

Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee

Wednesday 23 January 2019
2.00 pm Taunton Library Meeting Room



To: The Members of the Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee

Cllr A Groskop (Chair), Cllr M Lewis (Vice-Chair), Cllr P Ham, Cllr B Filmer, Cllr John Hunt, Cllr J Thorne, Cllr L Leyshon and Cllr N Bloomfield

All Somerset County Council Members are invited to attend meetings of the Cabinet and Scrutiny Committees.

Issued By Scott Wooldridge, Strategic Manager - Governance and Risk - 15 January 2019

For further information about the meeting, please contact Lindsey Tawse on 01823 355059, ltawse@somerset.gov.uk or Jamie Jackson on 01823 359040, jajackson@somerset.gov.uk

Guidance about procedures at the meeting follows the printed agenda.

This meeting will be open to the public and press, subject to the passing of any resolution under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

This agenda and the attached reports and background papers are available on request prior to the meeting in large print, Braille, audio tape & disc and can be translated into different languages. They can also be accessed via the council's website on

www.somerset.gov.uk/agendasandpapers



RNID typetalk

AGENDA

Item Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee - 2.00 pm Wednesday 23 January 2019

****Public Guidance notes contained in agenda annexe****

1 **Apologies for absence**

2 **Declarations of Interest**

Details of all Members' interests in District, Town and Parish Councils will be displayed in the meeting room. The Statutory Register of Member's Interests can be inspected via the Community Governance team.

3 **Minutes from the previous meeting held on 11 December 2018** (Pages 5 - 14)

The Committee is asked to confirm the minutes are accurate.

4 **Public Question Time**

The Chairman will allow members of the public to ask a question or make a statement about any matter on the agenda for this meeting. **These questions may be taken during the meeting, when the relevant agenda item is considered, at the Chairman's discretion.**

5 **Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/20** (Pages 15 - 194)

To receive the report.

6 **Revenue Budget Monitoring Report - Month 8** (Pages 195 - 208)

To receive the report.

7 **Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee Work Programme** (Pages 209 - 222)

To receive an update from the Governance Manager, Scrutiny and discuss any items for the work programme. To assist the discussion, attached are:

- The Committee's work programme
- The Cabinet's forward plan

8 **Any other urgent items of business**

The Chairman may raise any items of urgent business.

Agenda Annexe

Guidance notes for the meeting

1. Inspection of Papers

Any person wishing to inspect Minutes, reports, or the background papers for any item on the Agenda should contact the Committee Administrator for the meeting – Lindsey Tawse on Tel: (01823) 357628 or 355059 or Email: democraticservices@somerset.gov.uk They can also be accessed via the council's website on www.somerset.gov.uk/agendasandpapers

2. Members' Code of Conduct requirements

When considering the declaration of interests and their actions as a councillor, Members are reminded of the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct and the underpinning Principles of Public Life: Honesty; Integrity; Selflessness; Objectivity; Accountability; Openness; Leadership. The Code of Conduct can be viewed at: <http://www.somerset.gov.uk/organisation/key-documents/the-councils-constitution/>

3. Minutes of the Meeting

Details of the issues discussed and recommendations made at the meeting will be set out in the Minutes, which the Committee will be asked to approve as a correct record at its next meeting.

4. Public Question Time

If you wish to speak, please tell Lindsey Tawse the Committee's Administrator - by 5pm, 3 clear working days before the meeting (Thursday 17th January 2019). All Public Questions must directly relate to an item on the Committee's agenda and must be submitted in writing by the deadline.

If you require any assistance submitting your question, please contact the Democratic Services Team on 01823 357628.

At the Chairman's invitation you may ask questions and/or make statements or comments about any matter on the Committee's agenda – providing you have given the required notice. You may also present a petition on any matter within the Committee's remit. The length of public question time will be no more than 30 minutes in total.

A slot for Public Question Time is set aside near the beginning of the meeting, after the minutes of the previous meeting have been signed. However, questions or statements about any matter on the Agenda for this meeting may be taken at the time when each matter is considered.

You must direct your questions and comments through the Chairman. You may not take direct part in the debate. The Chairman will decide when public participation is to finish.

If there are many people present at the meeting for one particular item, the Chairman may adjourn the meeting to allow views to be expressed more freely. If an item on the Agenda is contentious, with a large number of people attending the meeting, a representative should be nominated to present the views of a group.

An issue will not be deferred just because you cannot be present for the meeting. Remember that the amount of time you speak will be restricted, normally to two minutes only.

5. Exclusion of Press & Public

If when considering an item on the Agenda, the Committee may consider it appropriate to pass a resolution under Section 100A (4) Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 that the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the basis that if they were present during the business to be transacted there would be a likelihood of disclosure of exempt information, as defined under the terms of the Act.

6. Committee Rooms & Council Chamber and hearing aid users

To assist hearing aid users the following Committee meeting rooms have infra-red audio transmission systems (Luttrell room, Wyndham room, Hobhouse room). To use this facility we need to provide a small personal receiver that will work with a hearing aid set to the T position. Please request a personal receiver from the Committee's Administrator and return it at the end of the meeting.

7. Recording of meetings

The Council supports the principles of openness and transparency. It allows filming, recording and taking photographs at its meetings that are open to the public - providing this is done in a non-disruptive manner. Members of the public may use Facebook and Twitter or other forms of social media to report on proceedings and a designated area will be provided for anyone wishing to film part or all of the proceedings. No filming or recording may take place when the press and public are excluded for that part of the meeting. As a matter of courtesy to the public, anyone wishing to film or record proceedings is asked to provide reasonable notice to the Committee Administrator so that the relevant Chairman can inform those present at the start of the meeting.

