries to play a key part. However, Wimbledon Park and Morden Park libraries were closed and he did not wish to see West Barnes library go the same way.

The Chair invited Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender to address the meeting and agreed that a letter from her be circulated to cabinet members.

Councillor Lewis-Lavender commented that residents value the use of its libraries for a range of reasons in addition to the borrowing of books and that many representations have been made expressing concern at any proposal to close the library.

She noted that the statistics appear to support that the library is not well supported but that these did not account for other aspects of the library service that residents do make use of i.e. use of reference material, newspapers and community activities.

It was agreed that the letter circulated by Councillor Lewis-Lavender form part of the public record and that this be added to the web page relating to this meeting.

The Chair invited Councillor Samantha George to address the meeting.

Councillor George referred to page 66 of the printed agenda which detailed the proposals in respect of library spending (L101 refers). She noted that the specific detail in respect of West Barnes and Donald Hope libraries had not been provided with the papers before the Cabinet. Consequently, the Overview and Scrutiny Commission had similarly not had an opportunity to comment fully.

Councillor George stated that these two libraries are valued community facilities and

CABINET
13 DECEMBER 2010

that, in this regard, it is imperative that the detailed information is seen to be in the public domain in order that residents may understand the likely impact for them.

She observed that the changes to opening hours reflect the substantial investment made in self- service technology.

Concluding she asked that, if the intention is to proceed with the savings in respect of the two libraries, then the public record should include reference to the detailed costings. This would allow consultation with residents and scrutiny of the proposals to be undertaken with full transparency.

Having regard to the outcome of the 2009 public consultation and the actual increase in the volume of opening hours and in the context of the overall savings to be made by the council, Councillor Mark Betteridge confirmed that there has been an effort to find a flexible response that meets the saving requirement but that also protects the service. He observed that the papers before Cabinet do not state that either of the libraries are to close although it is appreciated that this may be the perception of some parts of the community.

Councillor Martin Whelton expressed his hope that West Barnes library would not need to be closed but that, in view of the council's financial position, there is a need to consider all options.

The Chair put the recommendations to the meeting and it was

RESOLVED: That

1. the latest information in respect of the Budget 2011/12 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 is noted and that approval is given to the latest package of budget proposals and draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2015 and refers them to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Panels for comment;
2. it is noted that the two savings for which decisions were held in abeyance following Cabinet on 8 November (i.e. Page 55 of the printed agenda – Ref: CSF15 Reducing of Financial Support to Merton Music Foundation; and Page 79 of the printed agenda – Ref: CC22 Direct Provision, Closure of Taylor Road”) will be considered again in January 2011;
3. the draft Capital Programme 2011-15 is noted and confirms the draft programme to refer to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Panels for comment;
4. it is noted that there will be a review of the Capital Strategy to ensure that the funding of the programme and the debt outstanding of

CABINET
13 DECEMBER 2010

the authority can be optimised;

5. Council is recommended to approve the addition of the Sure Start-Childrens Centres scheme, estimated to cost £0.612m, to the Capital Programme and approval is given to a new capital scheme relating to the technical costs of joining the London Libraries Consortium; and

6. the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on the initial package referred to it by Cabinet on 8 November 2010 are noted together with the responses as set out in a agenda item 3 of this agenda.

Revised library opening hours for 2011/12

Library	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Wimbledon	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 -19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 17.00
Morden and Heritage Centre	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 17.00
Mitcham	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 17.00
Raynes Park	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	CLOSED	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 17.00
Pollards Hill	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	CLOSED	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 17.00
Donald Hope	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	CLOSED	9.30 – 19.00	CLOSED	9.30 – 17.00
West Barnes	CLOSED	9.30 – 19.00	CLOSED	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 19.00	9.30 – 17.00