

---

**Report to Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Select Committee (PVFM)**

## **Liberal Democrat's Budget Amendment Proposals 2016 /17**

**Portfolio Holder:** Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition, Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor John McCann

**Officer Contact:** Mark Stenson – Head of Corporate Governance

**2 February 2016**

---

### **Reason for Decision**

The report presents to the Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Select Committee (PVFM) the Liberal Democrat's Amendments to the Administration's Budget proposals for 2016/17 and offers some practical suggestions whereby the Council can begin work now to achieve needed efficiencies in future financial years.

### **Executive Summary**

The report presents to PVFM a number of budget amendments to those already presented for the financial year 2016/17.

The Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement confirms the need for the Council to make significant savings and the expectation that Council's will implement future increases to Council Tax from the financial year 2016/17. The national proposal to allow Council's to increase Council Tax by 2% for the expenditure to be spent on Adult Social Care agreed in the Administration Budget is therefore supported as previously stated by the Liberal Democrats at full Council.

This report also proposes a number of individual budget amendments which can be considered individually or collectively made possible by increasing the Council Tax by a further 1.99% as expected in the national settlement and proposed in the current Administration budget. It is proposed that a proportion of the extra income generated from this extra Council Tax of 1.99% (estimated at £1.508M) is used on specific expenditure where our citizens can see the direct benefits of the extra tax they are being expected to pay within their communities. The additional income to the Council from the Council Tax increase is proposed to be used as detailed below:

- 
- Using £80k of this money to re-instate the current Inspection and Enforcement regime operated by the Council which budget option B003b currently proposes to reduce. This has been referred back to Cabinet twice, by Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Committee.
  - Investing in increasing the present gully emptying capacity of the Council. Recent events both nationally and locally and over a number of years have shown a perception that properly cleaned gullies can prevent localised flooding and provides local assurance that councils are being proactive in flood prevention. The second Liberal Democrat budget amendment proposes to invest £130k to enhance the present gully emptying. This will support the creation of two additional gully emptying teams operating an extra vehicle to improve Council resilience in this area.
  - Removing the present charges introduced to support the 2014/15 budget in respect of introducing charging for Bulky Waste. The expected increase in cost of this proposal is £210k which is a combination of the contract costs exceeding (as more collections are undertaken) and no income as the service will be free. This is in line with Liberal Democrat priorities to make our communities cleaner.
  - The fourth budget amendment put forward by the Liberal Democrat's using the 1.99% increase in council tax is to distribute (£1.000M) to the 20 individual wards which can be spent as part of District Plans and priorities. This will enable each individual Ward Member, who reflects the views of their local communities, to have more financial independence collectively to spend funds on agreed local priorities such as Youth Outreach work. It reflects the principle of giving greater financial flexibility to local areas and local leaders.

In total the budget amendments proposed are proposing to utilise £1.420M of the extra Council Tax £1.508M generated from the 1.99% increase in Council Tax. In order to free up extra resources within the Council within the budget already scrutinised by this Committee a review of the areas the Administration is proposing to invest extra resources for 2016/17 has been undertaken. This has identified £1.318M of proposed expenditure which would effectively have been financed by the extra Council Tax which these budget amendments are not proposing to finance.

The report also identifies a number of efficiency savings totaling £416k. A proportion of this will be invested to fund the small shortfall identified in investing £50k per ward to District Budgets. It will also be invested to fund an investment in the road network proposed to be £5.000M in 2016/17. This will be determined by the condition of both footways and carriageways following detailed consultation with the relevant District Executives.

The report also highlights the importance of long term strategic planning, identifying opportunities to make savings for the Council, where work can start early to support these initiatives. Four areas where the Liberal Democrats have identified where potential savings could be achieved in future years include:

- 1) Reducing the overall number of Councillors and hold elections every two years.

- 
- 2) Deferring the Heritage Centre and Oldham Coliseum capital project for two years to save capital financing charges and allow due diligence of the financial sustainability of the project.
  - 3) Changes to Waste Collection regime to increase recycling rates and cost avoidance against the Waste Disposal Levy.
  - 4) Reducing the cost of staffing in a number of areas by beginning work now to generate required efficiency savings in 2017/18 which will assist the Council in balancing its budget. This is to be incentivised by proposing some small reductions in staffing budgets within the 2016/17 proposals.

## **Recommendations**

That PVFM recommend to Cabinet the following individual budget amendments for the financial year 2016/17:

- 1) Reinstate the funding proposed on budget saving B003b by not reducing the present staffing levels of the Neighbourhoods Enforcement Team. This is to be funded from the extra Council Tax raised by implementing a 1.99% increase on top of the Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care.
- 2) Implementing the introduction of two additional Gully Emptying Teams within the Borough to improve the Council's future resilience to flooding. This is to be funded from the extra Council Tax raised by implementing a 1.99% increase on top of the Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care.
- 3) Remove the present charges for Bulky Waste to provide the service for free to all residents of the Borough. This is to be funded from the extra Council Tax raised by implementing a 1.99% on top of the Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care.
- 4) A sum of £1M financed from a combination of the increased council tax increase of 1.99% and additional proposed budget amendments reducing expenditure around staffing, reduced energy charges and reduced spend on publications be allocated at £50k per ward to enhance District Executive Revenue Budgets.
- 5) The savings in this budget amendment report is agreed for implementation in the 2016/17 Council budget.
- 6) The agreed savings in this budget amendment report be utilised to fund a capital investment programme on highways totaling £5.000M in 2016/17 and £1.8000M in 2017/18.

That PVFM recommend to Cabinet the following are considered for future financial years:

- 7) Reducing the present number of Councillors from 60 to 40 and hold elections every 2 years.

- 
- 8) Deferring future capital expenditure on the Heritage Centre and Coliseum project for 2 years to save capital financing charges.
  - 9) Consider introducing revised waste collection arrangements in the future to improve recycling and reduce waste disposal costs.
  - 10) Ensure managers are held to account for implementing the agreed policies and procedures within the Council such as the Appeals Process to generate efficiency savings in staffing budgets.

---

## **Budget Amendment Proposal 2016 /17**

### **1 Background**

- 1.1 Funding to Local Government continues to be cut, with the requirement for the Council to make overall savings of £16.044M in 2016/17 as set out in the Administrations report to this Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2016. The Administration has presented three tranches of budget proposals to PVFM, with two ratified by Council, advising on how it proposes to deal with the budget gap in 2016/17.
- 1.2 The Liberal Democrats recognise the tough choices that must be made to deal with the financial pressures the Council faces and accept all the Administration's savings proposals as being reasonable apart from budget option B003b considered in Tranches 1,2 and 3 with a specific suggested budget amendment for the budget to be reinstated as detailed for consideration in this report.
- 1.3 We recognise the challenging environment in which Local Government operates. It has been confirmed in the 2016/17 Provisional Settlement that this Council will continue to see year-on-year reductions in its funding base. The impact of the Greater Manchester devolution agenda is still emerging, with responsibilities for health and social care included in the devolution deal for Greater Manchester. There are also national financial pressures outside to consider in this area such as the National Living Wage. As such the proposed increase in council tax at 2% ring fenced to support Adult Social Care is accepted.
- 1.4 To ensure the Council's meets its objectives to its residents we have put forward a number of budget amendments to the Administration's Budget linked into a proportion of the extra recurring resources the Council would generate from increasing its Council Tax by 1.99%. This will generate extra estimated council tax income of £1.508M during the financial year 2016/17 to the Council. We have also identified some extra savings to those proposed by the administration and are proposing to utilise both sources of funding in a number of budget amendments as set out in this report to benefit our citizens.
- 1.5 As we have always done in both National and Local Government, we will face these challenges head-on, suggesting budget amendments which minimise the impact on those who can't look after themselves and reflects our commitment to local people having the capacity to influence local issues.

### **2 The Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement**

#### **2.1 Settlement Core Funding**

The Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement was made available to councils on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2015. Within the provisional allocation, the Government is providing more protection than originally envisaged for those Council's providing Adult Social Care and Children's Services. The impact on the Council is that it will provisionally receive more Revenue Support Grant than originally forecast. This has

the impact of reducing the overall level of savings required, funding new burdens and allows funding to offset possible financial pressures currently being reported in the financial monitor reports. These were set out in the report to this Committee on the 21<sup>st</sup> January 2016. In relation to Council Tax, the Provisional Settlement confirms the abolition of the Council Tax Freeze Grant and the potential to increase Council Tax to 3.99% (2% for Adult Social Care and 1.99% for Council use) before triggering a local referendum.