We would ask that, as far as possible, members of the public aren't filmed unless they are playing an active role such as speaking within a meeting and there may be occasions when speaking members of the public request not to be filmed.

The Council will be undertaking audio recording of some of its meetings in County Hall as part of its investigation into a business case for the recording and potential webcasting of meetings in the future.

A copy of the Council's Recording of Meetings Protocol should be on display at the meeting for inspection, alternatively contact the Committee Administrator for the meeting in advance.

SCRUTINY FOR POLICIES AND PLACE COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee held in the Taunton Library Meeting Room, on Tuesday 11 December 2018 at 10.00 am

Present: Cllr A Groskop (Chair), Cllr M Lewis (Vice-Chair), Cllr P Ham, Cllr B Filmer, Cllr John Hunt, Cllr J Thorne, Cllr L Leyshon and Cllr N Bloomfield

Other Members present: Cllr M Chilcott, Cllr T Munt, Cllr B Revans and Cllr A Wedderkopp

Apologies for absence:

145 **Declarations of Interest** - Agenda Item 2

Cllr Liz Leyshon declared an interest as a member of Friends of Street Library.

Cllr Anna Groskop declared an interest as a member of Friends of Bruton Library.

Cllr Bob Filmer declared an interest as Chair of the Planning Committee at Sedgemoor District Council.

146 **Minutes from the previous meeting held on 13 November 2018** - Agenda Item 3

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2018 were accepted as being accurate by the Committee.

147 **Public Question Time** - Agenda Item 4

There were two public questions in relation to Item 7 – Library Service Re-design Update.

Cllr John Irven, Chair of Watchet Town Council (WTC) made a statement that WTC require the freehold transfer of Watchet Library from West Somerset Council (WSC) in order to be able establish a Community Library Partnership. Cllr Irven sought the Committee's support with this.

Cllr Irven received the following response from the Strategic Manager, Community & Traded Services. Thank you for the question John and thank you and others in Watchet Town Council for your support for Watchet Library.

We note that Watchet Town Council have always been clear that their support for a Community Library Partnership at Watchet is conditional on the freehold transfer of the library building. The County Council have supported Watchet Town Council in this objective by supporting their application for an asset transfer. However, ultimately the decision on any freehold transfer would be for West Somerset Council to make.

We have discussed and agreed a possible alternative solution of assigning the existing lease, a proposal which is supported by West Somerset Council and the County Council. This offer was put to Watchet Town Council yesterday. We hope that a resolution can be found which enables a Community Library

Partnership to be established in Watchet and all parties are continuing to work in good faith to achieve this common objective.

Peter Murphy, Chair of Friends of Somerset Libraries made a statement advocating additional funding to establish Community Library Partnerships (CLP) on a sustainable footing. He also asked for support for: District Councils to grant Discretionary Rate Relief to all proposed CLP's; the freehold transfer of Watchet Library to Watchet Town Council and for Taunton Unparished Area funds to support Priorswood Library. Mr Murphy raised concerns about the sustainability of volunteer-led models and questioned how this would be monitored. He also questioned whether the needs assessments already undertaken will be re-visited in order to determine the level of outreach and mobile provision necessary.

Mr Murphy received the following response from the Strategic Manager, Community & Traded Services. Firstly, on the provision of additional funding to all Community Library Partnerships. As you know this was determined through the recent Cabinet decision, which also determined the level of budget allocated to the library service for the next financial year. That level of budget having been determined, it is unlikely that there will be any scope to offer additional funding.

Secondly, following FoSL's submissions and letters on discretionary rate relief this issue is being investigated by district and county officers.

Finally, the level of outreach and mobile library provision was broadly determined in the Library Service Delivery Plan, produced as part of the Cabinet Report. This plan was based on a comprehensive and robust needs assessment, as well as consideration of the consultation feedback and a full impact assessment. We are currently undertaking local engagement in the communities of Highbridge and in high needs areas of Yeovil to determine the optimum mix and form of outreach services, and we will do the same for mobile library provision should this be necessary in other communities. However we will not revisit the full needs assessment and outreach or mobile service provision will be designed within the parameters established in the Cabinet decision.

148 **Month 6 Revenue Budget Monitoring Report - Agenda Item 5**

The Committee considered this report which outlined that the Month 6 projected revenue outturn for 2018/19 was £3.158m over the available budget of £317.883m. Good progress has been made in delivering the required savings and the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) is currently assessing the additional management action and mitigations required to further reduce the current projected overspend. The next detailed, quarterly report will be presented in February 2019, based on expenditure to the end of December 2018.

In a verbal update, Members were informed that the downward trend of spend is continuing at that the latest outturn position is now forecast at around £2.3m. The contingency in place would, therefore, be enough to meet the overspend currently although measures to address this overspend are still in place.

It was clarified that projected income from capital receipts was only based on those with low and medium risks attached to them and that the proposed sale of the Six Acres site did not form part of this.

It was clarified that Dillington House is a trading entity and has to make an appropriate return for investment, including any capital loan.

Members expressed satisfaction that revenue spending has been decreased and questioned how close this could be brought down. Based on the current trajectory, it was confirmed that it is anticipated that a balanced budget will be delivered by year end.

