

## Council

# Liberal Democrat's Budget Amendment Proposals 2017/18

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

**Officer Contact:** Shaer Halewood, Assistant Director of Finance

**1 March 2017**

---

## Reason for Decision

The report presents to Council the Liberal Democrat's suggested amendments to the Administration's Budget proposals for 2017/18 and offers some forward looking proposals to achieve savings in future years. The report also supports changes in the way the budget setting process is carried out to ensure more robust long term financial sustainability.

## Executive Summary

The report presents to Council a number of budget amendments to those already presented for the financial year 2017/18.

The reduction in 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 2017/18. The national proposal to allow Council's to increase Adult Social care Precept by up to 6% over a three year period to fund the budget gap on Adult Social Care is understood and accepted by the Liberal Democrats. The Administration proposes to increase Council Tax by 3.99% for 2017/18, representing a 1.99% general increase and a 2% adult social care precept is therefore supported by the Liberal Democrats.

This report proposes a number of investment proposals which can be considered individually or collectively. These proposals require initial investment that could potentially generate some offsetting savings in future years. This initial investment will be funded from a range of savings proposals put forward to offset the increased expenditure in the short term until any potential resulting saving arise. These are highlighted below:

<b>Opposition Budget - Investment proposals</b>		
<b>Para</b>	<b>Description of Proposal</b>	<b>£000</b>
3.2	Increase the number of a Gully Cleansing Teams to support the prevention of localised flooding	170
3.3	Remove the charge for removal of bulky waste to promote residents to dispose of their waste safely under the control of the Council	79
3.4	Establishment of a long term highways capital strategy to alleviate the backlog of approximately £5.6m gateway and secondary corridor highways works. (Part year effect £325k full year effect)	163
3.5	Enhanced Integrated and Targeted Youth Service Team	60
<b>Total Investment proposals for 2017/18</b>		<b>472</b>
<b>Opposition Budget - Savings proposals</b>		
<b>Para</b>	<b>Description of Proposal</b>	<b>£000</b>
3.6	Reduction in the number of publications/leaflets produced in hard copy	(10)
3.7	Reduction in the number of corporate subscriptions	(20)
3.8	More robust absence management procedures mitigating short term absence cover and reduced efficiency	(13)
3.9	Reduction in the value of Trade Union Support	(15)
3.10	Further reduction in the value of Agency Staff, Interims and Consultants	(50)
3.11	Further reduction in Supplies and Services as part of the Administration's Housekeeping savings proposal	(50)
3.12	Earlier resolution for disciplinary hearings resulting is less expenditure on paid suspensions	(3)
3.13	Reduction in the volume of hard copy committee papers	(5)
3.14	Further switching off or dimming of street lights in low risk areas to reduce energy costs	(100)
3.15	Generating additional income from fees or grants for Lifelong Learning activities	(1.5)
3.16	Reduce the advertising in the Oldham Chronicle for Lifelong Learning	(8)
3.17	Re-phasing of the capital programme to defer strategic capital projects to future years, resulting in a capital borrowing and operational expenditure saving ( <i>no proforma</i> )	0
3.18	Reduction in the Communication and Marketing Team and Strategic Partnership and Policy Team	(60)
3.19	Do not top up Public Health Grant fully and implement a phased reduction ( <i>no proforma</i> )	(398)
<b>Total Savings Proposals for 2017/18</b>		<b>(733.5)</b>
<b>Total Net Saving</b>		<b>(261.5)</b>
<i>(The balance to be used to underpin the saving on not topping up Public Health grant while the review of the functions that can be reduced or ceased takes place)</i>		

---

The report also considers savings proposals that could be delivered for 2018/19 to either reduce cost or generate income. These are listed in the table below:

Para	Description of Proposal	Type
4.1	Generation of income from highway advertising signs	Income
4.2	Reduction in the number of Councilors	Saving
4.3	Replacing traditional bulbs with LED in street lights	Invest to save
4.4	Further enforcement of driving in bus lanes	Invest to save

Following the presentation of proposals to Performance and Value for Money (PVFM) Scrutiny Committee on 7 February, the Committee did recommend to Cabinet that:

- a) There should continue to be robust monitoring of the Capital Programme.
- b) It considers the saving proposal of £0.060m with regard to the Communications and Marketing and the Strategic Partnerships and Policy teams with a corresponding investment in the Enhanced Integrated and Targeted Youth Service team.
- c) It might wish to consider proposals put forward for 2018/19 regarding highway advertising, street lighting and bus lane enforcement within the 2018/19 Administration's budget deliberations.

The report also proposes that a longer term budget setting view is undertaken in future years to ensure the continuing financial sustainability for the Council through a programme of wide ranging transformational projects, focused on outcomes, as opposed to the continued salami slicing of budgets that is evident in the proposals that have been agreed or proposed by the Administration for 2017/18.

To enable the period of sustained change, we support the four year Medium Term Financial Planning horizon from 2017/18 in line with the efficiency plan to enable a structured programme of change projects to be implemented and sustainable savings and benefits to be realised over the longer term.

## **Recommendations**

That Council agree the Investment and savings proposals as budget amendments for 2017/18.

That Council agree that the 2018/19 proposals are commenced immediately in order to generate savings in future years.

That Council agree a longer term Medium Term Financial Strategy to enable the budget to be managed by transformational change programmes focused on specific outcomes.

---

## **Budget Amendment Proposal 2017/18**

### **1 Background**

- 1.1 As austerity continues, so does the requirement for Local Government to make savings as a result of continued funding cuts. Although the economic climate has improved and people are recognising the need to take responsibility for themselves, service demand for the most vulnerable is increasing and these functions are the most resource intensive areas of the council. In an attempt to mitigate future funding cuts, the Administration has presented a series of savings proposals advising on how it proposes to deal with the budget gap in 2017/18.
- 1.2 In addition, a series of investments have been included within the budget report for 2017/18 to mitigate increased demand for services, inflationary increases, legislative changes and other budget pressures.
- 1.3 The Liberal Democrats recognise the difficult choices that need to be made to ensure a balance budget can be presented to Council and as a result accept all the Administration's savings proposals for 2017/18. We have some reservations over the investments included to offset pressures and we have considered these in paragraph 2.3.
- 1.4 We accept that austerity continues to have an impact on the environment in which Local Government operates and this has been evidenced by the extent of the reductions to the Revenue Support Grant over the next three years. We must anticipate that by the end of the next spending review that Revenue Support Grant will cease as a funding source and that the 100% Business Rates retention regime which will be introduced will require the Council to be more reliant on locally generated income.
- 1.5 The impact of the Greater Manchester devolution agenda is still emerging, with further responsibilities and opportunities for devolution for Greater Manchester. As work continues with our partners to integrate Health and Social Care, pressure is upon us to ensure we can support the most vulnerable in the most appropriate way while contributing to alleviate the £2bn Health and Social Care funding gap for the sectors across Greater Manchester by 2020.
- 1.6 National financial pressures such as the National Living Wage, the Apprenticeship levy and reductions in Education funding have a significant impact on our ability to meet the budget gap; coupled with demographic pressures within Children's and Adult Social Care render it inevitable to increase the Council tax in 2017/18.

### **2 Local Government Funding**

#### **2.1 Provisional Finance Settlement**

The final Local Government Finance Settlement was announced on 20 February 2017. The final settlement reflects the Government's multi-year settlement offer in relation to Revenue Support Grant funding for 2016/17 to 2019/20 that was confirmed to the Council on 16 November 2016 and was as a result of the submission of an Efficiency Plan.

---

Following the final settlement announcement, the Council will receive an additional £1.127m of one-off funding for Adult Social Care growth which will go some way to offsetting the Administration's pressure of £3m included within the budget for increased demand for the service in 2017/18.

## **2.2 Council Tax and Adult Social Care Precept**

In order to present a balanced budget, the Administration is proposing the maximum of 1.99% increase in Council Tax for 2017/18. As no additional funding was made available in the final Settlement for the Revenue Support Grant, over what the Council had anticipated, we accept the Administration's proposed Council Tax increase of 1.99% for 2017/18.

The settlement provides for the Adult Social Care Precept to be increased to 3% from 2017/18; however the total precept must not exceed 6% by the end of the three year spending review to 2019/20. Councils may choose to vary the increases within the three years as long as a 3% increase is not exceeded in any one year. The Administration is proposing to apply the Adult Social Care Precept evenly at a 2% increase over the next three years.

The service is facing significant pressures in 2017/18, not least a £2.5m overall impact as a result of the National Living Wage, part of which will affect Adult Social Care. Therefore we accept the Administration's proposal to increase the Adult Social Care Precept by 2% in 2017/18.

## **2.3 Proposed funded budget pressures**

2.3.1 In preparing the budget for 2017/18, the Administration is proposing to fund a series of pressures. We have considered these pressures and while we concur with the majority of them we are not fully supportive of the following:

- **Support for Public Health £796k – not supported**

We do not support funding of this pressure. The reduction in Public Health grant should be met with a reduction in service and should not be topped up. We recommend that that this pressure should only be funded at 50% in 2017/18 and then not funded at all from 2018/19 as a phased approach to not topping up the funding for this service. In order for the service to review which functions of Public Health should be reduced or ceased, we will underpin the reduction in 2017/18 with the balance of our savings proposals submitted as a one of reserve in anticipation that it will take some time to review all the functions. Further underpinning of this can be undertaken with the Council's Public Health reserve is necessary.

- **End of Terms and Conditions saving £2,000k**

This net pressure is £913k as it is offset by a compensating saving of £1,083k as the majority of the changes to the original terms and conditions remain. We support the funding for this; however we recommend that other areas of terms and conditions are looked at to an equivalent value from the pay line to make further savings in future years.

---

2.3.2 When undertaking the review of the budget for the 2018/19 budget, we would request that specific regard is had to the following:

- **Apprenticeship Levy £400k**

The Apprenticeship levy comes into force in April 2017 with consultation closing on 3 February 2017. We support fully funding this pressure for 12 months only until the full impact of the consultation responses are known as this may result in changes being made in the future.

- **Home to School Transport £350k**

The home to school transport funding alleviates an ongoing pressure as a result of an increase in pupils and out of borough placements. We support fully funding for this for 12 months only pending a further review of the service and more robust challenge at appeals.

- **Impact of changes in Education funding £494k**

The pressure relates to changes to Education funding arising from changes to the use of Dedicated Schools Grant. We would support fully funding this pressure for 12 months only pending a further review of the relevant services impacted by the change.

- **Impact of changes in Early Years funding £600k**

The pressure is in response to a change in legislation for Early Years funding, which specifies that the Council must passport 93% of funding directly to providers. We would support fully funding this pressure for 12 months only in anticipation of a service review during the year to assess the full impact of the change.

### **3. 2017/18 Detailed Proposals**

3.1 We are proposing a number of specific budget amendments to be considered by Council members this year. These are split into:

- Investment proposals where we consider some initial financial investment in the immediate term may deliver compensating and further cashable and non-cashable savings in the medium term.
- Savings proposals where we consider individual service areas can make new or additional savings next year in order to fund to the Investment proposals.