## 2.2 Council Tax (Adult Social Care Precept)

The Settlement has conferred on Councils the ability to increase Council Tax by 2% to generate an Adult Social Care precept. This additional funding must be ring-fenced to support expenditure on Adult Social Care. Certain financial pressures in this area have been caused in part by the Government's move to introduce the National Living Wage and new legislative requirements. The Government in calculating Core Spending Power for all authorities has assumed this increase will be levied. In Oldham such a levy will raise an extra £1.515M to finance an estimated £2.700M of cost for introducing the National Living Wage within the care sector. As such, the Liberal Democrats are supportive of increasing Council Tax by 2% to fund Adult Social Care within Oldham.

## 2.3 Abolition of Council Tax Freeze Grant and Potential to Increase Council Tax

The Provisional Settlement identifies the Council will not receive the £0.926M of Council Tax Freeze Grant it originally envisaged it would receive. The settlement gives the Council the option to raise Council tax by an additional 1.99% which would raise an extra £1.508M in Council Tax without capping. The inference in the provisional local government settlement is that government expects a significant proportion of councils to increase THEIR Council Tax by a further 1.99% as direct government grant is reduced year on year.

## 2.4 Overall Estimated Provisional Financial Position of Council

The overall improved financial position of the Council from the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement is detailed in the table below. Overall the Council provisionally has additional funding of £5.127M available and as such does not need to find additional budget reductions of £1.955M to fund the previously expected budget gap. As the table below highlights a 1.99% increase would generate an additional £1.508M in Council Tax. Without the increase in Council Tax of 1.99% the Council would only have net extra resources of £3.619M to support the budget.

<b>Changes to funding after the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement</b>	<b>Previous Estimate £M</b>	<b>Latest Estimate £M</b>	<b>Variance £M</b>
Central Government Grants - Settlement	10.956	9.953	(1.003)
Small Business Rates Relief Grants	1.369	1.508	0.139
Provisional Settlement Funding Assessment	93.338	99.140	5.802
Council Tax Increase of 1.99% for	0	1.508	1.508

use on Council Initiatives			
Precept from Collection Fund without the Council Tax Increase of 1.99%	76.485	75.784	(0.701)
<b>Overall Council Tax for Council Use</b>	<b>76.485</b>	<b>77.292</b>	<b>0.807</b>
2% Adult Social Care Precept	0	1.515	1.515
Parish Precept	0.239	0.241	0.002
Collection Fund Surplus	0.196	0.196	0.000
<b>Total Change to Council Resources</b>	<b>182.583</b>	<b>189.845</b>	<b>7.262</b>
Parish Precept ring-fenced to Parishes	0.239	0.241	(0.002)
Pay Award	0.917	0.950	(0.033)
Adult Social Care Living Wage	0.600	2.700	(2.100)
<b>Change to Budget</b>	<b>1.756</b>	<b>3.891</b>	<b>(2.135)</b>
<b>Net additional Funding</b>			<b>5.127</b>

## 2.5 Further Expenditure Pressures and Opportunity for New Investment

Since the budget reduction target was revised other finance pressures have arisen which it is proposed can be financed by these funds as set out in the Administration's Report of 21<sup>st</sup> January 2016.

In preparing this report, the Liberal Democrats have ranked these pressures using a Red, Amber and Green rating system in order to assess which budgets it is believed should get funding in line with the priorities and interests of residents. Red indicates those investments classed as a high priority which warrant investment, Amber as a medium priority which warrant investment if resources are available and Green as Low priority indicating budget investment should be made elsewhere. It has also provided the opportunity to introduce four proposed budget investments into this exercise:

- reinstating the present level of Inspection and Enforcement Gully Emptying;
- Introducing an extra Gully Emptying Team;
- Removing the Charges for Bulky Waste introduced in the 2014/15 budget and
- An increase in District Executive budgets which are to be funded specifically from the extra resources available from an increase in Council Tax of 1.99%.

Further rationale for these being high priority for investment are detailed in sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of this report.

Directorate Pressure	Financial Impact £'000s	Priority
<b>Corporate</b>		
Reduced Savings Target	1,955	<b>HIGH</b>
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		
Social Worker Retention	91	<b>HIGH</b>
Social Care Redesign	380	<b>HIGH</b>



Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding	375	HIGH
Early Help	375	HIGH
Reduction in Public Health Grant	0	LOW
<b>Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives</b>		
Children's Social Care Commissioning	200	HIGH
Early Years Commissioning	183	HIGH
School Places and Commissioning	150	HIGH
Reinstate Inspection and Enforcement	80	HIGH
Gully Emptying	130	HIGH
Remove Charging for Bulk Waste	210	HIGH
Increased in District Executive Budgets	1,000	HIGH
<b>Economy and Skills</b>		
Car Parking Income	0	MEDIUM
Market Rental Income	0	MEDIUM
<b>Corporate and Commercial</b>		
Coroners Services	100	HIGH
<b>Total high priority financial pressures and areas for investment</b>	<b>5,229</b>	

In this budget amendment report it is recommended that the high priority financial pressures are fully funded from the improved financial resources available of £5.127M. This will reduce the support given by the Council to Public Health, the shortfall in car parking income and proposal to review charges on markets as proposed in the Administration's budget. The Public Health Grant spend should correspond to the amount of grant received, whilst the pressures on both car parking and market rental income which it would have been agreed to fund if the resources were available should be managed by the Directorate. The extra £102k cost of these proposals as against the overall finance available will be financed from proposed savings identified elsewhere as detailed in paragraph 3.5 of this report.

### 3 2016/17 Detailed Proposals

We are proposing a number of specific budget amendments to be considered by Council members this year. The options are split into areas of particular interest, where we feel savings can be achieved and where investment will benefit Oldham and its residents. The options can be implemented either on their own, or as the full package. A proportion of the investment is to be financed from the 1.99% increase in Council Tax.

#### 3.1 Reinstatement of Budget Option B003b – Maintain Current Inspection and Enforcement Regime

We are proposing to reinstate the three Enforcement Officers included within Tranche 3 budget reduction, at a cost of £80k, which the Administration has proposed as savings budget option, B003b. We believe that detection and enforcement needs to lead the way in tackling fly-tipping and littering which actually results in increased costs elsewhere in the Council. Poor street cleanliness does not assist regeneration, pride in the local area by residents and portrays a poor image of Oldham. Cleaning up fly-tipping can result in a substantial cost to the



---

Council. It is therefore more cost effective to be proactive as Borough and continue to invest in employing these three Enforcement Officers rather than be reactive. This can be funded from the additional resources generated by the proposed 1.99% increase in Council Tax.

### **3.2 Investment in Gully Cleaning Teams**

The recent weather conditions, resulting in extreme flooding shows the importance in having places where water can disperse quickly and these are maintained throughout the year.

Investing in the Gully Cleaning service is vital to assist with the prevention of localised flooding and erosion to the Highway infrastructure. This budget therefore proposes to provide funding to support two additional gully cleaning teams, at an estimated cost of £130k per annum. This will allow two teams to work cyclically cleaning gullies across the borough, and another team to work reactively, ensuring any unforeseen issues are dealt with quickly. Through the efficient use of one vehicle by both teams working on a shift basis, the cost to the Council of this investment can be minimised and funded through utilising the additional funding available to the Council, as generated by the proposed 1.99% increase in Council Tax.

### **3.3 Re-instate the Bulky Waste Service at no Cost**

This budget amendment proposes to spend £210k on abolishing the charges introduced in the 2014/15 budget for bulky waste collection. When this measure was introduced it saved £210k with a reduction in the contract price as demand reduced and the income from charges. The improved financial position of the Council for the financial year 2016/17 offers the opportunity for the Council to revisit this decision. This has been made possible by the Council having the flexibility to generate an extra 1.99% increase in Council Tax.

### **3.4 Increase Devolved Budget for Each Ward**

Members have seen a reduction in the Devolved budgets for each ward by the current Administration. We are proposing as a budget amendment to use the operational savings identified to support an increased in Devolved Budgets by £50k per ward (£1m extra in total) funded by the increase in council tax of 1.99%, to allow Members too collectively and co-operatively target towards priorities excluding highway schemes within their wards. This will be further supported by savings identified in paragraph 3.5 of this report.