Members questioned how the £9.9m capital grant from government for Highways will be allocated. It was confirmed that this grant has been physically received from government and the Economic and Community Infrastructure directorate is now considering how best to use the funds. It is a challenge to spend the funds by year end whilst fulfilling the requirements of the grants. Any funds that can be will be spent flexibly and the directorate is committed to spending the fund in the best way possible. A suggestion was made to spend some of the funds on additional gritting but it was clarified that this constitutes revenue spend not capital. However, if it is possible to use funds flexibly it will be considered. It was clarified that as this is a capital grant it is not shown in the revenue budget. There is an additional grant for normal highways maintenance of £1.7m. This is a reward grant due to high performance of the highways service.

Some members expressed concern about the ability to spend the funds by March. It was clarified that all of the work does not have to be carried out in the next three months and the service is looking at a range of activities. If existing works meet the requirement of the grant, it may be possible to re-allocate revenue funds and use capital grant funds instead.

Members questioned whether the Small Improvement Scheme (SIS) is a capital or revenue scheme and whether it will be repeated in this quadrennium. It was clarified that this is a capital scheme. It is proposed to reduce the spending on this scheme from £2mm to £1m and then discontinue it. The capital grant could only be used for this if it qualifies according to the requirements set by government for its use. It is not believed that the government will claw-back funds, however, we are ensuring that we are compliant.

Members asked for an update on the progress of savings proposals which required consultation with the Schools Forum. They were informed that all have been discussed with the Schools Forum. Some proposals have been supported but some major proposals have not. Whilst some proposals required consultation with the Schools Forum, the decision can still go ahead. The Director of Children's Services has made the decision to proceed with the proposals.

The Committee noted the report and asked for an update on the use of the Highways capital grant and the Small Improvement Scheme. It was agreed to provide this once the analysis had been completed.

149 **2019-20 Capital Investment Programme - Agenda Item 6**

The Committee considered this report which outlined the proposed Capital Programme for the period 2019/20 to 2022/23 of £225.121m.

It was clarified that this report would be presented to Cabinet in the New Year and that any comments from the Committee would feed in to the decision-making process.

In previous years the Capital Programme has been agreed one year at a time. This creates difficulty in some areas, such as the Colley Lane development in Bridgwater and the A Block refurbishment project, when agreement is reached for the first part of development but not the second. Officers are better able to plan in a considered way if they are able to plan ahead. Therefore, the proposal is to seek approval for an on-going programme which can still be subject to change. Any decision on the capital programme will also have an impact on the revenue budget.

Members questioned whether the announced school building programme was still on track. It was clarified that the same sum of money is earmarked and there is still commitment to the programme. However, it was highlighted that a large capital programme places a strain on the revenue budget. There is a need to prioritise the School Basic need programme and focus on those elements pre 2021. We are applying pressure on government to improve grants to limit the need to borrow.

Members questioned how communities will be able to access highways improvements if the Small Improvement Scheme (SIS) is discontinued. It was clarified that there is a need to prioritise across the whole service but Members will still be able to have an impact in a strategic way. Safety will always be of paramount in prioritising works.

The report stated that the SIS programme will be reprofiled over a longer timeframe and Members questioned the timeline for this. The detail of this was not known but it was believed that there is a commitment to deliver existing schemes but not to accept further applications.

A Member questioned whether Parish Councils have been approached for funding to support activity such as SIS schemes. It was not known whether this had happened previously but there is no reason why this couldn't be discussed and considered.

Members questioned whether capital funds could be used to make capital investments. This would only be possible if there was a net nil or positive return for the revenue budget. It would be possible to do this if there was a time lag on the return if sufficient measures could be put in place to mitigate this. However, it would be challenging to support this in the current financial position.

Members queried the definition of the Minimum Revenue Position (MRP) and stated that it was essential that members had an understanding of this. The MRP is the gap between payment of debt and what has to be accounted for

and it is based upon the life of an asset. More information about this will be provide to Members via the Cabinet and Audit Committees.

Members questioned the diversity of the estimated funding for the capital programme. Members were informed that it is common for local authorities to have a capital programme that is much more detailed and clear in earlier years and less detailed in later years due to unknown future funding factors. For example, the grants available for highways are not yet known beyond 20/21 so these have not been estimated yet. Things will inevitably change and this will feed into the programme as it evolves. The programme is, therefore, not prescribed but is monitored closely.

Members questioned what discussions the Council was having with District Councils regarding use of Section 106 (S106) and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds. Discussions regarding this are on-going. Sedgemoor District Council has allocated CIL funding to the Bridgwater Barrier and Taunton Deane Borough Council has expressed a wish to allocate CIL funding to town centre and garden town development. This poses a challenge as the Council wishes to encourage development but there is also a need to ensure sufficient funds for the infrastructure to support this development. CIL funds helps us to provide school places where people want them. It was confirmed that it us up to District Councils to decide the priorities for CIL funds.

A Member suggested that the Council needed to be stronger during the planning process. It was clarified that the council is a consultee only but is able to put forward reasonable mitigations with regard to highways. A delicate balance is needed as we don't want to stymy development but we need to ensure the infrastructure.

Members questioned whether the Council can afford to borrow. Members were informed that this is possible but that the government is tightening the reins on local authorities investing in commercial investments. The government and professional bodies have become nervous about this and there are further issues to consider such as whether to invest inside or outside of the county. This would need a very carefully considered business case.