#### **Investment Proposals**

3.2 **Increase the number of Gully Cleaning Teams £170k**

Providing additional investment to increase the number of Gully Cleansing Teams would potentially result in the service reacting to a flood situation more quickly due to increased capacity. Inclement and sudden adverse weather can put

---

significant pressure on the gullies throughout the Borough and can result in extreme flooding for which the impact cannot always be anticipated in advance. Therefore it is important to have 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 proposal is to provide pump priming funding to support an additional 4 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) posts and one gully wagon.

This will allow the teams to work cyclically cleaning gullies across the borough as part of the annual maintenance programme, and to work reactively, ensuring any unforeseen issues are dealt with quickly. Through the efficient use of vehicles with the teams working on a shift basis, the cost to the Council of this investment can be minimised.

### **3.3 Remove the charge for disposal of Bulky Waste £79k**

Imposing a charge for the disposal of bulky waste could be a deterrent for some of the public to have this waste disposed of safely under the Council's control. This may encourage fly tipping which can be more costly to dispose of, can pose a health and safety hazard to the public and is detrimental to public realm. Enabling the public to have their bulky waste disposed of safely and in a controlled manner free of charge will mitigate this undesirable impact. The proposal will result in lost income of £79k from bulky waste collections per year.

### **3.4 Highways capital investment £163k**

It is proposed to invest an extra £5.6m in 2017/18 on a targeted programme of capital works to remove the backlog of gateway and secondary corridor work. The revenue implication of borrowing will be £325k per year over the 25 financing period. It is anticipated that due to the capital work required that only half year investment is required in 2017/18 at a cost of £163k.

### **3.5 Enhanced Integrated and Targeted Youth Service Team £60k**

The additional funding would allow the team to enhance the current offer by employing more part time and sessional staff. This would specifically allow much needed additional cover sessions at weekends when more staff on the streets are really required. The team is generally seeing more issues across the Borough with larger groups of young people congregating causing Anti-Social Behaviour and involved in risky behaviour. The team can be extremely stretched covering multiple locations with a limited team. Additional funding would go directly into increasing the staffing resource to support this. When this investment was scrutinised by PVFM Select Committee on 7 February they made a recommendation that the Cabinet consider alongside the corresponding saving detailed in paragraph 3.18.



---

## **Savings Proposals**

### **3.6 Reduction in the number of publications/leaflets produced in hard copy £10k**

We are aware of the Administration's proposal to save £150k on housekeeping however we feel that a further £10k could be saved specifically on reducing hard copy publications and printing leaflets. As the Council moves to more digital communications we propose that an additional £10k could be saved on printing costs across the organisation.

### **3.7 Reduction in the number of corporate subscriptions £20k**

The Council holds a number of subscriptions for publications, magazine, websites etc. across its various Directorates. We recommend a review of these with a view to making a small saving of £20k. There is a chance that more than one Directorate subscribe to the same publication/magazine and this should be reviewed and rationalised. We would also like considered whether there is an opportunity to share subscriptions across Greater Manchester or our closest neighbours via a regional subscription to enable saving across authorities.

### **3.8 More robust absence management procedures mitigating short term absence cover and reduced efficiency £13k**

It is estimated that overall sickness notionally costs the Council £2.304m. The council has introduced further rigour into the managing absence process and has an established Fit for Oldham programme in place. Therefore we feel that additional savings could be made from reducing the average sickness per FTE.

Some of the savings realised could be re-invested into a new approach to be adopted by the Council similar to other Local Authorities whereby the first call from an employee who is off sick is to a nurse who is qualified to ask specific questions of the employees absence and recommend alternative solutions to being off sick or to reduce the length of sickness. In Watford Council's case they have seen a 44% reduction in absence with a rolling 12 month absence rate of 2.04%. Last year we proposed a saving of £13k from the 2017/18 budget and as a result of the more robust processes described above we still feel that this could be achievable.

### **3.9 A reduction in Trade Union Support £15k**

The process for supporting Trade Unions is reviewed on a two yearly basis with the next review due in September 2017. We believe that a reduction in 0.5 F.T.E can be achievable which will generate £15k savings for 2017/18.

### **3.10 A further reduction in the expenditure on Agency Staff, Interims and Consultants 50k**

Agency staff are staff that are used to cover short term absences e.g. while vacant posts are being filled, sickness cover etc. and they cover an already established post that is budgeted for. They usually cost more than the employee as they



---

include Agency on-costs, and if engaged via the Agency framework, an on-cost for the framework provider.

Interims are staff that are used to cover vacant posts, usually while considering whether to fill the post or not, or to restructure. They can cover for long term absences e.g. long term sickness or maternity leave. They can be used to cover an already established post or a new post while a wider review of a service or structure is being undertaken. They can be engaged via a number of ways e.g. an agency placement, a self-employed contract, a recruitment process or acting up arrangement. Depending on the method of engagement the cost can vary.

Consultants are staff engaged on a specific project or piece of work, usually time limited. They do not cover an already established post and are usually brought in for their expertise that is lacking from within. They can be engaged on grant funded projects and capital projects where their costs are recharged to the particular project or on invest to save projects where their cost is offset by a later saving. They can also be engaged on projects that do not have any offsetting funding or saving and this will usually be for a specific piece of work e.g. to assess the impact of something i.e. a new piece of legislation.

The proposal is to reduce the costs of agency staff and Interims where their costs are higher than those that are budgeted for established posts. The Administration has submitted a proposal to reduce the value of external support staff by £100k and we recommend that a further £50k could be saved from a further reduction in Agency staff and Interims.

### **3.11 Further reduction in supplies and services £50k**

The Administration has submitted a proposal to reduce Housekeeping by £150k from a range of services e.g. publications, stationery, printing, refreshments etc. This represents around 7.5% of the overall supplies and services budgets. We are proposing that an additional £50k could be found taking the reduction to 10% without detriment.

As the general public are demanding we go more digital we believe that internal meeting papers can be provided electronically to demonstrate our commitment to hearing the view of the public. As the officers in the Council move to full digital and agile working, there will be a minimal need for stationery and printing. We recommend that refreshments are only provided in meetings with external delegates and that no catering should be provided for Officers or Councillors before or after meetings.

### **3.12 Earlier resolution for disciplinary hearings resulting in less expenditure on paid suspensions £3k**

Over the past 5 years an average of £40k per year has been paid in staff salaries to staff that are on suspension while awaiting the progression of their case. An earlier and swifter resolution to disciplinary hearings would result in cashable and non-cashable savings. Not all posts are backfilled for suspension; generally only 20% are backfilled and are those relating to the front line. An estimate of £3k cashable

---

savings pro rata across the Council could be realised as a result of an earlier resolution with a much higher further % relating to efficiency gains.

### **3.13 Reduction in the volume of hard copy committee papers £5k**

As the public expectation and requirement is that the Council becomes more digital, as Members we must lead by example wherever possible and reduce printing external committee papers. Reports on some public meeting agendas can be quite lengthy as sometimes publications, appendices and background documents that Members are asked to consider in taking a decision or approve are printed with the meeting papers. All committee papers are available electronically as a matter of course and are sent via the Modern.gov system to Members for each meeting they attend.

We appreciate that it not always possible to be fully digitalised but where appropriate printing of committee papers can be reduced. We recommend a review of these papers to be undertaken with a view to making savings of £5k in 2017/18.

### **3.14 Street Lighting £100k**

The Council has installed street lights that can be dimmed as and when required. From January 2016 lights were dimmed by 50% and 25% in various areas during various times. British Standards lighting design recommends that street lights should be dimmed in steps of 25%. Therefore where the street lights can be further dimmed by 25% we recommend that this is actioned giving a saving of around £100k per year.

### **3.15 Generating additional income from fees or grants for Lifelong Learning activities £1.5k**

The Service increases their fees and charges for lifelong learning activities at the start of the academic year and from September could increase their fees by 2%. A full year impact of this would generate an additional £3k income with a part year effect in 2017/18 of £1.5k.

### **3.16 Reduce the adverts for Lifelong Learning in the Oldham Chronicle £8k**

The Service uses a variety of methods to advertise new courses. These include advertising in their Focus on Learning brochure, Twitter, Facebook, Team Brief and Oldham Chronicle. They utilise printxchange and will be using Job Skilla in the future. The main purpose of advertising is to stimulate interest within the local community thereby increasing course attendances and associated revenue. The spend for advertising from April 2016 to December 2017 was £8k so for a full year is assumed to be £11k of which  $\frac{3}{4}$  could be saved by reducing the adverts In the Chronicle to once a year.

---

**3.17 Re-phasing of the capital programme to defer strategic capital projects to future years, resulting in capital borrowing and operational expenditure saving £0k (*no savings proforma*)**

The Administration has made savings of £1.483m as a result of re-phasing capital projects into later years. We are pleased that this exercise had been completed and agreed, especially in light of recent longer term changes to the capital programme. However we would like to ensure that this continues to be robustly monitored during the year to enable continuous future re-profiling in order that further savings can be made.

**3.18 Reduction in the Communication and Marketing Team and Strategic Partnership and Policy Team £60k**

The proposal is to reduce the Communications and Marketing Team and Strategic Partnership and Policy Team by 2 Full Time Equivalent staff in total, resulting in a permanent saving of £60k. This saving was scrutinised by PVFM Select Committee on 7 February and the Committee asked that the Cabinet consider it within the budget proposals for 2017/18.

**3.19 Not funding the Public Health top up as a result of government grant cuts £398k (*no savings proforma*)**

As described in paragraph 2.3 we do not support the top up for Public Health grant. Where Government grant funding is cut we should ensure corresponding cuts are made across the service to mitigate the impact on other services across the Council. Therefore we recommend that only a 50% top up is provided in 2017/18 reducing to zero from 2018/19. We will however be prepared to underpin the savings with the balance of our proposals while the review of the functions that can be reduced or ceased takes place in anticipation that it will take some time to come to fruition. Further underpinning of this can be undertaken with the Council's Public Health reserve as necessary.

**4. Proposals for 2018/19 Budget**

In addition to the savings proposals for 2017/18, we are recommending a series proposals for 2018/19 in order to make savings or generate income to support the future year's budget. Due to the lead in time for these proposals, it is imperative that work is commenced on these immediately so that a full year's saving can be realised in 2018/19.

**4.1 Generation of Income from highway advertising signs**

The proposal is to erect further advertising signs in strategic areas e.g. A627m, By-Pass and main roundabout. Other Council's use advertising in this way and either use static or rolling and digital advertising, which enables more than one advertiser at any time. The Council could generate additional income from the additional advertising to support the financial sustainability of the Council's budget.

---

In order to consider new advertising there would be a long lead in time to any income being generated. Therefore it is recommended that the Council commence a project to undertake this in order that income can be generated from 2018/19. This was supported by PFVM Select Committee on 7 February 2017

#### **4.2 Reduction in the number of Councillors**

The proposal is to reduce the number of elected members from 60 to 40. The current basic allowance is £9,239 per annum and therefore this would represent a saving of £184,780 per annum. The proposal would take at least 12 months to come to fruition and would be dependent on Boundary Commission timescales. Therefore the proposal should be commenced immediately so that savings can be achieved in 2018/19.