### **3.5 Additional Operational Savings**

To manage the financial challenges Local Government faces, we must look at alternative ways to deliver services whilst ensuring we meet our statutory duties. Whilst we support the majority of savings proposals put forward by the Administration, we feel there are further areas which should be explored.

---

## **Street Lighting**

The five year investment in new street lighting across the borough through the PFI contract with E.ON will be completed in July 2016. Following a successful trial of dimming street lighting further in pilot areas, we would like to build on this quickly and dim street lighting levels across Oldham to 50%. This would achieve savings in energy costs, whilst still providing residents with street lighting throughout the night without compromising their safety. We acknowledge there is a risk to decreasing lighting levels, and would ensure public perception about a reduction in safety levels is managed by working closely with officers and residents to minimise the risk. There is also an opportunity to review whether street lighting is required at all in certain areas. Although minimal street lighting was installed in rural parts of Saddleworth, replacing the same number of street lights, there are some areas lit by street lighting for areas not inhabited. It is therefore proposed for a review to start across Oldham to assess where street lighting is not required, along with a risk assessment to evaluate the impact. This will provide potential future savings.

## **Lifelong Learning**

The Lifelong Learning service is predominantly funded by the Skills Funding Agency and European Social Fund. The service also charges for courses, dependent on the course and concessionary status of the learner. Although we fully support the Lifelong Learning service, providing residents with opportunity to improve their employment skills, we feel there is an opportunity to achieve greater external funding for the service. We are therefore proposing an increase in the income target for the service of £25k.

## **Publications**

We feel the Council could make further savings through a reduction in non-essential expenditure. The printing and distribution of Council publications, including the Borough Life, Family Life and Council Tax Leaflet, could be stopped. We have a statutory duty to provide Council Tax information and recognise that savings have already been made by reducing the size of the Council Tax leaflet, however further savings could be achieved by utilising other communication methods. This would eliminate the cost of printing. Internal communication and events within the Council could also be reduced, and would generate a further saving to the Council.

## **Subscriptions**

Savings could be achieved within the Council through a 10% reduction in conference and subscription budgets. By restricting budgets, we feel a saving of £9K can be achieved across the Council.

## **Sickness**

The estimated average sickness level for an employee in Oldham for the financial year 2015/16 is estimated to be 9.69 days per Full Time Equivalent. This is estimated to have a notional cost of £2,304,527 to the Council. For 2016/17 and 2017/18 if 8 days average absence was achieved, the expected notional saving

---

would be £402,082. In budget terms it is recognised that reducing sickness does not always lead to cash saving. The budget amendment proposed for 2016/17 is to reduce actual budgets by a notional saving which equates to £13K in year. For 2017/18 it is proposed to allocate the same level of cashable saving i.e. £13K.

### **Trade Union Support**

The current arrangement for the facility to provide support to the non- teaching trade unions was reviewed in 2015 as a two year agreement. The cost of this support is estimated at £142,121 in 2015/16. The Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement gives the Council certainty that its resources are going to reduce over the next four years as the amount of direct grant is reduced and the Council becomes more dependent on the revenue that it can generate locally. The agreement recognises that an earlier review can be undertaken, amongst other things, to reflect the budgetary position of the Council. As the Council has certainty about its future financial position which are likely to result in continued reductions to staffing it is recommended these negotiations are began earlier than set out in the agreement. Overall it is proposed to set a target for the Council to save £40k over 2 years in this area. In order to incentivise the Council to instigate this work early it is proposed to reduce the budget by £10k in 2016/17.

### **Consultancy / Agency**

It is proposed to instigate a detailed review to reduce the present use of Consultancy and Agency Staff within the Council. Within these proposals a modest target of £50k has been set for the two years between 2016/17 and 2017/18. In order to incentivise the organisation to undertake this work as a priority a saving of £10k has been set up for 2016/17.

### **Review of Communications**

A review of the Communications Service has identified the potential to save £60k in the service by restructuring and efficiencies.

### **Expand Budget Option D019 on the realignment of Supplies and Services Budgets to Save 1% in Total to all Directorates**

Budget Option D019 sets out an option to save £292,360 from supplies and services within the Economy and Skills Directorate. This will be done by a targeted approach within the Directorate. There has been one further proposal C014 within People Services to reduce non staffing budgets. It is proposed to adopt this principle to those other Directorates and Service Areas which have not put this forward as a budget option. This is expected to generate additional savings of £106k in 2016/17.

A summary of the operational savings identified is detailed in table 3.5.1 below

**Table 3.5.1 – Summary of Operational savings identified**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>2016/17 £'000s</b>	<b>2016/17 FTE</b>	<b>2017/18 £'000s</b>
ALB	Savings through more efficient	(90)	0	0

SAV1	street lighting			
ALB SAV2	Increase external income generated by Lifelong Learning	(25)	0	0
ALB SAV3	Savings through reducing Council publications and internal communications	(93)	0	(10)
ALB SAV4	Savings through reducing newspapers, periodicals, subscriptions and conference expenditure across the Council by 10%	(9)	0	0
ALB SAV5	Reduction in sickness levels by the Council in applying its existing rules and procedures	(13)	0	(13)
ALB SAV6	Review the cost to the Council of Trade Union support in light of an ever decreasing workforce	(10)	0	(30)
ALB SAV7	Review the use of Consultancy and Agency Staff	(10)	0	(40)
ALB SAV8	Reduction in Communication and Marketing by restructuring and efficiencies reduction in staffing.	(60)	0	0
ALB SAV9	Reduce expenditure on supplies and services to all Directorates which is an expansion of Budget Saving D019.	(106)	0	0
	<b>Total savings proposals</b>	<b>(416)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(93)</b>

### 3.6 Increase Devolved Budget for Each Ward and Invest in Highways Maintenance Programme

Members have seen a reduction in the Devolved budgets for each ward by the current Administration. We are proposing as a budget amendment to use an element of the operational savings identified to support an increased in Devolved Budgets by £50,000 per ward in total, to allow Members collectively and co-operatively target towards priorities within their wards. This requires a contribution of £102k from the operational savings required.

It is also proposed to invest an extra £5.000M in 2016/17 and a further £1.800M in 2017/18 on a targeted programme of capital works to improve the highways network of both footpaths and carriageways within the Borough. Local Leaders and Highways Officers will work together to prioritise areas within District Executives and devise a programme. This level of investment is in addition to that proposed in the Capital Strategy and Capital Programme 2016-2021. It is set at such a level that it will not adversely impact on the Treasury Management Indicators of the Council which were reported to PVFM at its meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> January 2016.

#### **Table 3.6.1 – Summary of Budget Amendments financed by increase in Council Tax and Operational Savings**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>2016/17 £'000s</b>	<b>2016/17 FTE Reductions</b>	<b>2017/18 £'000s</b>
ALB INV1	Enforcement in the Borough be maintained to counteract activities such as litter, dog-fouling, fly tipping and similar matters	80	0	0
ALB INV2	Investment in extra gully cleaning teams within Highways Operations	130	0	0
ALB INV3	Remove charging for Bulky Waste collections- working in partnership with Enforcement	210	0	0
ALB INV4	Increase in District Executive Ward Budgets to help Local Leaders decide priorities within their areas	1,000	0	0
ALB INV5	Increase Investment on the Highways Network with a detailed programme to be devised by Local Leaders and Highway Officers	293	0	106
	<b>Total Cost of Proposed Budget Amendments</b>	<b>1,713</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>106</b>

### 3.7 Proposals

Further details for all the budget proposals set out in this report are included in Appendix A of this report.

## 4 Future Year Proposals for Savings

### 4.1 Reduction in Councillors

As put forward for a number of years, we feel strongly that the number of Councillors for each ward should be reduced. This proposal reflects public opinion, repeatedly expressed in consultations and the press, and would generate a saving of at least £187k. We consider that modern communications, the provision of paid caseworkers and a much reduced number of committees have reduced the workload on Councillors. As the proposal would require a legislative change and consideration of the proposals and recommendations arising from an Electoral Review, which we expect to take 18 months, the earliest opportunity the proposal could therefore be implemented would be May 2017. This also would be consequent upon recommendations from the review reducing the number of Councillors. However, as there are no planned elections in May 2017, it would not be until the elections in May 2018 that the proposal could start to take effect.

As this falls outside of the two year budget setting process, we are recommending that this option is considered for future years.