Members questioned whether the capital grant from government could be used to pay down capital loans. It is not believed that the government would support this. Additionally, paying off debt is usually bad value for money as the Council is able to benefit from preferential interest rates but there are huge penalties if the debt is repaid early. Members further questioned whether it could be used to pay the interest rather than the capital. This would not qualify as capital spend and special permission would be required for this (as in the case for Northamptonshire Council).

Members queried whether a consortium of local authorities could purchase significant shares in property developers in order to influence build. The Interim Finance Director was not aware that this type of commercial investment would not be permissible. A Member commented that the authority's ability to borrow cheaply could be seen to be giving a competitive advantage.

It was clarified that the table of capital grants in 4.2 is intended to make it clear to Members that there are choices for these funds.

It was noted that the authority has been very successful in accessing grant funds to date. It has two teams that support the development of bids from both the government and the Local Enterprise Partnership.

Following a vote, the Committee approved the following recommendation:

The Scrutiny for Polices and Place Committee acknowledges the importance of SCC's ability and necessary resources to negotiate the best possible contributions to infrastructure projects from the development of housing in Somerset.

The Committee noted the report.

150 **Library Service Re-design Update - Agenda Item 7**

The Committee considered this report which provided an update on progress with establishing Community Library Partnerships (CLP's), in the early stages of implementing the decision by the County Council's Cabinet to re-design the libraries service.

A summary of the expressions of interest that are being taken forward was provided. The Committee was informed that no expressions of interest were received for Highbridge and Sunningdale libraries. These libraries will therefore close on 29 December 2018, and library services will be delivered to the surrounding communities through the new Library Outreach Service delivery model, as determined through the Cabinet decision. The Committee was also updated on the progress of other areas of work underway as part of the Cabinet decision.

A Member questioned whether an additional mobile library will be provided. It was clarified that the two areas which have libraries closing at the end of the year (Highbridge and Sunningdale) will have library services provide through an outreach delivery model as they are less than two miles away from other library services.

Members questioned whether any support can be given to Watchet Town Council. It was clarified that the Council has done everything it can to support the Town Council's case and that we can only seek to influence the decision of West Somerset Council. It was clarified that the Council is unable to provide legal advice to third parties but that it understands that Watchet Town Council have taken their own legal advice.

The Committee noted the report.

151 **Corporate Performance Report Q2 2018-19 - Agenda Item 8**

The Committee considered this report which provided an update on the council's ongoing progress towards the outcomes laid out in the council's Business Plan. The report provided the latest information available in the period up until 30th September 2018.

The new design and format of the report was highlighted to the Committee.

152 The Committee noted the report and were pleased with the new format.
A Block Refurbishment Project Update - Agenda Item 9

The Committee considered a presentation which provided an update on the A Block Refurbishment project.

The presentation outlined the business case for change and the Cabinet recommendations, the options considered, expected savings and future opportunities, benefits and risks and key next steps for the project.

Members questioned the total value of the County Hall site. This information was not available but Members were reassured that market appraisals of buildings have been carried out. It is a unique site and would require specialist inputs. The cost of an alternative site would be quite high. Members questioned how option 4 could be discounted if the value of the asset was not known.

Members queried what the risks would have been if the enabling works had not been carried out. This would have caused business continuity issues. The loss of C Block would also have incurred landlord obligations with a need to find alternative accommodation for staff in C Block and for the Court service in Shire Hall. The cost of this would have been very high.

Members questioned occupancy levels and parking arrangements. It was clarified that occupancy studies are carried out on a rolling basis. This has looked at how space is being used and configured. There are currently 1370 desk spaces in B and C Block. When the works are completed this will rise to around 2,500 desk spaces. The service is looking at how parking on site is managed and it is keen to encourage alternative ways to travel to County Hall.

It was clarified that there are some drawings of the layout once complete. These are just being finalised.

Members questioned whether other buildings in Taunton were being emptied and sold to generate capital receipts and what the estimated financial value of this is. It was clarified that the buildings are leased so the benefits will be revenue based rather than capital receipts. The estimated revenue benefit is £723k.

A Member commented that he had first been made aware of this project via the media and asked that Members be better informed in future.

It was clarified that some teams have been moved into offices at Taunton library. This is a temporary measure and is being leased from Taunton Deane Borough Council. The Council was already paying for this so is maximising the use of this space.

It was clarified that savings identified at Taunton Academy relate to rental and service charges that we currently pay to rent office space and parking at the Academy.

Members questioned the limited number of risks that had been associated with the project and highlighted the reputational risk of the public perception of the authority spending such a large amount of money on itself. Members were reassured that there were other risks identified on the full risk register.

Members questioned whether A Block was useable as it stands and it was clarified that there would be costs involved to get the building to a useable state. It was clarified that the building is subject to listed building regulations and, therefore there are certain elements that have to be maintained such as the façade. Members questioned whether any One Public Estate money would need to be returned if the project did not go ahead. The Council reports quarterly on the use of One Public Estate funds but there wouldn't be a claw-back.

Members raised concerns that so few risks had been presented and it was clarified other risks were identified on the full risk register.

Following a vote, the Committee made the following recommendation:

The Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee recommends that a complete, detailed assessment of all risks associated with the A Block Refurbishment Project, along with a valuation of A, B & C Block should be provided to the Cabinet ahead of their meeting on 19 December 2019.