#### **4.3 Replacing traditional street lighting bulbs with LED's**

We propose a phased programme of change of using LED's instead of conventional lighting bulbs which are more energy efficient and require less maintenance. This proposal would require contract renegotiation and agreement and would not come to fruition until at least 2018/19 due to the long lead in time. We recommend that the Council commence negotiations with the service provider to support the installation of LED's in order to generate savings in 2018/19. This was supported by PFVM Select Committee on 7 February 2017

#### **4.4 Further enforcement of driving in bus lanes**

The Council has a number of bus lanes and the Administration has included a proposal to enforce contravention of two bus lanes. However we would recommend this is rolled out to include all bus lanes within the Borough, as TFGM have requested. A recent report from Preston Council who have enforced contravention of their bus lanes stated that they issued £1.3m in fines in the first two months to 23,000 drivers at £60 per fine, and of this 16,000 drivers had already paid their fine. We expect that additional costs will be associated with enforcing all bus lane contraventions e.g. capital costs of installing cameras and that a lead in time will apply. As a result we would expect that this would not take effect until 2018/19 but we would recommend the Council to commission this work now in order for it to progress. This was supported by PFVM Select Committee on 7 February 2017

### **5. Proposed changes to the budget setting process**

- 5.1 The Council has received a four year funding settlement from the Government following its efficiency plan submission covering the period 2016 to 2020. It is anticipated that assuming no further changes that over the four year period to the end of 2021 the budget gap will be £39m. The Council's current budget setting process looks at the 2 year timeframe 2017/18 to 2018/19, although the current budget round has identified few savings for 2018/19. This is not effective for the long term financial sustainability of the council and there are no longer any low hanging fruit to be taken. The current 'salami slicing' of budgets is not sustainable and the Council needs a firm plan of change to deliver transformational savings to support its priority outcomes over the next four years.

---

5.2 By their nature, long term transformational savings take time to come to fruition and can involve projects such as new build, acquisitions, alternative service delivery vehicles, substantial regeneration and a significant step change to tackle demand. We support a three year programme of transformation following the principles set out in the Council's Efficiency Plan approved in September 2016, with a series of change projects led by senior officers within the Council that delivers:

- A programme of significant savings from doing things differently
- Future and sustainable income generation
- Economic benefits to promote the borough
- A programme of new builds that considers non-social housing, the needs of the ageing population and the most vulnerable and social hubs that combine a variety of Council services in one accessible place
- Cost avoidance measures by investing to avoid future pressures
- Services via an alternative provision where relevant to release capacity, increase efficiency and potentially deliver savings

5.3 This will ensure the Council continues to have a robust long term plan for financial sustainability. In determining its priority outcomes, future resources can be targeted to highest priority areas with consideration of whether lower priority functions should still be provided at all or in the same way.

5.4 Clarity of the cost of providing the Council's statutory functions would help any ongoing budget review.

## **6. Director of Finance Comments**

6.1 I confirm in my role as Responsible Officer under Section 151 of the Local Government Act that the budget amendments as presented are robust and deliverable.

6.2 As it is an alternative set of budget options the opportunity for testing the risks associated with the proposals are more limited and it is therefore necessary to afford a level of caution in presenting these alternatives.

## **7. Options/Alternatives**

To consider the investment proposals and savings proposals for 2017/18 and the savings proposals for 2018/19. The options are to accept all or any of the proposals or not.

## **8. Consultation**

8.1 Service Managers have been involved in compiling the proposals and the proposals have been agreed within the content of the business cases attached at Appendix A.

## **9. Financial Implications**

9.1 The financial implication are included within the report.

---

## 10. **Legal Services Comments**

10.1 None at this time.

## 11. **Co-operative Agenda**

11.1 Savings proposals have been considered in conjunction with the Councils Co-operative Agenda and there are no adverse impacts.

## 12. **Human Resources Comments**

12.1 Any proposed revisions to employment policy and protocol must be fully considered and consulted upon 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

## 13. **Risk Assessments**

13.1 The risks of deliverability have been considered and are thought to be minimal at this stage.

## 14. **IT Implications**

14.1 There are no specific IT requirements associated with the proposals that have not already been considered.

## 15. **Property Implications**

15.1 There are no specific property implications associated with the proposals.

## 16. **Procurement Implications**

16.1 Any procurement implications will be considered as and when any procurement decisions are required if the proposals are accepted. There are no immediate adverse procurement implications associated with the proposals.

## 17. **Environmental and Health & Safety Implications**

17.1 There are no adverse environmental or Health and Safety implications associated with the proposals.

---

18. **Equality, community cohesion and crime implications**

18.1 There are no equality, community cohesion and crime implications associated with the proposals.

19. **Equality Impact Assessment Completed**

19.1 These are not required at the present time for these proposals.

20. **Key Decision**

20.1 No.

21. **Key Decision Reference**

21.1 Not a Key Decision.

22. **Background Papers**

22.1 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:	Shaer Halewood
Contact No:	0161 770 2171

23. **Appendices**

23.1 Appendix A: Savings proposals business cases.





# **Appendix 1**

## **Opposition proposals**

## Section A

<b>Responsible Officer :</b>	<b>Craig Dale</b>
<b>Support Officer :</b>	

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Highways Operations</b>
<b>Budget Investment Title:</b>	To increase the provision of gully teams within the Borough

### Opposition Budget Investment Proposal :

This proposal is to increase the number of Gully teams to invest in the upkeep of neighbourhoods and to reduce problems with drainage.

The proposed investment would give greater efficiency of cleaning over and above the recommended standard.

In the event of a flood event it is envisaged that the service would be able to deal with the situation more quickly due to the increased capacity.

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
<b>Controllable</b>	4,142	(721)	3,421
<b>Non-Controllable</b>	545	0	545
<b>Total Revenue Budget</b>	4,687	0	3,966
<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>			(44)

<b>Number of posts (Full time equivalent)</b>	<b>54</b>
---	-----------

2017/18	£000
<b>Proposed Investment</b>	<b>170</b>

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

The proposal is to increase the number of Gully teams to invest in the up keep of neighbourhoods and reduce problems with drainage. This would also assist with the annual maintenance programme

Cost of investment would include 4FTE Grade 4 posts and one Gully Wagon – at a cost of £170K

There will be no impact on other services.

**Who are the key stakeholders?**

Oldham Borough Residents  
Highways Operation Staff  
Oldham Borough Council

**Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements**

Residents would have an improved service, with speedier response to blocked gullies and drainage issues. There should be fewer flooding issues  
Highways Operations would have additional resources to improve performance and responses times to blockage and flooding incidents. The extra resources will assist with the general maintenance programme  
The improved service will reflect favourably on the Council.

## Section C

**Key Risks and Mitigations**

Risk	Mitigation
Without the additional Team, it may not be possible to operate a fully efficient response service to flooding incidents	Impossible to predict Weather and number of incidents.
Without investment the service may be unable to complete its cyclical maintenance of gullies	Prioritisation of Maintenance according to need

**Key Development and Delivery Milestones**

Milestone	Timeline
Reduction in number of blocked gully/flooding reports	Within First Year of Operation

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

<b>Property</b>
There is a potential to reduce the incidents of flooding to properties, if gullies are regularly maintained. Reports of flooding will have potentially quicker response, and therefore less damage to properties
<b>Service Delivery</b>
Highways Operations will be able to respond to incidents more promptly and will have additional resources to undertake ongoing upkeep and maintenance of gullies
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
Quicker Response times Improved general Maintenance
<b>Organisation</b>

Highways Operations would have additional resources to improve performance and responses times to blockage and flooding incidents. The extra resources will assist with the general maintenance programme

#### **Workforce**

The proposal is for an additional 4 FTE Grade 4 employees

#### **Communities**

There should be fewer flooding issues, and a quicker response to incidents

#### **Service Users**

Residents would have an improved service, with speedier response to blocked gullies and drainage issues.

There should be fewer flooding issues, and a quicker response to incidents

#### **Partner Organisations**

The Environmental Agency offer advice and funding for flooding incidents – we will be able to demonstrate efficient and proactive practice in management of potential flooding incidents

**Consultation required?**

**No**

#### **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

**EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)**

**No**

#### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>0</b>

## Section A

Responsible Officer :	<b>Carol Brown/ Craig Dale</b>
Support Officer :	

Service Area :	<b>Waste Management Service</b>
Budget Investment Title:	<b>Remove the charge for bulky waste collection</b>

### Opposition Budget Investment Proposal :

At present, the Council levy's a charge on residents for taking away and tipping Bulky items. The proposal is to remove this charge, forego the income generated and thereby make larger savings elsewhere through the reduction in the level of Fly Tipping and subsequent clean-up operations. The proposal infers that some residents may resort to fly tipping their bulky items rather than paying the Council charge.

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	5,129	(1,428)	3,701
Non-Controllable	901	-	901
Total Revenue Budget	6,030	(1,428)	4,602
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			4,602

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	107.8
--	-------

2017/18	£000
Proposed Investment	<b>79</b>

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

#### Impact of introducing a Household Bulky Waste charge on Fly-tipping volumes

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 A charge was introduced for residents using the bulky waste collection service in April 2013. The current charging rate is £17 for 3 items plus £9 for each additional item. A free collection service is offered to any residents on the council's assisted collection database.
- 1.2 The bulky collection contract is held by Bulky Bob's Ltd. The contractual payment amount is £283.2k per annum. The contract is now in its final year of operation (4 years plus 1 arrangement) and will be subject to the Council's procurement conditions in due course.
- 1.3 The charge for bulky waste collection is forecast to generate income of £79.3k in 2016/17

(2015/16 £75.3k). As the figures show, the income generated from customers is significantly less than the cost of providing the service and the Council therefore subsidises this shortfall.

- 1.4 Oldham was the last authority in Greater Manchester to introduce charging for bulky waste collections. There is little consensus in the level of charging across the region with each authority setting its own rates of charge according to local conditions and priorities. Only a handful of authorities in England still provide a free bulky waste collection service. Anecdotally, this number is thought to be no more than 10.

## 2. Monitoring the Impact of Charging

- 2.1 Waste Management Services continued to monitor the impact of the new charging regime at various stages until as late as January 2016. This included an assessment of whether the introduction of charges had led to an increase in fly-tipping.
- 2.2 Table 1 shows the impact on Bulky Waste volumes including recycling and land fill tonnages.

Table 1

### **Bulky Waste Collection Service 2012/13 v 2015/16**

Item	2012/13	2015/16	Reduction
Number of Collections (Thousands)	25	7	(18)
Collected Tonnage	1,354	402	(952)
Sent to Landfill Tonnage	895	247	(648)
Recycled Tonnage	459	155	(304)
Sent to Landfill as a % of Collected	66%	61%	
Recycling as a % of Collected	34%	39%	

- 2.3 The table above shows that demand for bulky waste collections has fallen from approximately 25k p.a. to 7k p.a. Whilst there has been a commensurate reduction in collected tonnages, the comparative percentage of recycled goods has increased by about 5% to 39%. This increase is probably due to the fact that more goods are now collected from inside properties rather than being left outside and open to the elements.
- 2.4 Table 2 below shows the volume of Fly-Tipped/Street Cleaning Waste collected from 2012/13 (the year before the tariff regime was introduced) until 2015/16.