---

## 4.2 Capital Programme

The Capital Programme for the Council envisages capital expenditure on a number of major regenerations schemes within Oldham Town Centre. Whilst we support the regeneration of Oldham Town Centre, it must be ensured that projects are managed effectively to provide value for money for residents and also that they are self-sufficient and sustainable long term. We feel the Heritage Centre and Oldham Coliseum capital project would benefit from a delay of two years. The delay would allow time to review the financial models which underpin the project, firstly in terms of the financing of the project and secondly, the long term financial sustainability of the centres to support themselves. The review would also provide a financial saving to the Council over the two years, as the cost of borrowing will not be incurred.

## 4.3 Waste Disposal

Disposing of waste is a significant cost to the Council, and is expected to amount to £16.573m in 2015/16. The cost to the Council of waste disposal is expected to increase each year. The recycling rates of the Council play a significant factor in determining the waste disposal costs to be incurred under the Inter Authority Agreement for each member of the Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority (GMWDA). Recent improvements in recycling within other Districts have resulted in the levy to Oldham Council increasing as a proportion of the Waste Disposal Authority.

Increased recycling rates, will not only mitigate against the potential rising costs of waste disposal, but also benefit the environment and communities. Currently Oldham Council's recycling rate is 39%. Through the European Waste Framework Directive, UK local authorities are expected to reach a minimum recycling rate of 50%.

We see recycling as an important area which we should be investing in to create not only financial savings/future cost avoidance, but social and environmental benefits too. Other authorities have changed their waste management strategies to encourage recycling within their borough. After considering the options available, we would like to put recommend the Council prepares a business case to review its collection arrangements to encourage residents to recycle. Various methods have been implemented successfully at other Greater Manchester Councils, and this has seen increased recycling rates and a reduction of their waste disposal levy for the financial year 2015/16.

As an invest to mitigates costs initiative we would encourage this matter to be considered by the Council in 2016/17 to deliver future cost reductions.

## 4.4 Implement the Agreed Staffing Appeals Procedure

The Council has an agreed Staffing Appeals Procedure which according to information obtained from a Freedom of Information Request is not always followed by Managers in the timescales required. Ensuring compliance by all Managers in the timescales required under the appeals procedure has the scope to reduce costs in 2016/17 and in a properly structured way to generate potential budget savings for 2017/18.

---

## 5 **Options/Alternatives**

Ten specific budget proposals, as detailed in the recommendations to this report are being put forward for implementation in 2016/17 and future years. This report has been set out in such a way that these recommendations can all be accepted, accepted on an individual basis or rejected collectively.

## 6 **Consultation**

- 6.1 Individual Budget options proposed in this report have been subject to consultation with the relevant budget managers and are supported by appropriate budget documentation which is attached as Appendix A to this report.

## 7 **Financial Implications**

- 7.1 The financial implications are incorporated into the body of the report (A Ryans).

## 8 **Legal Services Comments**

- 8.1 N/A

## 9. **Co-operative Agenda**

- 9.1 N/A

## 10 **Human Resources Comments**

- 10.1 Any organisational changes or proposed revisions to employment policy and protocol must, individually and in detail, be routed first for full consideration then final decision as follows:

- Strategic consideration and authority to open consultations
- Strategic and early engagement with the recognised trade unions
- Inclusion, if appropriate, in a potential Section 188 notice in accordance with the Trade Union Labour Relations Act
- Release for public consultation
- Opening of formal trade union then staff consultations including directly with any individuals affected
- Council approval
- Implementation

**(Dianne Frost, Director of People)**

## 11 **Risk Assessments**

- 11.1 N/A

## 12 **IT Implications**



---

12.1 N/A

13 **Property Implications**

13.1 N/A

14 **Procurement Implications**

14.1 N/A

15 **Environmental and Health & Safety Implications**

15.1 N/A

16 **Equality, community cohesion and crime implications**

16.1 N/A

17 **Equality Impact Assessment Completed?**

17.1 These are not required for the proposals submitted here.

18 **Key Decision**

18.1 No

19 **Key Decision Reference**

19.1 N/A

20 **Background Papers**

20.1 The following is a list of background papers on which this report is based in accordance with the requirements of Section 100(1) of the Local Government Act 1972. It does not include documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act :

File Ref : Background papers are contained in Appendix A  
Officer Name: Mark Stenson  
Contact No: 0161 770 4783

21 **Appendices**

21.1 Appendix A: Detailed Pro-Forma's for Budget Options

## Appendix A – Budget Proposal Pro-formas

### Budget Proposal Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

#### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB INV1</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Environmental Health</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Neil Crabtree - Head of Service - Public Protection</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr D Williamson – Neighbourhoods and Co-operatives</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Enforcement in the Borough be maintained to counteract activities such as litter, dog-fouling, fly tipping and similar matters.</b>
---------------	--

#### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£316k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£56k</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£260k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>11.8</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial impact on Administrations proposals:</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed change in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

#### Section 3

<b>Background:</b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	<p>The role of Enforcement Officers is seen as a high priority in preventing fly-tipping and littering within the Borough</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the 3 additional Enforcement Officers, which the Administration has proposed to remove from 2016/17. This will allow the continued level of support for the Neighbourhood's Enforcement Team to detect and deter fly-tipping and littering.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Proposed Budget option £k:</b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>As the Enforcement Officers generate an income from the issuing of fines, the cost of reinstating the 3 Enforcement Officers will be offset by a small potential increase in income.</p> <p>3 Enforcement Officers = £82,140 (incl. oncosts)  Increase income = £2,140  <b>Total investment = £80,000</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	N/A
--	-----

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

#### **Section 4**

<b>Key Milestones</b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Approval to reinstate Enforcement Officers	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b>Key Risks and Mitigations</b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Enforcement Officers may leave the Council for other opportunities due to the budget proposal put forward by the Administration and the current uncertainties/delays with the decision.	If vacancies exist, recruitment will take place once the budget option is approved.

---

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
N/A

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
The outcome of the proposal will have a positive impact on service delivery as it will continue the investment in the up keep of neighbourhoods and reduce problems of street littering and fly tipping.

<b><u>Organisation (other services)</u></b>
The proposed investment would allow the Council to continue its commitment to a Cooperative Borough, by using enforcement as an enabler for changing person's behaviours regards littering and fly-tipping.

<b><u>Workforce</u></b>
<b>Note:</b> Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models

---

The proposal would see the retention of the 3 Enforcement Officers posts within the service on the same terms and conditions.

**Communities**

The proposed budget option would continue to benefit the community through cleaner streets and supporting the Cooperative Borough approach.

**Service Users**

There would be no change to the service.

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

---

## **Section 6**

<b><u>Supplementary Information</u></b>
N/A

## **Section 7**

<b><u>Consultation Information –</u></b>	
<i>This should include as a minimum the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?</i></li><li>• <i>Further consultation required?</i></li><li>• <i>Date consultation to be started and concluded</i></li></ul>	
<b>NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.</b>	
<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	To take place if the proposal is agreed
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	To take place if the proposal is agreed
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Neil Crabtree
----------------------	---------------



## Budget Proposal Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB INV2</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Highway Operations</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Craig Dale - Head of Service, Highways Operations, Waste and Fleet Management</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr D Murphy – Housing, Planning and Highways</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Investment in extra gully cleaning teams within Highway Operations</b>
---------------	---

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£3,818k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>(£675k)</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£3,143k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>54</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial impact:</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed change in FTE's</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b>Background:</b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	It is proposed to invest in the financial year 2016/17 with the creation of two additional gully cleaning teams within Highways Operations to ensure gullies are effectively cleaned and maintained. This will allow two teams to work cyclically cleaning gullies across the borough in a planned manner, and another team to work reactively, ensuring any issues are dealt with quickly.
--	---

<p><b><u>Proposed budget option £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>It is estimated to cost £128k, to provide 2 additional gully cleaning teams. By staff working on a 4 days working and 4 days non-working rota basis, this will allow one vehicle to be utilised by both additional teams, ensuring resources are efficiently and effectively used.</p> <p>4 Gully Drivers/Operatives = £97,560  1 Gully cleaning vehicle (including running costs) = £30,150  <b>Total cost = £127,710</b></p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>The increase in gully cleaning has the potential to increase the operational costs to Highways and Waste. Additional waste recovered would need to be disposed of through the Waste Disposal Levy. There would also likely be an increase in water charges for the service, as the gully cleaning vehicle would utilise water hydrants. There would also be additional staffing costs to the service for uniforms, training etc, although these costs are estimated to be minimal.</p> <p>The total cost has been increased to £130k to take into account notionally the further cost implications as detailed above.</p>
---	--

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

## **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Implement budget option (recruit additional staff, hire vehicle, carry out training etc)	March 2016 onwards
Review implementation	September 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b>Key Risks and Mitigations</b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
The benefits of the additional teams are not fully realized	Post implementation review to take place 6 months after implementation and allow changes to working models if needed.