The Committee noted the report.

153 **Lead Local Flood Authority Update** - Agenda Item 10

The Committee considered this report which updated the Committee on the continued progress by the Flood and Water Management team in 2018/19 and set out the key activities for 2019/20.

A Member welcomed the idea of green spaces in car parks but highlighted that vandalism and health and safety may be challenges.

Members questioned the role of the sustainable drainage (SuDS) inspector and whether they would check on long-term maintenance. It was clarified that the inspectors are focussed on the construction of SuDS only and don't address maintenance. Members were asked to report any concerns to the service so that this could be taken up with the developer.

A Member commented that highways, housing and flooding are all connected and there is a need for as much green space as possible on housing sites to mitigate the risks of flooding.

The Committee noted the report.

154 **Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee Work Programme** - Agenda Item 11

The Committee considered and noted the Council's Forward Plan of proposed key decisions.

Following debate, the Committee requested the following changes to the work programme:

- Add a Revenue Budget Monitoring Item to 23 Jan 2019 meeting
- Add an item on the Capital Investment Strategy
- Add an update on the County Council policy for disposal of property and an update on County Farms
- Add an update on the Council's statutory duties
- Add an update on Hinkley Point C

A Member also asked whether the CDS update could be provided at the 23 Jan meeting. It was clarified that sufficient information would not be available at that time but it was agreed to circulate a member information sheet once the information was available.

The Committee also requested that the additional risk information relating to the A Block Refurbishment Project be provided to the Committee before it goes to Full Council for decision.

155 **Any other urgent items of business** - Agenda Item 12

Members requested that officers give more consideration to presentations to ensure better accessibility including font size, clarity and colour of information.

(The meeting ended at 1.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

Somerset County Council
Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee
– Wednesday 23rd January 2019

Medium Term Financial Plan – Overview and Medium Term Financial Plan for Economic & Community Infrastructure and Corporate & Support Services

Lead Officer: Peter Lewis

Author: Peter Lewis, Director of Finance

Contact Details: 01823 359028

Cabinet Member: Mandy Chilcott, Cabinet Member for Resources

Division and Local Member: All

1. Summary

- 1.1.** The report summarises the key messages from the Medium Term Financial Strategy (2019-22) report presented to Cabinet on 19 December 2018 (attached as an Appendix) to enable Scrutiny of relevant service areas ahead of the more detailed budget report being presented to Cabinet and Full Council in February 2019. Given that this Scrutiny Committee has a role in reviewing the overall budget proposals, then this paper seeks to give sufficient information for that as well as service specific information for scrutiny. Scrutiny of the budgets for Children's Services and Adults Services will take place through the respective scrutiny committees.
- 1.2.** The Council recognises the on-going financial challenges confronting it and hence the importance of setting a robust budget for 2019/20 as well as laying foundations for the financial plans for 2020/20 and 2021/22. That means that all the known funding and service demand pressures have been reflected in the budget alongside proposals for reducing spend and hence producing a balanced budget for 2019/20. This produces indicative budgets for each service and this report focuses on those services for which this Scrutiny Committee is responsible.

- 1.3. By way of context, it is important to be aware that since the Cabinet Strategy paper was prepared, the provisional Local Government Financial Settlement has been published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), on 13 December 2018. The final Settlement can be expected early in the new year, although significant change is not anticipated. Alongside the core funding announcements issued in the Settlement, the Council has also received confirmation of several Special and Service specific grants from Government departments. The County's district and borough authorities (the Council Tax collecting authorities) have further up-dated their estimates for the numbers of properties liable for Council Tax next year.
- 1.4. Full details for the funding that the Council will receive will be included in the Cabinet and Full Council reports being prepared for February 2019, while this paper focuses on understanding the services spending requirements and proposed further savings required to be delivered.
- 1.5. It is important for Members to understand the on-going risks within approved budgets, the levels of reserves, balances and contingencies, as well as the mitigations aimed at limiting the impact on core services, especially those prioritised in the County Plan. Relevant links will be drawn out in the detail below.

2. Issues for consideration / Recommendations

- 2.1. Against a gross revenue budget of more than £800m annually, and a net revenue budget need for 2019/20 of £338m, (as reported in December 2018), the MTFP Strategy paper showed that funding falls short of spending need by £28m across the next three years. This means the Council must consider what it delivers and how it is delivered to reduce spending in line with funding.
- 2.2. After applying proposed corporate solutions, details of which will be set out in the February 2019 Revenue Budget report, there remained a gap between spending requirement and funding available across all services of £15m in 2019/20 (before the implications of the recent Settlement are factored in). It is not anticipated that these will make a significant difference to the overall financial challenges the Council faces as most of the improved figures are not envisaged to be sustainable beyond 31 March 2020. However, there may be some opportunity to partially replenish some earmarked or General reserves, which would then have a beneficial impact on the resilience of the Council rather than directly on core services.
- 2.3. In the meantime, this paper sets out the relevant service pressures and movements that made up that gap as well as details of the relevant service additional savings to be considered to produce a balanced budget for 2019/20.
- 2.4. This Committee is therefore **requested** to review the overall 2019/20 budget and MTFP preparations as well as the specific proposals relating to Economic and Community Infrastructure and Corporate and Support Services so they can comment on them, offer assurance to Cabinet and/or identify any matters for consideration that they would like to highlight to the Cabinet.