Table 2

### **Fly Tipping/Street Cleaning (2012/13 to 2015/16)**

Item	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Collected Tonnage	5,792	5,508	4,960	2,591
Cumulative Reduction v 2012/13	-	(284)	(832)	(3,201)

- 2.5 Fly Tipped and Street Cleaning Waste figures are combined because both types of waste are collected as part of the same operational activity.
- 2.6 As can be seen from the above table, the volume of fly tipped waste has fallen over the review period by 3.2k tonnes p.a. cumulatively. This downturn is thought to be closely linked to the Council's Changing Behaviours Programme.
- 2.7 This downward trend runs counter to the premise that introducing bulky waste charging would lead to an increase in fly tipping.



**Who are the key stakeholders?**

Residents

**Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements**

Free of charge service to residents. Favourable for the organisation

## Section C

**Key Risks and Mitigations**

Risk	Mitigation
N/A	N/A

**Key Development and Delivery Milestones**

Milestone	Timeline
N/A	N/A

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

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
N/A
Future expected outcomes
N/A
Organisation
N/A
Workforce
N/A

<b>Communities</b>
N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>No</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

### **Equality Impact Screening**

**Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?**

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>0</b>

## Section A

Responsible Officer :	<b>Craig Dale</b>
Support Officer :	

Service Area :	<b>Highways</b>
Budget Investment Title:	<b>Highways capital investment</b>

### Opposition Budget Investment Proposal :

To used capital funded from borrowing to carry out the backlog of gateway and secondary corridor highways works

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	*	*	*
Non-Controllable	*	*	*
Total Revenue Budget	*	*	*
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			

\* No revenue budget for Highways Capital

<b>2017/18</b>	<b>£000</b>
Proposed Investment	<b>163</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	<b>£000</b>
Proposed Investment	<b>162</b>

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

To undertake highways capital investment funded by borrowing to alleviate the backlog of Gateway and Secondary corridor work in 2017/18. The cost of borrowing £5.6m backlog funding required over 25 years would equate to £325k per year. It is not anticipated that all highways works could be carried out in 2017/18 as a phased programme would be required so an estimate of a half year effect is included for borrowing costs of £163k.

### Who are the key stakeholders?

Highways users

<b>Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements</b>
Improved Highways across the Borough

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
N/A	N/A

### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
N/A
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
N/A
<b>Organisation</b>
N/A
<b>Workforce</b>
N/A
<b>Communities</b>
N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>

N/A

Consultation required?

No

### **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, 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 and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)

No

### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)	0
Total financial loss to partners	0
Type of impact on partners	0

## Section A

<b>Responsible Officer :</b>	<b>Neil Consterdine</b>
<b>Support Officer :</b>	

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Public Health, Youth and Leisure</b>
<b>Budget Investment Title:</b>	<b>Enhanced Detached Youth Service Team</b>

### Opposition Budget Investment Proposal:

Detached Youth Work is a model of youth work practice, targeted at vulnerable young people, which takes place on young people's own territory. It is mostly street based work.

It begins from where young people are in terms of their values, attitudes, issues and ambitions and is concerned with their personal and social development. It is characterised by purposeful interaction between youth workers and young people and utilises a range of youth and community work methods.

The Detached Youth Service team would be enhanced so that additional sessions could be held to address the issues of anti-social behaviour within the borough of Oldham by working with young people and the community.

<b>2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>Exp £000</b>	<b>Income £000</b>	<b>Net £000</b>
<b>Controllable</b>	137	0	137
<b>Non-Controllable</b>	30	(26)	4
<b>Total Revenue Budget</b>	167	(26)	141
<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>			0

<b>Number of posts (Full time equivalent)</b>	<b>3.83fte</b>
---	----------------

<b>2017/18</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>Proposed Investment</b>	<b>60</b>

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

The Detached Youth Team is a small team of 2 full time and 3 part time staff and 1 Sessional member of staff. Detached work is a model of youth work practice delivered in Oldham by specialist, highly trained youth workers, targeted at vulnerable young people. This work takes place on young people's own territory including places such as parks, streets; canals etc. and they are led by young people at times that are appropriate to them. The team deliver community reassurance, reduce Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) through positive intervention, deliver targeted workshops and encourage a better understanding of young people.

The team work closely with a range of partner agencies including, Police, Early Help, specialist teams etc. They deliver a variety of work including targeted one to one support, generic sessions, response work and support annual community events. The team promote community cohesion, participation, and develop positive relationships with young people.

The additional funding would allow the team to enhance the current offer by employing more part time and sessional staff. This would specifically allow much needed additional cover sessions at weekends when more staff on the streets are really required. The team is generally seeing more issues across the Borough with larger groups of young people congregating causing ASB and involved in risky behaviour. The team can be extremely stretched covering multiple locations with a limited team. Additional funding would go directly into increasing the staffing resource.

### Who are the key stakeholders?

Elected members  
Young People  
The Police

### Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Increase staffing which would allow the team to work with more young people in different locations.  
Improve contact time and further develop a quality Youth Work offer rather than just a response. In particular the ability to work with some of our more challenging young people  
Reduction in reports of ASB

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Enhancing the team from its current staffing structure would not have any significant risk and would only support more effective working and generally support the more challenging circumstance the Detached Team more often find themselves in.	



## Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
The key milestone would be the approval of any additional spend and subsequent appointment of staff	April 2017

## What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
Improved service delivery via an increased offer
Future expected outcomes
Improved support to young people Reduction in ASB
Organisation
Support wider need for early intervention
Workforce
Greater flexibility to cover key issues
Communities
Improved support
Service Users
Additional support given to young people who are often our most vulnerable
Partner Organisations
Additional capacity to deliver partnership work with key agencies such as the Police.

Consultation required?	No
------------------------	----

## Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
-----------------	----

<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

#### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	0
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	0
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	0

## Section A

<b>Responsible Officer :</b>	<b>No specific individual officer</b>
<b>Support Officer :</b>	

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Communications across all Council areas</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>A reduction in the number of publications and leaflets</b>

<b>Opposition Budget Reduction Proposal and Objectives :</b>
To reduce the number of publications and leaflets that the Council produces in hard copy format

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	*	*	*
Non-Controllable	*	*	*
Total Revenue Budget	*	*	*
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			*

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000	Proposed Staffing Reductions
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	10	2017/18 Full Time Equivalent
Additional reductions in future years?	0	2018/19 Full Time Equivalent
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	0	

\* Budgets for publications and leaflets are held in a range of areas across the Council.

## Section B

<b>Further detail on the proposal</b>
<p>To extend the Administration's proposal of £150k saving on Housekeeping for the element of publications and leaflets. We recognise also that savings have been put forward as savings on Borough Life (2017/18 only) and Council Tax information.</p> <p>As the public requires us to become more digital we feel that there is less of a need to print items for public usage. We already use social media to advertise and hold electronic copies of most, if not all of our publications on the Internet. We recommend that further savings could be made by not producing hard copies of publications, especially in glossy, colour and photographic format. This is not restricted to corporate communications but applies to all leaflets and publications that the Council produces</p>

**Who are the key stakeholders?**

Users of leaflets & publications

**Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements**

Less strain on other areas of the organisation to make savings. Quicker access for the public and immediate updating on-line for any changes whereas hard copies can be quickly out of date and inaccurate

## Section C

**Key Risks and Mitigations**

Risk	Mitigation
Not all the public will be able to access on-line publications	A number of documents will always be available in hard copy for equality purposes

**Key Development and Delivery Milestones**

Milestone	Timeline
From 1 April when publications come up for renewal, each one will be considered separately	As and when needed to be reproduced

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

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
N/A
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
N/A
<b>Organisation</b>
N/A
<b>Workforce</b>

N/A
<b>Communities</b>
N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>No</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

### **Equality Impact Screening**

**Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?**

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>0</b>

## Section A

Responsible Officer :	No specific officer
Support Officer :	

Service Area :	Communications
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduction in the number of corporate subscriptions

Opposition Budget Reduction Proposal and Objectives :
To review and reduce the number of subscriptions across the Council or join up with other GM Authorities for a regional subscription at a reduced rate

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	*	*	*
Non-Controllable	*	*	*
Total Revenue Budget	*	*	*
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			*

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions		£000	Proposed Staffing Reductions	
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18		20	2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	0
Additional reductions in future years?		0	2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19		0		

\* Subscriptions budgets are held in a range of areas across the whole Council

## Section B

Further detail on the proposal
The Council holds a number of subscriptions for publications, magazine, websites etc across its various Directorates. We recommend a review of these with a view to making a small saving of £20k. There is a chance that more than one Directorate subscribe to the same publication/magazine and this should be reviewed and rationalised. We would also like considered whether there is an opportunity to share subscriptions across Greater Manchester or our closest neighbours via a regional subscription to enable saving across authorities.
A negotiation could also be entered into with the subscription body as to whether a discount can be negotiated.

Who are the key stakeholders?
Staff/Members

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements
Savings made that do not have to be made elsewhere on priority outcome services

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Unable to keep up to date with current developments	A review of all subscriptions could be undertaken and a log held centrally so that all staff know where to access information

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Subscriptions not renewed individually	As and when they come up for renewal

### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
N/A
Future expected outcomes
N/A
Organisation
N/A
Workforce
N/A
Communities
N/A
Service Users
N/A



Partner Organisations
N/A

Consultation required?	No
------------------------	----

### Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, 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 and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
--	----

### Economic Impact Summary (if known)

Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)	0
Total financial loss to partners	0
Type of impact on partners	0

## Section A

Responsible Officer :	Dianne Frost, Director of People
Support Officer :	Catherine Butterworth, Assistant Director of People

Service Area :	People Services
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduced Sickness Absence

Opposition Budget Reduction Proposal and Objectives :
Consider potential financial savings through reducing sickness absence across the workforce.

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	*	*	*
Non-Controllable	*	*	*
Total Revenue Budget	*	*	*
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	13
Additional reductions in future years?	0
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	0

Proposed Staffing Reductions	
2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	0
2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0

\* No budgets held for sickness absence

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

#### The Opposition Budget Proposal for last year was as follows:

*“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 10% a notional savings which equates to £13K in year. For 2017/18 it is proposed to allocate the same level of cashable saving i.e. £13K.”*

Actual absence levels for the full year of 2015/16 were **10.09** days, i.e. higher than that estimated at the time the opposition proposal was submitted. As of the end of Quarter 3 for 2016/17 performance is **7.22** days with the projected full year outturn standing at **9.63 days**. This represents a projected full year reduction of **12.5%**.

It should be noted that, as above, savings resulting from reduced absence do not always lead to cashable savings.

In connection, the changes to terms and conditions result in the removal of the 2 days additional annual leave for employees with no sickness in the preceding 12 months. This benefit was introduced for the workforce on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 with accrued leave then applied from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012. Over this period the percentage of the workforce **without** sickness increased from 35% in 2010/11, to 49% in 2011/12 and 55% in 2012/13. Since then this has levelled with outturns of 63%, 61% and 62% for 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16 respectively. Over this period however, average absence lengths have increased thus explaining absence levels being in full alignment with the increases in the workforce not having sickness absence.