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b>Property Implications</b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
N/A

<b>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</b>
Gullies will be cleaned more frequently across the borough.

<b>Organisation (other services)</b>
N/A

---

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

4 additional employees will be recruited by the service and work a 4 days working and 4 day non-working shift pattern.

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

N/A

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

---

## **Section 6**

### **Supplementary Information**

N/A

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	To take place if the proposal is agreed
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	To take place if the proposal is agreed
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Craig Dale
----------------------	------------

## Budget Proposal Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB INV3</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Waste Management</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Craig Dale – Head of Service, Highway Operations, Waste and Fleet Management</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr D Williamson– Neighbourhoods and Co-operatives</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Remove charging for Bulky Waste collections – working in partnership with Enforcement.</b>
---------------	---

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£6,075k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>(£1,306k)</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£4,769k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>72</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial impact on Administrations proposals:</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed change in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b>Background:</b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for</i>	<p>Charging for bulky waste collections was introduced in 2013/14, as part of the budget process, option BWWTs 13 103. This generated a saving to the Council of £210k, through a reduction in demand for bulky waste.</p> <p>Given the Council's improved financial position, it is proposed to remove the charge for bulky waste, to assist residents in the</p>
---	--



<i>implementation</i>	removal of waste.
<b>Proposed Budget option £k:</b>  <i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i>	Providing free bulky waste collections across the borough will increase the demand for the service.  The cost to the Council is therefore estimated to be £210k, taking into account the loss of income, and the increased contract and waste disposal costs.

<b>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</b>  <i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i>	N/A
---	-----

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

#### **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Implement no charging for bulky waste collections	April 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
A further decrease in the Council's recycling rate.	Contractor will be reminded to recycle as much waste collected as possible.

---

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
--

N/A
-----

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
--

N/A
-----

<b><u>Organisation (other services)</u></b>
---

N/A
-----

---

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

N/A

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

N/A

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

---

## **Section 6**

### **Supplementary Information**

N/A

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Craig Dale
----------------------	------------

## Budget Proposal Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB INV4</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Jill Beaumont - Director of Community Services</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr D Williamson– Neighbourhoods and Co-operatives</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Increase Devolved Budgets for each ward from £10k to £60k</b>
---------------	--

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£613k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£k</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£613k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>0</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial Impact:</b>	<b>£1,000k</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed change in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b><u>Background:</u></b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	<p>Currently each of the 20 wards across Oldham has a Devolved Revenue Budget for Members to meet and support priorities in their areas. It is proposed to increase the budget to £60k per ward.</p> <p>This will enable Local Leaders to decide on priorities for their areas and fund additional activities such as Youth work, Crime Prevention, Enhancing Businesses, encourage Tourism and supporting Community Groups.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Proposed Budget Option £k:</b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>To increase the Devolved Budgets to £60k per ward, it will cost £1,000k.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>Dependent on how the additional monies are allocated by Members, there is a potential to fund works through the Devolved Budgets which would have previously had to be funded and prioritised from within service budgets. This gives a opportunity to increase expenditure in local areas and work cooperatively.</p>
--	---

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Not Known</b>

#### **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Implement budget option (increasing Devolved Budgets to £60k from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2016)	March 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b>Key Risks and Mitigations</b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Members are not aware of the increased budget allocation	Once approved, appropriate communication will be issued to inform Members of the increase
Additional funding is not utilised	It is vital that resources are allocated efficiently and effectively. Members will be expected to plan and allocate how they will utilize their funding. Arrangement will be put in place for where resources are being pooled together for future year projects.

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b>Property Implications</b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
N/A

<b>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</b>
The increase in budget will allow Members to further support their wards, and the meet priorities and needs in their areas.



---

**Organisation (other services)**

N/A

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

N/A

**Communities**

Members will be better able to support communities projects through the availability of additional funding.

**Service Users**

Residents within wards will see more funding available to support the needs and priorities of their local area.

---

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

**Section 6**

**Supplementary Information**

N/A

**Section 7**

**Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Jill Beaumont
----------------------	---------------

## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB INV5</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Environmental Services</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Joanne Betts (Senior Transport Officer)</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr D Murphy – Housing, Planning and Highways</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Increase Capital Investment on the Highways Network with a detailed programme to be devised by Local Leaders and Highways Officers</b>
---------------	---

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>N/A</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial impact:</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Proposed change in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b>Background:</b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	There is a backlog of footways and carriageway maintenance in the Borough. To tackle this backlog capital investment is required to improve the network. This proposal plans for this to be done in co-operation by local District Executives and representatives of Highways working closely together
--	--

<b>Proposed Budget Option £k:</b>  <i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i>	To invest £5.000M in 2016/17 and a further £1.800M in 2017/18 to improve the conditions of footways and carriageways
---	--

<b>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</b>  <i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i>	N/A
---	-----

Economic Impact Summary	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	Positive

#### **Section 4**

Key Milestones	
Milestone	Timescale
<b>Mandatory – Completion of EIA &amp; Consultation within PVFM timeline</b>	

Key Risks and Mitigations	
Risk	Mitigating Factor

---

**Section 5**

**What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

**Property Implications** *ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc*

N/A

**Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:**

N/A

**Organisation (other services)**

N/A

---

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

N/A

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

Residents will see an improvement in the asset

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

---

## **Section 6**

### **Supplementary Information**

*A detailed programme of works will be developed*

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A



---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	Enter name of officer
By:	Enter the date by which the assessment will be complete

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Joanne Betts
----------------------	--------------

## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV1</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Co-operatives and Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>John McAuley – PFI Lighting Manager</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr D Murphy – Housing, Planning and Highways</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Savings through more efficient street lighting</b>
---------------	---

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£6,377k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>(£2,496k)</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£3,881k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>3</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b>Background:</b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	<p>Investment to replace 80% of street lighting across the borough over five years through the present PFI contract with E.ON will be completed in July 2016.</p> <p>The newly installed lights have the ability to reduce the light output, resulting in a reduction in energy costs and the Council's carbon footprint. This is referred to as a variable lighting strategy.</p> <p>A successful pilot to reduce street lighting to 50% in specific</p>
--	---

	<p>locations has recently been undertaken. It is proposed that the Council quickly builds on the success of this trial and reduce street lighting across the Borough to 50%.</p> <p>Work to de-illuminate advanced direction signs, traffic signs and traffic bollards is currently being incorporated in the street lighting core investment programme which is due to be completed in July 2016.</p> <p>There is also a further opportunity to review whether street lights are required at all in certain areas and whether they can be switched off/removed to provide further savings. It is therefore proposed for an assessment to start to review where street lighting is not required, along with a risk assessment to evaluate the impact.</p>
--	---

<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>The dimming of the street lights further would save an estimated £90k per annum in energy costs.</p> <p>However the saving is subject to changes in the price of energy.</p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>Any savings realised could be offset by claims against the Council for accident claims to be caused by reduced lighting.</p>
---	---

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

---

## **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Start the implementation of street lighting across the Borough	March 2016
Start to review areas whether street lighting may not be required and carry out risk assessments	March 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Risk of accidents and increase the risks associated with wider community safety due to reduction in street lighting levels	Council officers would work closely with Members and other stakeholders prior to any proposal being implemented to minimise any risk to safety.

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
The savings associated with dimming street lighting will result in savings in energy costs for the Council.

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
Members of the public may notice a reduction in the level of street lighting and feel this is a reduction in level of service provided by the Council.
The expectation of stakeholders for the service will need to be managed through engagement and consultation, to explain the rationale for the change and the benefits.

---

**Organisation (other services)**

The organisation will see a reduction in its energy costs.

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

N/A

**Communities**

The wider community may feel that the reduction in street lighting will put them at risk. Engagement with stakeholders will take prior to the implementation to ensure this risk is minimised.

**Service Users**

Members of the public may notice a reduction in street lighting levels following the implementation of the dimming to 50%.

---

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

Council officers will engage and work with other community groups to ensure that any concerns are dealt with and risks are minimised.