3. Background

3.1. Spending and Savings Assumptions

- 3.1.1. This section sets out the main changes to spend and the forecast to deliver previously planned savings for each key service, followed by a summary of the indicative budgets across the MTFP period (2019-22).
- 3.1.2. The movements represent changes from the existing MTFP (2018-21) agreed in February 2018 and adopt the previously Cabinet agreed key principle of ensuring robust, transparent budgets are set for 2019/20 onwards. This will place the council in the best position to effectively monitor service spending needs and funding.
- 3.1.3. For each service, the heading in the following paragraphs reflects the net budget for 2019/20 alongside the net movements for service pressures and savings proposals for each of the three years of the MTFP: 2019/20, 2020/21 and 2021/22.

3.2. Overview

- 3.2.1. The Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee has responsibility for scrutiny of the overall budget of the County Council. With this in mind the Committee will wish to assure itself of the robustness of the preparations of the 2019/20 budget and the MTFP. The detailed report considered by the Cabinet meeting on the 19th December 2019 is linked here [MTFP Strategy Report](#), and the Committee is invited to review the details of the ingredients of the MTFP and to offer comments thereon to the Cabinet.

3.3. Economic & Community Infrastructure: Indicative net budget for 2019/20 £67.400m, net movements: 2019/20 £0.853m; 2020/21 £0.767m; 2021/22 £2.031m

- 3.3.1. ECI services have worked hard to remain in budget over the last few years. However, these services can be affected by extreme weather events, residents behaviour (for example waste volumes) and economic trends. It is impossible to predict extreme weather and economic trends a year in advance accurately. The savings agreed in September 2018, have been delivered and as far as possible impacts have been mitigated.
- 3.3.2. **Pressure movements:**
- 3.3.3. **Table 1** below sets out the incremental service pressures within Economic & Community Infrastructure budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 1: Pressure movements by type for Economic & Community Infrastructure

Type of Pressure	2019/20 (£m)	2020/21 (£m)	2021/22 (£m)
Demand	0.361	1.597	-
Inflation (Contract)	1.699	2.019	2.131
Inflation (General)	0.125	-	-
Legislation Change	0.200	-	0.100
Pay (Service Specific)	0.201	-0.050	-

Previously Unfunded	0.320	-	-
Prior Year Savings Unachievable	1.178	0.414	-
Total	4.084	3.979	2.231

3.3.4. Demand Pressure £0.361m/£1.597m/£0.000m

There is a need for additional budget to replenish Library book stock, and to account for stock that is no longer suitable for circulation (£0.361m in 2019/2020, reducing to £0.211m per annum thereafter).

2020/21 includes the loss of a time limited contractual discount agreed with our waste disposal contractor, and the transfer of disposal from landfill to our long-term Energy from Waste agreement from April 2020 (£1.747m). The contract discount only runs until the new facility is operational.

Ordinarily, there would be a demographic pressure for waste disposal volumes linked to the household growth within Somerset. However, the recent trend as reported to the Somerset Waste Board throughout 2018/2019 is that current waste volumes are down on budget and previous years, and that the demographic pressure from new households can therefore be absorbed.

3.3.5. Inflation (Contract) Pressure £1.699m/£2.019m/£2.131m

ECI has several external contracts around Waste, Highways, Transport, Property and utilities. Estimates have been made of inflationary uplifts that are required under the various contracts. The Waste pressures (including landfill tax) were discussed and approved at the Somerset Waste Board on Friday 14th December 2018. There are still considerable pressures on utility prices and transport provision. However, all the contractual inflation pressure has been calculated in line with the terms of the contracts.

3.3.6. Inflation (General) Pressure £0.125m/£0.000m/£0.000m

This is additional revenue budget for developing our responses to Highways England's Development Consent Order applications for A303/A358 improvements.

3.3.7. Legislation Change Pressure £0.200m/£0.000m/£0.100m

There are costs of compliance with the new Street Works Permitting regulations, new costs associated linked to membership of the Sub National Transport Board, as approved by Cabinet in July 2018. Additional pressures come from the loss of rental income from County Farms, as the estate reduces.

3.3.8. Pay Pressure (Service Specific) £0.201m/-£0.050m/£0.000m

There is an historic pressure within ECI in relation to a small number of previously unfunded posts and a short-term reliance on consultancy staff for some planning positions due to recruitment and retention difficulties.

3.3.9. Previously Unfunded Pressure £0.320m/£0.000m/£0.000m

The non-schools Repairs and Maintenance budget is not sufficient for the needs of the current estate. There has been an in year contingency release for 2018/2019

that now needs to be part of the permanent budget.

3.3.10. Prior Year Savings Unachievable £1.178m/£0.414m/£0.000m

This includes a number of small unachievable or potentially double-counted elements of larger savings. This also includes Technology and People programme (TAP) savings for 2018/19 and subsequent years as described above.

3.3.11. The TAP programme was originally intended to be a 5-year programme commencing late in 2016 and due to conclude in 2021 having made workforce related savings of approximately 10% of salary costs (£7.58m) in that time. To date the programme has achieved £600k of directly attributable savings and a further £294k of partially attributable savings. It is also anticipated that the Adults service will deliver a further £439k of savings in 19/20 as a direct result of the performance insight and targeted improvement opportunities provided by the systems review across locality areas.

3.3.12. The programme has also significantly contributed to service savings made across the organisation as an enabler for example, reduction in travel expenditure due to the introduction of Skype for Business. Furthermore, a conservative estimate of 600 working hours have been saved daily from faster power up and log speeds further to the introduction of new devices and Windows 10 functionality.