For assurance, the impact of removing the 2 days for no sickness will be mitigated through application of the Council's rigorous absence management policy, the monitoring of employee and manager compliance and the Fit for Oldham Programme seeking to prevent absence through supporting better health and condition management. The removal of the 2 days delivers savings calculated at £242k in productivity (non-cashable) and £42k for agency cover (cashable).

Any further service budget reductions associated with sickness absence require a policy decision. This has previously been enacted for underperforming services but since withdrawn due to the limited impact on absence levels and extensive administration surrounding the process.

### Who are the key stakeholders?

Workforce  
EMT  
Trade Unions

### Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Reduced absence results in greater productivity from the workforce, reduced costs of cover through agency and overtime and performance improvements across Council services.

# Section C

## Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
N/A	N/A

## Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
N/A	N/A

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
N/A
Future expected outcomes
N/A
Organisation
N/A
Workforce
N/A
Communities
N/A
Service Users
N/A
Partner Organisations
N/A

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
-------------------------------	------------

	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>		
<b>Trade Union</b>		
<b>Public</b>		
<b>Service Users</b>		
<b>Other (Members as employer)</b>		

### **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>n/a</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Nil</b>

Responsible Officer :	Dianne Frost, Director of People
Support Officer :	Catherine Butterworth, Assistant Director of People

## Section A

Service Area :	People Services
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduction in Trade Union Support

Opposition Budget Reduction Proposal and Objectives :
Review TU Facilities Expenditure with a view to undertaking review and making a saving

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	188	(37)	151
Non-Controllable	74	0	74
Total Revenue Budget	262	(37)	225
<i>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</i>			(8)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	3.69 fte
--	----------

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	15
Additional reductions in future years?	
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	15

Proposed Staffing Reductions	
2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	0.5
2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0.5

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

The Opposition Budget Proposal for last year was as follows:

*'It is proposed to set a target for the Council to save £40,000 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 £10,000 in 2016/17'.*

Expenditure on Trade Union Facilities is governed by the Local NJC Committee. A report on this matter was submitted to that Committee on 13 October 2015 which recommended that there be no change to TU Facilities at that time and that this be subject to review again in September 2017. Cllr McCann was in attendance. This review is currently outstanding but will be undertaken within the 2 year timeframe during the course of 2017/18.

Minute Extract:

#### **ACTION:**

- a) *That the continued provision of facility time to the three recognised non-teaching unions; namely UNISON, GMB and Unite be approved in line with current provision i.e.*
- *UNISON -2.89 FTE*
  - *GMB – 0.8 FTE*
  - *Unite -0.4FTE*

*That the recommendation that a further review take place in September 2017 be noted, such review to take place before then, if prompted by a significant change, for example the level of union membership, the council's budgetary position or where forced by a change in statute*

### Who are the key stakeholders?

Trade Unions  
Managers  
Members

### Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Collective bargaining and having a workable recognition agreement such as is enshrined within national guidance and in Oldham's local agreements is the most efficient form of conducting consultations and negotiations.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
TU incapacity to deal with strategic change particularly as we approach GM devolution and revision to multi-agency operating models	Retain a recognition agreement and sufficient and benchmarked facilities time to permit effective consultation and case mgt on the part of the TU side

Increase in management time on workforce consultations	Retain a recognition agreement and sufficient and benchmarked facilities time to permit effective consultation and case mgt on the part of the TU side
Increase risk of successful employment litigation for failure to consult as per statute and policy	Retain a recognition agreement and sufficient and benchmarked facilities time to permit effective consultation and case mgt on the part of the TU side

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Review current workforce size and update TU membership figures	May 2017
Benchmark with other GM and/or regional authorities	May 2017
Monitor statute – to identify potential for change/restriction	March – May 2017
Open consultation with the TUs	June 2017
Submission to LNJCC	October 2017 (date to be determined)

### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
Not yet known but should the review impact the provision of office facilities for Unison, this could impact the usage and rent collection for Manchester Chambers
<b>Service Delivery</b>
n/a – potential management capacity issue and time delays from reduced TU interface
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
n/a – potential management capacity issue and time delays from reduced TU interface
<b>Organisation</b>
Potential delay in change projects
<b>Workforce</b>
Potential reduction in employee capacity arising from requirement for increased workforce participation in consultations concerning change or budget cuts
<b>Communities</b>
Could be cost / budget implications of delayed change implementation



<b>Service Users</b>
Could be cost / budget implications of delayed change implementation
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
Could impact implementation of change proposals which increasingly involve other agencies

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
-------------------------------	------------

	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>	n/a	
<b>Trade Union</b>	June 2017	Sept 17
<b>Public</b>	n/a	
<b>Service Users</b>	n/a	
<b>Other (Members as employer)</b>	Sept 17	Oct 17

### **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

<b>Disabled people</b>	n/a
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	n/a
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	n/a
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	n/a
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	n/a
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	n/a
<b>People on low incomes</b>	n/a
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	n/a
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	n/a

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>Nil</b>

## Section A

<b>Responsible Officer :</b>	<b>No Specific individual responsible officer</b>
<b>Support Officer :</b>	

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Cross cutting across all areas of the Council</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in the number of agency staff and interims</b>

<b>Opposition Budget Reduction Proposal and Objectives :</b>
To further reduce the proposal for savings on the number of Agency and Interim staff across the Council

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	*	*	*
Non-Controllable	*	*	*
Total Revenue Budget	*	*	*
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18</b>	<b>50</b>
Additional reductions in future years?	0
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19</b>	<b>0</b>

Proposed Staffing Reductions	
<b>2017/18 Full Time Equivalent</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2018/19 Full Time Equivalent</b>	<b>0</b>

\* There are no specific individual budgets for agency or interim staff as the costs are offset generally by staffing savings if available

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

Agency staff are staff that are used to cover short term absences e.g. while vacant posts are being filled, sickness cover etc. and they cover an already established post that is budgeted for. They usually cost more than the employee as they include Agency on-costs, and if engaged via the Agency framework, an on-cost for the framework provider.

Interims are staff that are used to cover vacant post, usually while considering whether to fill the post or not or to restructure. They can cover for long term absences e.g. long term sickness or maternity leave. They can cover an already established post, or a new post while a wider review of a service or structure is being undertaken. They can be engaged via a number of ways e.g. via an agency, a self-employed contract, a recruitment process or an acting up arrangement. Depending on the method of engagement the cost can vary.

Consultants are staff engaged on a specific project or piece of work, usually time limited. They do not cover an already established post and are usually brought in for their expertise that is lacking from within. They can be engaged on grant funded projects and capital projects where their costs are recharged to the particular project or on invest to save projects where their cost is offset by a later saving. They can be engaged on projects that do not have any offsetting funding or saving and this will usually be for a specific piece of work e.g. to assess the impact of something i.e. a new piece of legislation.

The proposal is to reduce the costs of agency staff and Interims where their costs are higher than those that are budgeted for established posts. The Administration has submitted a proposal to reduce the value of external staffing support by £100k however we recommend that a further £50k could be saved from this proposal from reducing agency staff and interims.

### Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff

### Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Reduced requirement to make savings thereby protecting priority services

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Staff not replaced in priority areas impacting on front line services	A case by case review could be carried out when deciding to engage agency staff and interims

## Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Not engaging agency staff or interims	As an when the situation arises

## What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
N/A
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
N/A
<b>Organisation</b>
N/A
<b>Workforce</b>
N/A
<b>Communities</b>
N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

Consultation required?	No
------------------------	----

## Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No

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

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

#### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	0
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	0
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	0

## Section A

Responsible Officer :	No specific officer
Support Officer :	

Service Area :	Cross cutting across the whole Council
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduction in Housekeeping expenditure

Opposition Budget Reduction Proposal and Objectives :
To further reduce the proposal for savings on Housekeeping savings across the Council e.g. stationery, printing etc.

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	*	*	*
Non-Controllable	*	*	*
Total Revenue Budget	*	*	*
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			*

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions		£000	Proposed Staffing Reductions	
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18		50	2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	0
Additional reductions in future years?		0	2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19		0		

\* Budgets for housekeeping expenditure e.g. printing, stationery etc. are held in a various areas across all services

## Section B

Further detail on the proposal
<p>The Administration has submitted a proposal to reduce Housekeeping expenditure by £150k which we support. However as the officers of the Council move to more agile and digital working there will not be necessity to print as much material or use as much stationery as in previous years. Most officers have laptops or are moving to laptops and these all contain electronic notebooks that can be used instead of paper notebooks. Files, emails etc. can be stored electronically thereby reducing the number of files, storage boxes and cupboards that are required. Therefore we feel that an additional £50k could be gained from further savings.</p> <p>The proposal also demonstrates that officers are leading by example and changing the culture of the organisation to that of a more business-like and professional organisation.</p>

Who are the key stakeholders?
Staff

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements
Savings made that do not have to be made elsewhere on priority outcome services

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Not all items will be able to be saved immediately and due to the change process will need a phased approach	Consideration is given each time to any items of stationery, printing, equipment etc is required to ascertain whether it is a priority item

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
All items of supplies and services reviewed	As and when they required

### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
N/A
Future expected outcomes
N/A
Organisation
N/A
Workforce
N/A
Communities

N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>No</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

### **Equality Impact Screening**

**Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?**

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	<b>0</b>



## Section A

Responsible Officer :	Cathy Butterworth
Support Officer :	

Service Area :	People Services
Budget Reduction Title:	Earlier resolution for disciplinary hearings

<b>Opposition Budget Savings Proposal and Objectives:</b>
To resolve disciplinary hearings earlier and reduce costs incurred

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	*	*	*
Non-Controllable	*	*	*
Total Revenue Budget	*	*	*
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			*

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000	Proposed Staffing Reductions
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	3	2017/18 Full Time Equivalent
Additional reductions in future years?	0	2018/19 Full Time Equivalent
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	0	

\* The budgets for staff on suspension are held as part of the normal service staffing budgets. There is no separate budget.

## Section B

<b>Further detail on the proposal</b>
Over the past 5 years an average of £40k per year has been paid in staff salaries for staff on suspension while awaiting the progression of their case. An earlier and swifter resolution to disciplinary hearings would result in cashable and non-cashable savings. Not all posts are backfilled for suspension; generally only 20% are backfilled and are those relating to the front line. An estimate of £3k of cashable savings pro rata'd across all services could be realised as a result of an earlier resolution with a much higher % relating to efficiency gains.

Who are the key stakeholders?
Staff/Trade Unions

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements
Increased efficiency for earlier resolution and minimal potential cashable savings

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
The saving is not made as a result of potential difficulties within individual cases	A robust plan is implemented as soon as an issue occurs with dates set in advance

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Earlier resolution to suspension cases	As and when they arise

### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
N/A
Future expected outcomes
N/A
Organisation
N/A
Workforce
N/A
Communities

N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>No</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

### **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	0
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	0
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	0

Responsible Officer :	Liz Drogan
Support Officer :	

## Section A

Service Area :	Legal and Democratic Services
Budget Reduction Title:	A reduction in the number of hard copy committee papers

### Opposition Budget Savings Proposal and Objectives:

To reduce the number of hard copy committee papers for meetings with Councillors and other external meetings

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	308	(16)	292
Non-Controllable	127	(419)	(292)
Total Revenue Budget	435	(435)	0
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			0

### Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions

£000

Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	5
Additional reductions in future years?	0
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	0

### Proposed Staffing Reductions

2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	0
2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

One copy only of large agenda items or appendences is provided to each political group for all meetings, however the budget is an exception as it is imperative that every Member has access to all information before making a decision on the budget as we print other agendas.