**Section 6**

**Supplementary Information**

N/A

**Section 7**

**Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	Once the option is approved, consultation will take place with stakeholders.
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	Once the option is approved, consultation will take place with stakeholders.
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	<b>Yes / No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	John McAuley
By:	25/01/2016

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	John McAuley
----------------------	--------------

## Equality Impact Assessment

### Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	John McAuley
People involved in completing EIA:	
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	Yes  Date of original EIA: 16/02/15

### General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	ALB SAV1 Street Lighting
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Reduction in lighting levels for street lighting
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	Savings on energy as a result of a reduction in lighting levels.
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	The proposal is for a reduction in lighting levels for the Authority's street lighting. There is a possibility that this could disproportionately impact on some groups. However, until detailed work is completed and a decision was made about which areas will be affected this is not possible to assess in detail.

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	<b>None</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



process of gender reassignment				
People on low incomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
<i>E.g. vulnerable residents, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be?	<b>None / Minimal</b>	<b>Significant</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1h	How have you come to this decision?	A review would need to be undertaken with a focus on safety and risk. As part of this review the Council would need to consider equality impacts on the groups highlighted above.

## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV2</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Economy and Skills</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Economy and Skills</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Enterprise and Skills</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Lynda Fairhurst Head of Service, Oldham Lifelong Learning Service</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr G Harkness - Education and Skills</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Increase external income generated by Lifelong Learning by £25k</b>
---------------	--

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£4,348k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>(£3,525k)</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£823k</b> Note: This includes Capital Charges – Depreciation £414,210 this is a central cost to the Authority. Revised Net Expenditure £408,770
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>80 FTE</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b>Background:</b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for</i>	<p>The Lifelong Learning Service is predominantly funded by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and European Social Fund (ESF) via the Adult Skills Budget and the Community Learning Budget.</p> <p>The Service complies with SFA requirements to provide free courses for designated categories of learners. For other learners</p>
---	---

<i>implementation</i>	<p>course fees are charged and these must be used to co-fund the delivery of learning.</p> <p>The proposal is that the Service contributes an additional £25k in 2016/17 from external funding bids.</p>
-----------------------	--

<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>The proposal will create an additional income target against the Service of £25k in 2016/17.</p> <p>This will be achieved by bids to European Social Fund (ESF) and a range of external funding bids.</p>
---	--

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>The Service is largely funded through external grants and therefore subject to the risks associated with grant funding.</p>
---	--

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>None</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	<b>None</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Positive</b>

## **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Equality Impact Screening completed and an EIA is not required	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Failure to secure funding from bids due to competitive nature of bidding.	The Service is working with a wide range of networks to maximise opportunities for successful partnership bids.

---

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
N/A

### **Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:**

There should be little impact on the Service's ability to deliver outcomes and meet targets. The high quality of the service will be maintained and outcomes and targets will remain in line with Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and Council requirements. The development of a non SFA element of delivery may help to diversify the offer from the Service.

The Service currently:

- Is graded as outstanding by OFSTED
- Has circa 11,000 enrolments and engages circa 5,500 learners per year
- Contributes significantly to the Council's Get Oldham Working ambitions, the Public Service Reform agenda and our Health and Wellbeing ambitions by delivering
- Focuses provision on people who are:
  - Unemployed
  - Seeking work
  - Jobcentre Plus clients
  - Hard to reach and most disadvantaged
  - Parents and families
  - Minority ethnic groups
  - Experiencing learning difficulties and/or disabilities
  - Full level 2 learners
- Delivers vocational learning, English, Maths and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Family English, Maths and Language (FEML), ICT, community learning and community engagement, health and wellbeing
- Works closely with key partners to deliver the Council's vision and priorities these include:
  - The Oldham College
  - Jobcentre Plus
  - Work Programme providers
  - Positive Steps
  - National Careers Service
  - Work Clubs
  - Union learning representatives
  - Workforce development service
  - Schools
  - Children's centres
  - Voluntary and Community sector

- 
- Local businesses

### **Organisation (other services)**

Successful bids for external funds will expand the opportunity to work with other organisations and partners.

There is no investment requirement for other services.

### **Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

Additional staff may be required to deliver the programmes stemming from successful bids.

### **Communities**

Learners are already largely taking responsibility for their own learning.

There will be no change in the community in terms of responsibility.

### **Service Users**

There will be no change in access to learning programmes for learners / Service Users. If bids are successful, a wider range of programmes will be available. This will give learners more opportunities to engage in and access learning which develops the skills needed to progress and gain employment.

The high quality of Service delivery will be maintained.

There will be no negative impact on the current fees and charges made to learners. Those learners on existing programmes who qualify will continue to have free or concessionary learning. It is highly likely that additional funding streams will focus on the most disadvantaged for whom learning will be free.

### **Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

There is a potential positive impact on the third sector organisations as partnership bids are likely to involve local organisations, potentially increasing their capacity to engage local citizens.

## **Section 6**

### **Supplementary Information**

Any additional funding secured from successful bids will complement SFA funded provision which already focuses on the Council's priorities, especially Get Oldham Working and the Co-operative agenda.

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Public Consultation</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Any other consultation</b>	<b>N/A</b>

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there **potential** for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:

	<b>State Yes / No against each line</b>
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No

People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

### **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Lynda Fairhurst
----------------------	-----------------

## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV3</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Chief Executive</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Chief Executive</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Communications and Marketing</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Carl Marsden – Head of Communications</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr J Turner- Performance &amp; Corporate Governance</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Savings through the deletion of Council publications and reduction in spend on internal communications</b>
---------------	---

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£1,088k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£959k</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£129k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>16</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b><u>Background:</u></b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	<p>Oldham Council produces a quarterly newsletter (Borough Life), advising residents of Council services and developments within the borough. It is a full colour paper, of approximately 12 pages. It is produced and distributed to all 93,000 households within the borough and delivered to key locations like libraries, doctor's surgeries, cafes and pubs. It is also available as a PDF document on the Council website.</p> <p>The Council also produces a newsletter for families (Family Life)</p>
---	---



	<p>which is distributed through schools three times a year to coincide with major school holidays.</p> <p>The proposal is to remove both of these publications from circulation, to deliver a budget saving from all associated costs of the production and distribution of both magazines.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory obligation to provide information regarding Council Tax to its residents. Although the Council Tax Leaflet has been reduced in size, further savings could be made by utilising other communication methods, just as the Council's website, eliminating printing costs.</p> <p>The Council currently spends £31k on internal communication events including staff and management conferences. These events could be reduced and other communication methods utilised to generate a further saving to the Council.</p>
--	--

<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>Borough Life deletion £43k saving in 16/17</p> <p>Family Life deletion £19k savings in 16/17</p> <p>Discontinue the publication of Council tax leaflet from 17/18, £10k saving</p> <p>Reduction in internal communication and events £31k in 16/17</p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	N/A
---	-----

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

---

## **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Stop production of the Borough Life and Family Life	April 2016 onwards
Utilise other effective communication methods for Council Tax information	February 2017 onwards
Implement a reduction in staff communication and events	April 2016 onwards
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Residents no longer receive information regarding Council services and developments	Other communication methods will be utilised to provide information to residents
We no longer comply with statutory obligations to provide residents with Council Tax information	Council Tax information will be published on the Council's website to ensure we fulfil our statutory obligation
Members of staff are not kept up to date on changes and developments within the Council	It is vital that staff are kept up-to-date, especially through times of change. It will be therefore ensured that communication with staff continues through utilizing cost effective communication methods.

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
N/A

---

**Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:**

N/A

**Organisation (other services)**

There will be no impact on other services.

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

A reduction in internal communication spend during a significant period of change could lead to lower staff morale and reduced levels of engagement, productivity and motivation.

**Communities**

Lack of direct communication could lead to lower awareness and take-up of key Council services particularly in areas or among groups with lower levels of online access.

There is a risk that this could be detrimental to the image of the Council within communities, which could provide a drop in satisfaction levels.

---

**Service Users**

Residents may not be aware of services and Council developments. Without delivering information to every household within Oldham, there is no guarantee that everyone has received communication issued by the Council.