3.3.13. The programme closed before the anticipated end date due to the financial imperative focus which has reviewed future MTFP saving targets and reset the 2019/2020 budget. This resulted in a decision to reabsorb the future years attributed service TAP related savings into an overall organisational target. This decision was based on a confident assumption that the foundation has been laid and tools made available for ongoing technology and people transformation aligned to the organisational redesign which will determine the shape and size of the organisation in the future. Fundamental to delivering ongoing savings and future sustainability will be a focus on the behavioural shifts necessary to change the cultural mindset of the organisation.

3.3.14. **Other movements:**

3.3.15. **Table 2** below sets out the incremental service movements (savings and adjustments) within Economic & Community Infrastructure budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 2: Other movements by type for Economic & Community Infrastructure

Type of Movement	2019/20 (£m)	2020/21 (£m)	2021/22 (£m)
In Year Savings (MTFP 2)	-2.406	-0.200	-0.200
Prior Year Savings	-0.851	-0.480	-
Technical Adjustments (SRA)	0.026	-2.533	-
Total	-3.231	-3.213	-0.200

3.3.16. In Year Savings -£2.406m/-£0.200m/-£0.200m

These include all MTFP2 savings for ECI that were considered by Cabinet in September where the saving is ongoing into 2019/20 and onwards. This also includes a subsequent decision on the Household Waste Recycling Centre contract

extension agreed by the Waste Board.

3.3.17. Prior Year Savings -£0.851m/-£0.480m/-£0.000m

This includes savings agreed in previous MTFP rounds scheduled for 2019/20 onwards. These comprise the TAP, (£0.725m in 2019/20 and £0.414m in 2020/21), reduced agency spend (£0.157m in each year), and the rationalisation of parts of the property estate (£0.110m in 2019/20 and £0.050m in 2020/21).

3.3.18. Technical Adjustments £0.026m/-£2.533m/£0.000m

This relates to the Somerset Rivers Authority, which precepts separately for its funding, although it is managed by SCC staff. The 2019/20 adjustment is due to an increase in the tax base. Beyond 2019/20 the MTFP assumes that the Government enact the proposal to establish the SRA authority as a separate entity and so both the funding and the expenditure (£2.533m in 2019/20) have been excluded from the planning assumptions. If the Council continues to be a precepting body beyond 2019/20 then the income and expenditure will be re-introduced to the budget with no net effect on the Council's finances.

3.3.19. **Indicative Service Budgets:**

After reflecting the movements above, the indicative budgets for the MTFP period (2019-22) are set out in the table below.

Table 3 Three-year budget for Economic & Community Infrastructure (ECI) compared to the current 2018/19 budget.

Service	2018/19 Budget £m	2019/20 Indicative Budget £m	2020/21 Indicative Budget £m	2021/22 Indicative Budget £m
Economic & Community Infrastructure	66.547	67.400	68.167	70.197

3.4. **Corporate & Support Services: Indicative net budget for 2019/20 £24.222m, net movements: 2019/20 £3.645m; 2020/21 £0.006m; £2021/22 £0.012m**

3.4.1. Customers and Communities:

Customers and Communities Services have worked hard to drive efficiencies and improvements throughout the Authority as well as delivering significant savings in their own teams. There is a planned boost to base budget largely to cover inflation and legislative changes as well as a structural underfunding within ICT. There is also corporate recognition that some cross-directorates savings have not been delivered in full. The spending plan for the next three years leaves Customers and Communities Services in a strong position to deliver essential transformational change across the Authority.

3.4.2. HR & OD Service:

The HR&OD Service has provided significant support to the Financial Imperative

Programme over the last few months and will continue to do so, which combined with a reduction in resources is beginning to impact on the ability of the Service to deliver BAU and fully support other Services projects and programmes as well as progress those in HR & OD. However, the service continues to work hard to prioritise the work in order to minimise any risks to the Authority. For 2019/20 the Service will prioritise the continuing work to embed the People Strategy in the organisation, delivery and implementation of the organisational design work, on-going support to the transformation programmes in Children's Services and Adult Social Care along with other Council transformation programmes. Income generation opportunities will continue to be maximised, although maintaining the current levels is likely to be challenging as factors outside the control of the service may have an influence e.g. conversion of schools to academies and in particular multi academy trusts. The Service continues to remain within budget along with delivering the MTFP savings agreed in September 2018.

3.4.3. Finance Service:

While the Finance Service has undergone restructuring and downsizing in recent years, there were no planned reductions in staffing arising from the additional proposals put forward to Cabinet in September 2018 and there are no such proposals contained within this MTFP. It is important to retain a robust Finance Service while the Council is addressing the financial challenges that it is currently confronting. The budget for the Finance Service will enable existing resources to be maintained. In addition, efforts will be made to identify how support to budget holders can be improved in 2019 through better processes and systems. This will, in turn, improve budget monitoring in 2019/20 and should provide for better information upon which members and officers can make effective decisions.