Year on year printing budgets have reduced and have more than halved the original figure allocated. The options are to:

1.Go paperless and invest in the infrastructure to enable this i.e. every Member is issued with an Ipad or alternative to take to committees, ICT support when needed (the technology in terms of Modern.gov is already in place to do this)

2.Have an 'opt out of paper agendas' system.

All committee papers are available electronically as a matter of course and are sent via the Modern.gov system to Members for each meeting they attend.

As the public expectation and requirement is that the Council becomes more digital, as Members we must lead by example wherever possible and reduce the volume of printing for external committee papers. Reports on some public meeting agendas can be quite lengthy as sometimes publications, appendices and background documents that Members are asked to consider in taking a decision or approve are printed with the meeting papers. All committee papers are available electronically as a matter of course and are sent via the Modern.gov system to Members for each meeting they attend. The volume of printing could be reduced by an estimate of £5k if further changes were made to some of the more lengthy papers that include a lot of background information and appendices.

#### Who are the key stakeholders?

Members & members of the public

#### Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Less strain on other areas of the organisation to make savings. Quicker access for the public and immediate updating on-line for any changes whereas hard copies can be quickly out of date and inaccurate

## Section C

#### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
There will still be a requirement to print committee papers as the technology available does not support full digitalisation and for equality purposes	Committee papers could be printed on a risk basis only dependent on the importance of the paper to Members making an informed decision Where members need to print papers they should for equality purposes

#### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
From 1 April when meetings are scheduled each one will be considered as to whether a full set of papers is needed	As and when papers need to be produced

#### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
N/A

<b>Service Delivery</b>		
N/A		
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>		
N/A		
<b>Organisation</b>		
N/A		
<b>Workforce</b>		
N/A		
<b>Communities</b>		
N/A		
<b>Service Users</b>		
N/A		
<b>Partner Organisations</b>		
N/A		
<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>No</b>	

#### Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

#### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	0
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	0
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	0

## Section A

Responsible Officer :	Carol Brown/John McAuley
Support Officer :	

Service Area :	Street Lighting
Budget Reduction Title:	Switching off or dimming the lights

### Opposition Budget Savings Proposal and Objectives:

The proposal is to reduce power consumption and, thereby reduce the cost of Street Lighting by switching off and/or dimming the lights.

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	5,502	(2,496)	3,006
Non-Controllable	319	-	319
Total Revenue Budget	5,821	(2,496)	3,325
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			3,048

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	3.0
--	-----

### Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions £000

Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	100
Additional reductions in future years?	0
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	0

### Proposed Staffing Reductions

2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	0
2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

The purpose behind this proposal is to reduce energy costs/mitigate future energy costs of electricity consumed on Street Lighting by reducing the consumption of energy.

By implementing a variable lighting strategy the financial impact can be reduced whilst still maintaining a street lighting provision. However it should be noted that a reduction in light output is not directly proportional to a reduction in energy consumption. This is as a result of the additional energy used by the street light's control equipment.

A scheme of variable street lighting went live across Oldham from January 2016 following trialling across 1,000 lanterns in the borough.

The new street lights have the ability to vary the light output anywhere between 100% and 50%; however it is common practice to reduce the levels in steps of 25% as this equates to one lighting class (in accordance with British Standards lighting design). This provides three stepped options as follows – 100% (full brightness), 75% (a 25% reduction in light) and 50% (half brightness).

Under a scheme of delegated authority, the Portfolio Holder determined a scheme for dimming lights in the borough as follows:

#### For traffic routes:

Hours	Dusk – 22:00	22:00 – 24:00	24:00 – 05:00	05:00 – Dawn
Option approved	100%	75%	50%	100%

#### For residential areas:

Hours	Dusk – 22:00	22:00 – 24:00	24:00 – 05:00	05:00 – Dawn
Option approved	100%	50%	50%	100%

The exception to the above is in respect of locations advised by Community Safety, the Police and areas covered by fixed CCTV sites. These areas will remain at 100% during the hours of darkness. These locations will be reviewed periodically in conjunction with Community Safety and the Police.

A review has been made of Street Lighting energy consumption/cost has been undertaken for the calendar years 2015 and 2016 and the results are shown in the table below. The table indicates



that the number of Kilowatt hours (KWH) consumed has fallen by 1,260,946 resulting a year on year saving of £182,744.

**Table 1**

**Year on Year Comparison of Energy Usage/Cost**

Month	2015		2016	
	Energy Usage	Cost	Energy Usage	Cost
	KWH	£	KWH	£
January	835,223	117,207	1,130,848	176,984
February	986,772	197,784	942,839	147,565
March	1,003,608	140,815	801,122	125,397
April	738,244	103,539	629,057	88,863
May	628,491	88,157	518,775	73,294
June	534,377	74,968	375,988	53,134
July	557,929	78,267	418,708	59,167
August	683,625	95,888	530,833	74,997
September	773,365	55,558	644,609	91,058
October	954,417	149,413	797,407	112,632
November	1,057,788	165,610	889,176	125,587
December	1,171,137	183,287	984,668	139,070
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,924,975</b>	<b>1,450,492</b>	<b>8,664,029</b>	<b>1,267,748</b>
<b>Year on Year Reduction in Usage/Cost</b>			<b>(1,260,946)</b>	<b>(182,744)</b>

A proposal could be to reduce lighting between 22.00 hrs and 05.00 hrs by a further 25%. This would mean that at these times, lanterns would have been dimmed by 75%. Technical guidance suggests that lighting at such low levels would impact adversely on lantern performance and shorten their lifespan thus leading to increased costs elsewhere.

An alternative proposal is to reduce the Dusk to 22.00 hrs and 05.00hrs to Dawn lighting periods from 100% to 75% (i.e. 25% across the board). It is estimated that this could produce a further saving of £100K p.a. on top of the £182.7k already achieved in 2016/17.

It should be noted that the current lighting reductions were achieved after consultation and advice from parties such as the Police, Highways, Health and Safety etc. A similar process would need to be considered to ensure that lighting continues to be set at a standard that minimises crime and third party claims.

**Who are the key stakeholders?**

Residents/Members/Businesses/Partners/Other Organisations

**Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements**

Reduced savings requirements from other areas

## Section C

Risk	Mitigation
As per the original risk log from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016	As per the original risk log from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
As per the original proposal project plan from 2015 & 2016 and consultation with partners	In consultation with partners

### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible
<b>Service Delivery</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible
<b>Organisation</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible
<b>Workforce</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible
<b>Communities</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible
<b>Service Users</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible

Consultation required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff		
Trade Union		
Public		
Service Users		
Other		

### Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, 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 and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	Yes (if approved)
--	-------------------

### Economic Impact Summary (if known)

Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)	0
Total financial loss to partners	0
Type of impact on partners	0

Responsible Officer :	Caroline Ballard Acting Head of Service, Oldham Lifelong Learning Service
Support Officer :	

## Section A

Service Area :	Economy Skills and Neighbourhoods, Oldham Lifelong Learning Service
Budget Reduction Title:	Generating additional income from fees or grants

### Opposition Budget Savings Proposal and Objecties:

The Lifelong Learning Service is predominately funded by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and the European Social Fund (ESF) via the Adult Education Budget.

The Service complies with SFA requirements to provide free courses for designated categories of learners. For other learner course fees are charged and these must be used to co-fund the delivery of learning.

The proposal is that the Service generates additional income from fees or grants.

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	3,003	(3,275)	(272)
Non-Controllable	965	0	965
Total Revenue Budget	3,968	(3,275)	693
Note: This includes Capital Charges – Depreciated £331 this is a central cost to the Authority. Revised Net Expenditure is £361			
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	42.19
--	-------

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	1.5
Additional reductions in future years?	Yes
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	1.5

Proposed Staffing Reductions	
2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	0
2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

The proposal could create an additional income target against the Service of £25k in 2017/18.

The Lifelong Learning Service is predominately funded by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and the European Social Fund (ESF) via the Adult Education Budget (AEB).

AEB brings together the previous Adult Skills Budget, Discretionary Learner Support and Community Learning budget into one budget. The AEB's principle purpose is to engage and provide adults with skills and learning needed for work or further training. It also enables more tailored programmes of learning, which do not need to include a qualification to help those furthest from learning or the workplace.

The Service is funded on an academic year basis (1<sup>st</sup> August – 31<sup>st</sup> July) and is required to increase its fee income in line with SFA requirements.

As part of the Budget Process, there is a need to review the level of fees and charges that are set in order to ensure that income received is in line with budgets and sufficient to cover costs and Service delivery. These changes are broadly in line with similar providers in the Greater Manchester area.

The Service must also ensure that fees and charges enable learners to access provision in line with the mission which centres around employment and skills, social inclusion and community cohesion.

All Service delivery is designed to meet the Council's ambition and objectives. The Service works with the six district partnerships with a focus upon the Council's 'Get Oldham Working' campaign and the Co-operative Agenda.

For Academic Year 2016-2017 the Service increased its fees and charges by 2% providing an additional £3k income. However, in order to generate an additional £25k from fees and charges it would need to increase its fees by 16%. This would need to be RAG rated as Red and as a result a more feasible option would be a further 2% increase for £3k income for a full year and £1.5k for a part year in 2017/18.

The SFA expect the Service to increase the level of fees and charges. This needs to be balanced against the risk that higher charges will discourage people from accessing the Service; therefore will cause a reduction in revenue and failure to engage key client groups especially in relation to 'Get Oldham Working'.

The SFA grant is fully ring-fenced to the Lifelong Learning Service and is subject to a detailed annual grant return and detailed monthly data returns to the SFA. The monthly data returns, namely the Individual Learner Record (ILR), record the amount of funding drawn down by individual learners and calculate the overall amount of funding earned each month. The Service is paid on a monthly profile.

If it is indicated that the Service is not on track to draw down the full funding allocation, some of the funding will be withdrawn. The Service has always delivered to the full funding allocation and therefore has never incurred funding to be withdrawn.

### Who are the key stakeholders?

The Lifelong Learning Service's key stakeholders are the Skills Funding Agency (SFA), Oldham Council, the Voluntary and Community sector via Action Together CIO (formerly known as Voluntary Action Oldham). Partnerships with Children Centre's, Schools, Public Health, Adult & Children's Social Care and others enable the Service to deliver targeted work which develops self-reliance, confidence, independence, health and progression to further learning, training and employment.

### Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Additional Savings

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
<p>The SFA expect the Service to increase the level of fees and charges.</p> <p>For Academic Year 2016-2017 the Service increased its fees and charges by 2% providing an additional £3k income. However, in order to generate an additional £25k from fees and charges it would need to increase its fees by 16%. This would need to be RAG rated as Red.</p>	<p>This needs to be balanced against the risk that higher charges will discourage people from accessing the Service; therefore will cause a reduction in revenue and failure to engage key client groups especially in relation to 'Get Oldham Working'.</p> <p>To mitigate the risk a 2% increase is proposed</p>
<p>The SFA grant is fully ring-fenced to the Lifelong Learning Service and is subject to a detailed annual grant return and detailed monthly data returns to the SFA. This would need to be RAG rated as Red.</p>	<p>The Council and Service will ensure funding is utilised in line with SFA funding rules / guidance.</p>

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Budget options approval	March 2017
Equality Impact Screening completed and an EIA is not required	January 2017
Fees and Charges increase from the academic year	September 2017

## What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
<p>There are no property implications. The Service will continue to operate from dedicated Lifelong Learning centres and community outreach locations. Community based delivery is an essential feature of delivery and is vital in maximising engagement of learners, especially in disadvantaged communities.</p>
Service Delivery
<p>The Service currently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is graded as outstanding by OFSTED</li><li>• Has circa 11,000 enrolments and engages circa 5,500 learners per year</li><li>• Contributes significantly to the Council's Get Oldham Working ambitions, the Public Reform agenda and our Health and Wellbeing ambitions by delivering provision which focuses on people who are:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Unemployed</li><li>○ Seeking work</li><li>○ Jobcentre Plus clients</li><li>○ Hard to reach and most disadvantaged</li><li>○ Parents and families</li><li>○ Minority ethnic groups</li><li>○ Experiencing learning difficulties and/or disabilities</li><li>○ Full level 2 learners</li></ul></li><li>• 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</li><li>• Works closely with key partners to deliver the Council's vision and priorities these include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The Oldham College</li><li>○ Jobcentre Plus</li><li>○ Work Programme providers</li><li>○ Positive Steps</li><li>○ National Careers Service</li><li>○ Work Clubs</li><li>○ Union learning representatives</li><li>○ Workforce development service</li><li>○ Schools</li><li>○ Voluntary and Community sector</li><li>○ Local businesses</li></ul></li></ul>
Future expected outcomes
<p>There should be little impact on the Service's ability to deliver outcomes and meet targets.</p> <p>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.</p>
Organisation
<p>There is no investment requirement for other services.</p>
Workforce

There will be no changes to the workforce for Lifelong Learning.

### **Communities**

Learners are already largely taking responsibility for their own learning.

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

### **Service Users**

There could be a change in access to learning programmes for learners / Service Users.

Those learners on existing programmes who qualify will continue to have free or concessionary learning. It is likely that additional funding streams will focus on the most disadvantaged for whom learning will be free.

The high quality of Service delivery will be maintained.

There could be a negative impact on the current fees and charges made to learners. The SFA expect the Service to increase the level of fees and charges. This needs to be balanced against the risk that higher charges will discourage people from accessing the Service; therefore will cause a reduction in revenue and failure to engage key client groups especially in relation to 'Get Oldham Working'.

### **Partner Organisations**

There could be a potential negative impact on the third sector organisations as if fees are increased by 16% so less likely to involve local organisations, potentially decreasing their capacity to engage local citizens. As a result a 2% increase is proposed

**Consultation required?**

**No**

### **Equality Impact Screening**

**Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?**

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>



EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
--	----

**Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)	0
Total financial loss to partners	0
Type of impact on partners	0

<b>Responsible Officer :</b>	<b>Caroline Ballard</b> <b>Acting Head of Service,</b> <b>Oldham Lifelong Learning</b> <b>Service</b>
<b>Support Officer :</b>	

## Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Economy Skills and Neighbourhoods,</b> <b>Oldham Lifelong Learning Service</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reducing spend on double page adverts in the Oldham Chronicle</b>

### Opposition Budget Savings Proposal and Objectives:

The Lifelong Learning Service is predominately funded by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and the European Social Fund (ESF) via the Adult Education Budget.

The Service is funded on an academic year basis (1<sup>st</sup> August – 31<sup>st</sup> July). The SFA grant is fully ring-fenced to the Lifelong Learning Service and is subject to a detailed annual grant return and detailed monthly data returns to the SFA.

The Service complies with SFA requirements to provide free courses for designated categories of learners. For other learner course fees are charged and these must be used to co-fund the delivery of learning.

The proposal is that the Service reduces spend on double page adverts in the Oldham Chronicle following an advertising review and will be liaising with the Marketing / Communications team.

<b>2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>Exp £000</b>	<b>Income £000</b>	<b>Net £000</b>
<b>Controllable</b>	3,003	(3,275)	(272)
<b>Non-Controllable</b>	965	0	965
<b>Total Revenue Budget</b>	3,968	(3,275)	693
<b>Note:</b> This includes Capital Charges – Depreciated £331 this is a central cost to the Authority. <b>Revised Net Expenditure is £361</b>			
<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>			0

<b>Number of posts (Full time equivalent)</b>	<b>42.19</b>
---	--------------

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Note:</b> Following an advertising review liaising with the Marketing / Communications team.	
<b>Additional reductions in future years?</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19</b>	<b>0</b>

Proposed Staffing Reductions	
<b>2017/18 Full Time Equivalent</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2018/19 Full Time Equivalent</b>	<b>0</b>

## Section B

Further detail on the proposal
<p>The Lifelong Learning Service is predominately funded by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and the European Social Fund (ESF) via the Adult Education Budget (AEB).</p> <p>AEB brings together the previous Adult Skills Budget, Discretionary Learner Support and Community Learning budget into one budget. The AEB's principle purpose is to engage and provide adults with skills and learning needed for work or further training. It also enables more tailored programmes of learning, which do not need to include a qualification to help those furthest from learning or the workplace.</p> <p>The Service is funded on an academic year basis (1<sup>st</sup> August – 31<sup>st</sup> July). The SFA grant is fully ring-fenced to the Lifelong Learning Service and is subject to a detailed annual grant return and detailed monthly data returns to the SFA.</p> <p>The proposal is that the Service reduces spend on double page adverts in the Oldham Chronicle.</p> <p>Lifelong Learning uses a variety of methods to advertise new courses. These include advertising in their Focus on Learning brochure, Twitter, Facebook, Team Brief and Oldham Chronicle. They utilise printxchange and will be using Job Skilla in the future.</p> <p>The main purpose of advertising is to stimulate interest within the local community thereby increasing course attendances and associated revenue. To date in 2016-17 Lifelong Learning has spent £7.9k on Oldham Chronicle advertising.</p> <p>Lifelong Learning normally advertises available courses in a 2 page format over 5 days at various times across the academic year. The latest charge for a 2 page format over 5 days was £2,590 plus VAT.</p> <p>The Service will be undertaking an advertising review and will be liaising with the Marketing / Communications team with a view to either reducing the adverts to one page or not advertising in the Oldham Chronicle. The Service would need to ensure that any adverts are legible and meaningful. They would need to consider the impact on its learners as part of the review. Ensuring not to reduce learners from accessing the Service; therefore it could cause a reduction in revenue and failure to engage key client groups especially in relation to 'Get Oldham Working'.</p>

Who are the key stakeholders?
<p>The Lifelong Learning Service's key stakeholders are the Skills Funding Agency (SFA), Oldham Council, the Voluntary and Community sector via Action Together CIO (formerly known as Voluntary Action Oldham).</p> <p>Partnerships with Children Centre's, Schools, Public Health, Adult &amp; Children's Social Care and</p>

others enable the Service to deliver targeted work which develops self-reliance, confidence, independence, health and progression to further learning, training and employment.

#### **Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements**

The Service will be undertaking an advertising review and will be liaising with the Marketing / Communications team with a view to either reducing the adverts to one page or not advertising in the Oldham Chronicle. The Service would need to ensure that any adverts are legible and meaningful. They would need to consider the impact on its learners as part of the review. Ensuring not to reduce learners from accessing the Service; therefore it could cause a reduction in revenue and failure to engage key client groups especially in relation to 'Get Oldham Working'.

## **Section C**

### **Key Risks and Mitigations**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
The Service will be undertaking an advertising review and will be liaising with the Marketing / Communications team with a view to either reducing the adverts to one page or not advertising in the Oldham Chronicle.	March 2017  The Service would need to ensure that any adverts are legible and meaningful. They would need to consider the impact on its learners as part of the review. Ensuring not to reduce learners from accessing the Service; therefore it could cause a reduction in revenue and failure to engage key client groups especially in relation to 'Get Oldham Working'.

### **Key Development and Delivery Milestones**

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Budget options approval	March 2017
Equality Impact Screening completed and an EIA is not required	January 2017

## What impact does the proposal have on the following?

### Property

There are no property implications. The Service will continue to operate from dedicated Lifelong Learning centres and community outreach locations. Community based delivery is an essential feature of delivery and is vital in maximising engagement of learners, especially in disadvantaged communities.

### Service Delivery

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 Reform agenda and our Health and Wellbeing ambitions by delivering provision which focuses 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
  - Voluntary and Community sector
  - Local businesses

### Future expected outcomes

The Service will be undertaking an advertising review and will be liaising with the Marketing / Communications team.

### Organisation

There is no investment requirement for other services.

<b>Workforce</b>
There will be no changes to the workforce for Lifelong Learning.
<b>Communities</b>
Learners are already largely taking responsibility for their own learning. There will be no change in community in terms of responsibility.
<b>Service Users</b>
The Service will be undertaking an advertising review and will be liaising with the Marketing / Communications team.
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
There will be no changes to partner organisations.

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>No</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

#### **Equality Impact Screening**

**Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?**

<b>Disabled people</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Particular Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are married or in a civil partnership</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People of particular sexual orientation</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People on low incomes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)</b>	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

#### **Economic Impact Summary (if known)**

<b>Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)</b>	0
<b>Total financial loss to partners</b>	0
<b>Type of impact on partners</b>	0

Responsible Officer :	Carl Marsden/Jackie Wilson
Support Officer :	

## Section A

Service Area :	Chief Executive's
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduction in the Communication and Marketing team/Strategy, Partnership and Policy

Opposition Budget Reduction Proposal and Objectives :
Reducing the Communications and Marketing team/Strategy, Partnership and Policy team by 2 FTE would generate a £60k saving

2016/17 Revenue Budget and Establishment	Exp £000	Income £000	Net £000
Controllable	1,572	(286)	1,286
Non-Controllable	271	(1,451)	(1,180)
Total Revenue Budget	1,843	(1,737)	106
Current Forecast (under) / overspend			(4)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	32.59
--	-------

Proposed Revenue Budget Reductions	£000	Proposed Staffing Reductions	
Proposed Budget Reduction 2017/18	60	2017/18 Full Time Equivalent	2
Additional reductions in future years?	No	2018/19 Full Time Equivalent	0
Proposed Budget Reduction 2018/19	0		

## Section B

### Further detail on the proposal

It is the Communications team's role to ensure that information and key messaging about Council services, decisions and campaigns are accessible to all of the borough's residents, our staff and our partners.

In considering cuts to the capacity of the team to do this there are several important facts to consider.