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

**Section 6****Supplementary Information**

N/A

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	<b>Yes / No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	Carl Marsden
By:	25/01/2016

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Carl Marsden
----------------------	--------------

## Equality Impact Assessment

### Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	Carl Marsden
People involved in completing EIA:	
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	<p>Yes No X</p> <p>Date of original EIA: 16/02/15</p>

### General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	Communications and Marketing
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Proposal to reduce spend on communication and marketing activity.
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	<p>To stop the publication of the council's newspaper – Borough Life and Family newsletter - Family Life and to reduce spend on internal communication which would achieve the following savings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Borough Life deletion £43k saving in 16/17</li> <li>• Family Life deletion £19k savings in 16/17</li> <li>• Discontinue the publication of Council tax leaflet from 17/18, £10k saving</li> <li>• Reduction in internal communication and events £31k in 16/17</li> </ul>
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	The council's Borough Life newspaper is delivered to every household in the borough four times a year. It is intended to inform residents about how their council tax is spent and how to access council services. Without Borough Life residents would have to rely on the council website and the local press for information about the

	<p>council.</p> <p>Readership of the Oldham Evening Chronicle has fallen 46% over the last five years and the Manchester Evening News has recently announced that it will no longer be publishing the Oldham Advertiser which will be replaced by a Manchester wide weekly newspaper with very little Oldham content.</p> <p>The number of residents with access to the internet in Oldham is growing steadily, however, some groups are less likely to have access including older people and those on lower incomes.</p> <p>A communications strategy reliant on digital could potentially make it more difficult for these groups to access information about the council and its services.</p>
--	--

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
<i>E.g. vulnerable residents, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**If the answer is “negative” or “not sure” consider doing a full EIA**

<p>1f. What do you think that the overall <b>NEGATIVE</b> impact on groups and communities will be?  <u>Please note that an example of none / minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or there will be no change to the service for any groups.</u>  Wherever a negative impact has been identified you should consider completing the rest of the form.</p>	<b>None / Minimal</b>	<b>Significant</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1h	How have you come to this decision?	If these publications were ceased then officers would work with members and stakeholders to find alternative methods of delivering the information. The equality groups identified – low income and particular age groups – would be targeted to improve their access to this information through focussed communication methods and through the use of our libraries and our digital inclusion programme.



## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV4</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	All
<b>Directorate:</b>	All
<b>Division:</b>	All
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	Anne Ryans – Director of Finance
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	All

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Savings through reducing newspapers, periodical, subscriptions and conference expenditure across the Council by 10%</b>
---------------	--

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£92k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£0k</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£92k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>N/A</b>

	<b>2016/17</b> <b>£k</b>	<b>2017/18</b> <b>£k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<p><b><u>Background:</u></b></p> <p><i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i></p>	<p>There is currently a total of £54k budgeted spend across the Council for periodicals and subscriptions, £22k in Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods &amp; £32k in Corporate and Commercial Services. By reducing budgets by 10%, it will drive managers to prioritise and spend efficiently on periodicals and subscriptions.</p> <p>A sum of £38K is budgeted for conferences across all portfolios. By reducing budget by 10% in 2016/17, it would require managers to review and prioritise conferences attended by their services, driving an efficient use of resources across the Council.</p>
--	---

<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	The saving across all portfolios would be £9k.
---	--

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	N/A
---	-----

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i>	N/A
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

#### **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Budgets across 16/17 budget adjusted	March 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Council Officers are not kept up-to-date on the latest developments and changes affecting their services.	Council Officers use a variety of methods to ensure they are aware of changes affecting the delivery of their services, including statutory and legislative changes. Other methods for keeping up-to-date will be utilised where conference are no longer attended and subscriptions ended.

---

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
--

N/A
-----

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
--

A 10% reduction in these budgets would have minimal impact on services' ability to deliver and would drive efficiency within the area.
--

<b><u>Organisation (other services)</u></b>
---

The impact is Council wide although minimal.
--

---

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

Members of staff may need to utilise different methods to keep up to date and ensure continued professional development.

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

N/A

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

---

## **Section 6**

### **Supplementary Information**

N/A

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Anne Ryans
----------------------	------------

## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV5</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Corporate and Commercial Services</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>People</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>People Services</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Cathy Butterworth – Assistant Director of People</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr J Turner - Performance &amp; Corporate Governance</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in sickness levels across the Council</b>
---------------	--

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£77,714k Staffing and agency across the Council</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£0</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£77,714k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>2142.3</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b><u>Background:</u></b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	<p>For 2015/16, it is estimated that 11 days per FTE will be taken as sickness, the equivalent of £2.3m of productive days lost based on the average salary for the Council.</p> <p>In frontline services, where employees are off sick, agency cover is needed and this creates an additional cost to the Council.</p> <p>It is proposed that work is undertaken to reduce the sickness level down to eight days per FTE, with work undertaken in areas</p>
---	--

	where sickness is covered by agency or overtime to reduce the cost to the Council.
<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	It is estimated that covering sickness will cost the Council £400k. By targeting a reduction in sickness in areas which use agency and overtime to cover sickness, it could generate a saving to the Council of £13k in 2016/17 and a further £13k in 2017/18

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	N/A
---	-----

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<p><b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	<b>Reduction in agency use, overtime and average contract length where sickness is being covered.</b>
<p><b><u>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</u></b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	N/A
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

#### **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Implementation	April 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Sickness is not reduced and the saving is not achieved.	Proactive intervention work will take place with managers and staff to support the reduction in sickness levels, along with the effective use of engagement and communications.



---

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
--

N/A
-----

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
--

N/A
-----

<b><u>Organisation (other services)</u></b>
---

N/A
-----

<b><u>Workforce</u></b>
-------------------------

<b>Note:</b> Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models
--

---

N/A

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

N/A

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

**Section 6**

**Supplementary Information**

N/A

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there **potential** for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:

	<b>State Yes / No against each line</b>
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No

Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
---------------------------------------	----

If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

### **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Cathy Butterworth
----------------------	-------------------

## **Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18**

### **Section 1**

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV6</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Corporate and Commercial Services</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>People</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>People Services</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Cathy Butterworth – Assistant Director of People</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr J Turner - Performance &amp; Corporate Governance</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Review the cost to the Council of Trade Union support in light of an ever decreasing workforce</b>
---------------	---

### **Section 2**

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£149k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£(7)k</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£142k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>4.2</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

### Section 3

<p><b><u>Background:</u></b></p> <p><i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i></p>	<p>To provide Trade Union facilities costs the Council £142k per annum, including accommodation, branch officers and parking costs.</p> <p>The Trade Union Facilities Agreement was reviewed and agreed in October 2013, which lead to a reduction in costs to the Council. The Facilities Agreement is agreed for a period of two years.</p> <p>Although the Facilities Agreement was agreed again at the same level in October 2015, it is felt that further costs reductions could be renegotiated.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>The Council's desire to renegotiate the Agreement would need to be taken to the next NJC Committee meeting in April 2016, and then consultation would start with the Trade Unions. The new agreement would then be taken to next NJC Committee meeting.</p> <p>Only partial years savings of £10k could potentially be achieved in 2016/17, with further full year savings of £30k in 2017/18.</p>

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>The savings will be dependent on the agreement of a revised Trade Unions Facilities Agreement at the NJC Committee meeting.</p>
---	--

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<p><b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	<b>1 FTE overall</b>
<p><b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Negative</b>

### Section 4

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Decision by the Council taken to the NJC Committee meeting	April 2016

Renegotiations start with Trade Unions	May 2016 onwards
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Management may not have the capacity to effectively renegotiate the agreement effectively.	Managers will be upskilled to support the renegotiation at a local level.
Collective bargaining may be reduced	Managers will be upskilled where needed.
Employee and employer relationships may be impaired.	Managers will be upskilled to manage relationships effectively.

### **Section 5**

#### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
If the provision of accommodation for Trade Unions is changed this may impact on Corporate Landlord.

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
Meaningful consultation needs to be undertaken to ensure that staff are still aligned to service objectives.
If the working hours of Trade Union Branch Officers are reduced, this may delay case work for members.

<b><u>Organisation (other services)</u></b>
---

---

Changes to Trade Union Facilities Agreement may result in cases/disputes taking longer to settle.

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

The workforce may feel less supported and motivated, and this may impact on the Council's ability to implement savings and service redesigns on time. It will need to be ensured that consultation takes place in a meaningful way.

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

---

The workforce may feel less motivated, which may impact on services provided. It will need to be ensured that consultation takes place in a meaningful way.

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

Trade Unions will be affected by the proposals.

**Section 6**

**Supplementary Information**

N/A

**Section 7**

**Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*



<b>NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.</b>	
<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	Required after the meeting with the NJC Committee in April 2016.
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
---------------	-----------------

---

EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

**Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Cathy Butterworth
----------------------	-------------------

## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV7</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Corporate and Commercial Services</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>People</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>People Services</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Cathy Butterworth – Assistant Director of People</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr J Turner - Performance &amp; Corporate Governance</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Review the use of Consultancy and Agency staff</b>
---------------	---

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£2,259k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£0</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£2,259k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>0</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b><u>Background:</u></b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	<p>The Council spent £3,023k on agency staff for the first nine months of 2015/16.</p> <p>It is proposed for the use of agency staff by services to be reviewed, to identify where savings can be made by analysing how agency staff are used across the Council and identifying the most cost effective way to carry out their duties.</p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>It is proposed that by analysing the use of agency staff, areas could be targeted to reduce agency costs, generating a savings of £10k in 2016/17 and a further £40k in 2017/18.</p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>If the reduction in agency costs is not targeted to the right areas, it could lead to further costs to the Council.</p>
---	--

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<p><b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	<p><b>0 FTE (directly employed)</b> <b>2 FTE (potentially of agency staff)</b></p>
<p><b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>
<p><b>Type of impact on partners</b></p>	<p><b>Neutral or marginal</b></p>

#### **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Start to analyse agency spend and identify areas to target	April 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b>Key Risks and Mitigations</b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
If reductions are not targeted, it could lead to higher staffing costs.	It will be ensured that reduction work is targeted to the areas where savings can be generated.
By reducing agency costs, frontline services are not carried out	It will be ensured that reduction work is targeted to the areas to ensure frontline services are not adversely affected as a result.
Key skills and duties are not covered.	It will be ensured that key skills and duties are still covered, through analysis work and targeted reductions.

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b>Property Implications</b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
N/A

<b>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</b>
N/A

---

**Organisation (other services)**

N/A

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

The workforce may increase as the use of agency staff reduces.

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

N/A

---

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

**Section 6**

**Supplementary Information**

N/A

**Section 7**

**Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Cathy Butterworth
----------------------	-------------------



## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV8</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Chief Executive</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Chief Executive</b>
<b>Division:</b>	<b>Communications and Marketing</b>
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	<b>Mark Reynolds - Director of Policy and Governance</b>
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	<b>Cllr J Turner- Performance &amp; Corporate Governance</b>

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in Communication and Marketing by restructuring and efficiencies</b>
---------------	---

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£1,088k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£959k</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£129k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>16</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<p><b><u>Background:</u></b></p> <p><i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i></p>	<p>The Communication and Marketing Team is supported by 16 members of staff, including Graphic Designers, Communication Officers and Marketing Officers.</p> <p>Given the size of the authority, it proposed that the Team could meet its aims and objectives through less staff, prioritising work on a value adding basis and working more effectively.</p>
--	---

<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>Reducing the Communication and Marketing Team by 2 FTE, would generate a £60k saving based on the average salary costs for the team.</p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>It would still need to be ensured that income targets are still achieved by prioritising work accordingly.</p>
---	---

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<p><b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	<b>2 FTE</b>
<p><b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	<b>N/A</b>
<p><b>Type of impact on partners</b></p>	<b>Neutral or marginal</b>

#### **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Start to implement restructure to take into account reduction of 2 FTE	March 2016 onwards
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
The Communication and Marketing Team will be unable to meet demand	Priorities will need to be reviewed and action taken accordingly to ensure statutory duties are carried out.

---

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
--

N/A
-----

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
--

The demand on the team is already significant which leads to delays in some areas. The impact on the service would depend on which posts are deleted.
---

<b><u>Organisation (other services)</u></b>
---

There may be a longer lead time for services from the Communication and Marketing Team.
---

<b><u>Workforce</u></b>
-------------------------

<b>Note:</b> Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models
--

---

N/A

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

N/A

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

---

## **Section 6**

<b><u>Supplementary Information</u></b>
N/A

## **Section 7**

<b><u>Consultation Information –</u></b> <i>This should include as a minimum the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?</i></li><li>• <i>Further consultation required?</i></li><li>• <i>Date consultation to be started and concluded</i></li></ul> <b>NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.</b>	
<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	To be undertaken if proposal approved
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	To be undertaken if proposal approved
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Mark Reynolds
----------------------	---------------

## Budget Saving Pro-forma 2016/17 and 2017/18

### Section 1

<b>Reference:</b>	<b>ALB SAV9</b>
<b>Portfolio</b>	All
<b>Directorate:</b>	All
<b>Division:</b>	All
<b>Responsible Officer and role:</b>	Anne Ryans – Director of Finance
<b>Shadow Cabinet Member and Cluster :</b>	All

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Reduce expenditure on supplies and services to all directorates which is an expansion of D019</b>
---------------	--

### Section 2

<b>2015/16 Budget for the section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£11,653k</b>
	<b>Income</b>	<b>£0k</b>
	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>£11,653k</b>
<b>Total posts numbers in section:</b> <i>(By Portfolio/Directorate/Division delete as appropriate):</i>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>N/A</b>

	<b>2016/17 £k</b>	<b>2017/18 £k</b>
<b>Proposed Financial saving:</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed reduction in FTE's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Section 3

<b><u>Background:</u></b>  <i>Brief description of the proposal ie: what will be different, how will changes be implemented, timescale for implementation</i>	<p>Controllable budget for supplies and services across the Council for 2016/17 is proposed to be £10,611k.</p> <p>This is a significant area of expenditure for the Council. It is therefore proposed to reduce the budget for supplies and services by 1% to drive services to work more efficiently and procure goods and services effectively.</p>
---	--

<p><b><u>Proposed Savings £k:</u></b></p> <p><i>Through efficiency, income generation, transformation, decommissioning, etc</i></p>	<p>Based on the proposed budget of £10,611k for 2016/17 for controllable spend on supplies and services, a 1% reduction would generate a saving of £106k.</p>
---	---

<p><b><u>Further Financial Implications &amp; Considerations</u></b></p> <p><i>ie Capital implications or invest to save, pump priming etc , variations to budget</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	------------

<b>Economic Impact Summary</b>	
<p><b>Total net FTE job losses (gains):</b> <i>(including Council, Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	N/A
<p><b>Total financial loss to partners (£k)</b> <i>(including Unity partnership, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, other partners, private sector)</i></p>	N/A
<p><b>Type of impact on partners</b></p>	Neutral or marginal

#### **Section 4**

<b><u>Key Milestones</u></b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Budget options approval	Full Council Meeting February 2016
Budgets across 16/17 budget adjusted	March 2016
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	January 2016

<b><u>Key Risks and Mitigations</u></b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Factor</b>
Savings are not achieved fully in 2016/17.	The achievement of the savings will be monitored and corrective action taken where needed.



---

## **Section 5**

### **What impact might the proposal have on the following?**

<b><u>Property Implications</u></b> <i>ie closures, maintenance costs, transfer of Assets, property savings, etc</i>
--

N/A
-----

<b><u>Service Delivery and future expected outcomes:</u></b>
--

A 1% reduction in these budgets would have minimal impact on the ability of services to deliver and would drive efficiency within the area.
---

<b><u>Organisation (other services)</u></b>
---

The impact, although Council wide, will have a minimal impact on individual services..
--

---

**Workforce**

*Note: Please detail here any direct or indirect impact on the employees beyond reduction in numbers, for example, changes working methods, job roles or delivery models*

N/A

**Communities**

N/A

**Service Users**

N/A

**Partner Organisations (Public & Private) inc Third Sector (Voluntary, Faith & Third Party Organisations)**

N/A

---

## **Section 6**

### **Supplementary Information**

N/A

## **Section 7**

### **Consultation Information –**

*This should include as a minimum the following:*

- *What has been consulted on so far? With whom and when?*
- *Further consultation required?*
- *Date consultation to be started and concluded*

**NB – All public consultations must be completed prior to approval by Cabinet/Council.**

<b>Trade Union Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Staff Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Public Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Service User Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Any other consultation</b>	N/A

---

## **Section 8**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

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

*If by answering yes to any of the question the screening has identified a potential disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

[http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality\\_impact\\_assessment\\_toolkit](http://intranet.oldham.gov.uk/downloads/file/124/equality_impact_assessment_toolkit)

EIA required:	Yes / <b>No</b>
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
By:	N/A

## **Section 9**

Responsible Officer:	Anne Ryans
----------------------	------------