We know that there is a direct and clear correlation between how informed our residents are with their satisfaction and use of our services. Our research shows that we are moving in a positive direction with 'informed levels' amongst residents (now up to a high of 47 per cent) but we remain below the Local Government Association average (66 per cent), at least partly because of the diverse nature of the borough.

Our research shows that in Oldham our most informed groups are the over-60s (55 per cent) and non-full time workers (51 per cent). Those most likely to not feel informed are residents aged 45 to 49 (64 per cent) and private tenants (62 per cent).

Industry-recognised intelligence shows that those residents who do not feel informed are significantly less likely to feel satisfied, to feel they are getting value for money, or to feel they can trust the council - and Oldham has a multiplicity of 'hard to reach' groups.

We see big disparities in feeling informed between age groups and between their use of channels and how they access information. For example, 70 per cent of residents aged over 60 have seen/read Borough Life, compared to just a quarter (26 per cent) of 16-24 year olds. The latter group is also much more likely to be engaging with our Social Media presence on platforms like Twitter and Facebook or the Council website.

This reflects the dramatic societal changes in how people access information: there is no such thing as a 'general public' anymore. A simple Press Release or email to staff is no longer the answer to the kind of issues that we face.

Oldham's population and demographic make-up is rapidly diversifying and with it the traditional methods of accessing information - like the local daily newspaper - are no longer the dominant channel used by all residents.

We now have a mish-mash of many overlapping and specific public audiences and within those a whole range of preferred access channels. That means we have to tailor our efforts far more than we ever used to - and it also means we have to work much harder finding our audiences out and figuring out how to get information to them.

Last September - in recognition of all this - we completely restructured the Communications team to reflect the realities of these new challenges and opportunities.

We understand the importance of using a range of channels as varied as leaflets up to Instagram and blogging to reach target audiences.

The new team structure deleted, for example, the posts of Press Officers and Marketing Officers to recognise the changing nature of our work and how we engage with people. We need staff to be



content producers with a range of skills rather than just one explicit discipline. To break through the noise we now need staff that are proficient with producing video, audio, Social Media, Vines, Memes and write for all kinds of different audiences - as well as being able to deal with the media or produce traditional marketing materials.

For Oldham to achieve its ambition to become a Co-operative Borough we need an effective Communications team more than ever before - and the proposed reduction of two posts to the suggested level would mean the loss of two senior members of this team.

Demand is increasing on all public services as budgets continue to dwindle and we need to achieve behaviour change - for example: 'channel shift' away from visiting contact centres to doing things online, or getting people to recycle more and better - to help reduce demand and costs to deliver sustainable savings which the council needs to find across all its services.

Reducing the size of the new Communications team to deliver this vital work would inevitably impact on our capacity to keep people informed and support this transformation.

A major part of the communications work that we do is with all our staff and partners - both of whom we need to act as ambassadors for our key messages, values and behaviours.

The majority of our workforce live in the borough and we need them to be actively engaged and 'on message' with the corporate plan and narrative in their communities if we are to deliver the kind of behaviour changes that we seek. Similarly, our partner organisations need to be informed and able to understand what is driving our actions and be able to engage with that programme.

In addition - as with all other local authorities - our communications team is faced with unprecedented challenges in a climate where the trust placed by people in government, local government and institutions is in decline. Those falling trust levels and continually fracturing audiences and channels are enabling misinformation to be spread by anonymous users at ever-increasing speeds.

We are now operating in what is known as a 'post-truth' environment where debate is largely framed by appeals to emotion - rather than facts and details of policy - and the repeated assertion of myths to which factual rebuttals are often ignored. To cut our capacity to counter that narrative would drastically reduce our chances of winning the important debates and mythbusting with our public, staff and partners. It will lead to falls in reputation, trust and our ability to listen to people. If we do not communicate with people then they will simply go elsewhere for their information.

### **Strategy, Partnerships and Policy Team**

The Team provides capacity and support across the organisation to Leadership, Elected Members and all Directorates. This includes core business work around the policy centre (one stop for information; guidance; good practice); horizon-scanning; responding to legislation; developing corporate policy and strategy and supporting Directorates to develop others (e.g. Housing Strategy).

The Team develops the Oldham Plan, Corporate Plan and supports business planning across the organisation. These provide clear, robust delivery frameworks and supporting delivery plans. We have a role in monitoring and performance management working with BI on the latter.

The Team lead in respect of:

- Cooperative Agenda – for the Council, Oldham Partnership and nationally as lead on the national Co-operative Council Innovations Network
- Equality – oversight and coordination of all equality impact assessments relating to Council decision making (particularly in respect of the budget); ensuring the Council meets its statutory under the Public Sector Equality Duty 2010.
- Sustainability and Environmental compliance – for the Council, collaboration with the Oldham

Partnership and leading role within Greater Manchester

- Community renewables and low carbon – cross-party energy group; securing investment; designing and delivering projects for Oldham and across GM;
- Effective operation of the Oldham Partnership and its commissioning clusters (health and wellbeing; economy and skills and coops and neighbourhoods). This includes specific work areas including:
  - work experience policy
  - social value framework
  - supporting work on Inclusive Growth
- Community Safety and Crime Partnership – including strategy, action planning and strengthening partnership working and collaborative working
- Food economy – leading on establishment of Food Network and the developing Growing Oldham:Feeding Ambition and taking forward the Sustainable Food Cities bid
- Tackling Poverty – working with Poverty Action Group and through the Partnership
- Co-leading on developing Thriving Communities Programme and developing framework; bid submission and delivery plans.
- Health and Wellbeing Board – including reports; scrutiny; links with GM (supporting the CEx, Executive Director and Director).
- Armed Forces – covenant, action plans

The Team designs, seeks investment for, implements and evaluates campaigns/projects relevant to its lead areas; for example:

- Your Oldham
- Love Where you Live
- Green Dividend
- Generation Oldham – including apprenticeship standard and community solar share offer
- Social Value – externally funded work with health, Action Together, Registered Providers etc.
- European Funded Projects – COALESCE and FoodChains for Europe
- Supporting other funding/investment – foodbank Crowdfunding appeal; DECC funding for community renewables; funding for place-based interventions - (a number of bids awaiting results)

Provides strategic capacity to the organisation to undertake specific project work (e.g. Business Support Redesign; Education Traded Services review; impact of electoral fraud recommendations).

### Who are the key stakeholders?

Oldham residents

Oldham Council staff - and service heads

Local Partners - including local businesses, voluntary organisations and stakeholders in key policy areas like education, health and housing,

Greater Manchester partners including GMP, GMFRS, GMCA

Ward Members and MPs

### Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

**Strategy, Partnerships and Policy** – the capacity, skills and expertise of the Team is becoming increasingly utilised by the organisation; recognised and trusted to take forward collaborative and partnership working. Working on a 'policy into practice' principle, Team capacity helps in practical ways to design, implement and evaluate new approaches and ways of working as exemplars of the co-operative agenda (an end-end example of this is the establishment of the Action Oldham Fund).

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
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
<p>The Strategy, Partnerships and Policy would be unable to deliver the breadth and depth of activity currently covered.</p> <p>There are a number of statutory compliance areas managed by the team (equality, environmental compliance) which the organisation needs to continue to deliver against.</p>	There would need to be a refocusing of the Team's activities to core business.

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within PVFM timeline	February 2017
Budget options approval	Full Council meeting March 2017
Undertake staff consultation and on conclusion start to implement restructure to take into account reduction in 2 FTE	March 2017 onwards

### What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
<p><b>Communication and marketing</b> - We would have to re-evaluate all our communications activity and cut some areas that are seen less as a priority and not statutory. This may mean some of our clients simply go elsewhere to get the work they need done. It could also lead to demand from some areas to be able to control their own activity and messaging instead, which has significant risks for the Oldham Council brand and the consistency of the approach taken.</p> <p><b>Strategy, Partnerships and Policy</b> – a refocusing of capacity would mean less capacity for the organisation; opportunity costs in respect of bringing in investment and reputation building; less capacity to support partnership and collaborative working in a period where this is becoming both a desired and required way of working.</p>

<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
<p><b>Communications and marketing</b> - As stated above, our ability to deliver behaviour change with staff, residents and partners - and to engage properly with them - would be impacted.</p> <p><b>Strategy, Partnerships and Policy</b> – a key role of the Team is horizon-scanning and setting strategic plans and frameworks for the delivery of agreed priorities and outcomes. These are generally a 3-5 year timeframe with some (e.g. Climate Change Strategy) being longer planning horizons.</p>
<b>Organisation</b>
<p><b>Communication and marketing</b> - Less communication with our staff would lead to them being less informed and impact negatively on our drive to make them ambassadors who understand our aims and objectives for the borough as a whole. It would make the job of leadership more difficult.</p> <p><b>Strategy, Partnerships and Policy</b> – a reduction in numbers would leave less capacity to support across the organisation; undermine the ability to develop impactful partnership working and less capacity to build reputation and draw in external investment.</p>
<b>Workforce</b>
<p><b>Communication and marketing</b> - Less communication with our staff would lead to them being less informed and impact negatively on our drive to make them ambassadors who understand our aims and objectives for the borough as a whole. It would make the job of leadership more difficult.</p> <p><b>Strategy, Partnerships and Policy</b> – less capacity would reduce the ability to engage the workforce as part of the Cooperative Oldham Team. Understanding the agenda; bringing forward ideas and opportunities and being ambassadors.</p>
<b>Communities</b>
<p><b>Communication and marketing</b> - Less informed residents means less satisfaction with services, falling trust - and the search for alternative sources of information that may not be objective or factually accurate. A lack of understanding by residents is also likely to lead to them being unwilling to 'do their bit'. This would impact on the success of our co-operative approach and ultimately lead to a greater impact on front line services and budgets.</p> <p><b>Strategy, Partnerships and Policy</b> – translating the Oldham and Corporate Plan into meaningful action and activity with and for residents requires complex; consistent and meaningful partnership working at all levels. Helping create the climate and opportunities for this are a key work area for the team. Reductions in capacity would impact on our ability to do this.</p>
<b>Service Users</b>
<p><b>Communication and marketing</b> - A reduction in capacity would mean less staff available to deal in engaging with residents, media and staff. Slower response times and less time to ensure the correct answer and messages are given are likely to feed into a further erosion of trust.</p> <p><b>Strategy, Partnerships and Policy</b> – a reduction in capacity would see a refocussing against core business. This would leave less support available to help with additional or ad-hoc requests – this would have a negative impact on services given the significant reduction across</p>

the organisation of strategic capacity and capabilities.

### Partner Organisations

**Communication and marketing** - We need partners to be able to understand our narrative. Any dilution of our work on that front could lead to partners feeling less well informed. In turn they might seek information direct from other services, which would simply move the response burden elsewhere and not necessarily save any money.

**Strategy, Partnerships and Policy** – currently partnership working is a central strand of the Team's function which is increasingly important. The resources in the Team are already stretched in leading and managing the ranges of partnerships we are responsible for.

Consultation required?

Yes – staff consultation to be undertaken if proposal approved

### Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, 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 and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)

No

### Economic Impact Summary (if known)

Total net job losses (gains) in partners (FTE)	0
Total financial loss to partners	0
Type of impact on partners	0