3.4.4. **Pressure movements:**

3.4.5. **Table 4** below sets out the incremental service pressures within Corporate & Support Services budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 4: Pressure movements by type for Corporate & Support Services

Type of Pressure	2019/20 (£m)	2020/21 (£m)	2021/22 (£m)
Inflation (Contract)	0.113	-	-
Inflation (General)	0.006	0.012	0.012
Legislation Change	1.357	-	-
Pay (Service Specific)	0.363	-	-
Previously Unfunded	0.757	-	-
Prior Year Savings Unachievable	3.780	0.829	-
Total	6.376	0.841	0.012

3.4.6. Inflation (Contract) Pressure £0.113m/£0.000m/£0.000m

This is the increased costs of IT Microsoft Licences compared to 2018/19.

3.4.7. Legislation Change Pressure £1.357m/£0.000m/£0.000m

The Council is no longer able to capitalise IT Licences under new accounting

regulations as we are moving from our own systems to the cloud. This means costs fall on revenue as opposed to previously being capitalised (£1.300m). There is also a small number of pressures on the Coroners budget in relation to pathology and other services.

3.4.8. Pay Pressure (Service Specific) £0.363m/£0.000m/£0.000m

There are several specific staff related cost pressures for 2019/20 within Corporate and Support Services that the Council is obliged to fund, (in addition to the expected pay increases for all staff), which are included here. These include the transfer of funding responsibility from the Police for Coroners Officers, (officers that carry out investigations into deaths on behalf of the Somerset Coroner). There are also historic underfunding of officer and member costs and the need to support the administration of the apprenticeship scheme. The funding of these pressures will reset the base budgets from 2019/20.

3.4.9. Previously Unfunded Pressure £0.757m/£0.000m/£0.000m

This is to recognise historic underfunding of the IT Services revenue budget (£0.670m). This was already recognised as a pressure within the forecasts provided to Cabinet in February 2018. There are also smaller unfunded pressures within Committee Services and Finance.

3.4.10. Prior Year Savings Unachievable £3.780/£0.829m/£0.000m

These include the TAP proposals for 2018/19 and subsequent years as described above. There are also a number of previous procurement targets that have not been possible to realise. These have been reported previously through budget monitoring.

3.4.11. **Other movements:**

3.4.12. **Table 5** below sets out the incremental service movements (savings and adjustments) within Corporate & Support Services budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 5: Other movements by type for Corporate & Support Services

Type of Movement	2019/20 (£m)	2020/21 (£m)	2021/22 (£m)
In Year Savings	-0.957	-	-
Prior Year Savings	-1.774	-0.835	-
Total	-2.731	-0.835	-

3.4.13. In Year Savings -£0.957m/£0.000m/£0.000m

These include all savings for C&SS that were considered by Cabinet in September 2018 where the saving is ongoing from 2019/20. These include significant reduced costs from restructures within Customers and Communities, Commercial and Procurement and IT Services.

3.4.14. Prior Year Savings -£1.774m/-£0.835m/£0.000m

This includes savings from previous MTFP rounds for 2019/20 onwards for TAP and Agency Spend.

3.4.15. Indicative Service Budgets:

After reflecting the movements above, the indicative budgets for the MTFP period (2019-22) are set out in the table below.

Table 6 shows the indicative three-year budget for Corporate & Support Services compared to the current 2018/19 budget.

Service	2018/19 Budget £m	2019/20 Indicative Budget £m	2020/21 Indicative Budget £m	2021/22 Indicative Budget £m
Corporate & Support Services	20.577	24.222	24.228	24.240

3.5. Non-Service: Indicative net budget for 2019/20 £35.436m, net movements: 2019/20 £0.739m; 2020/21 £3.726m; 2021/22 £3.655m

3.5.1. The non-service area of the Council's budget covers items that are held centrally such as bank charges, and financing transactions (investment income) contingencies, contributions (e.g. Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority and Environment Agency Levy's) and corporate costs (e.g. audit fee, pension deficit and subscriptions). These areas are not part of the Council's key services but are a cost to the authority overall. Some of these costs, such as Pension Deficit and Pay Award are later redistributed to the key services.

3.5.2. Pressure movements:

Table 7 below sets out the incremental service pressures within Non-Service budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 7: Pressure movements by type for Non-Service

Pressure Type	2019/20 (£m)	2020/21 (£m)	2021/22 (£m)
Demand	0.208	0.888	1.179
Inflation (General)	0.086	0.595	0.809
Legislation Change	0.005	-	-
Pay	3.022	1.000	1.000
Total	3.321	2.483	2.988

3.5.3. Demand Pressure £0.208m/£0.888m/£1.179m

The proposed 2019/20 capital programme has an element funded by borrowing. The principal element is accounted for as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). This additional need for borrowing impacts on the revenue budget from 2020/21 onwards. The additional budget needed in 2020/21 is £0.888m and £1.179m in 2021/22. The MRP policy has been revised and the savings generated from this are reported below within the technical adjustments.

3.5.4. Inflation (General) Pressure £0.086m/£0.595m/£0.809m

The 2019/20 capital programme also incurs interest on additional borrowing leading to pressures of £0.086m in 19/20 (£0.595m in 2020/21 and £0.809m in 2021/22).

3.5.5. Legislation Change Pressure £0.005m/£0m/£0m

There is a minor pressure in 2019/20 of £0.005m due to increasing online payment charges following legislative changes. More customers are using credit cards/business cards, instead of debit cards to pay Somerset County Council and this attracts a higher transaction fee percentage. Worldpay Group (payment processing company) also increased their fees in the summer of 2018/19 however, a new system is being developed which should reduce these fees.

3.5.6. Pay Pressure: £3.022m/£1.000m/£1.000m

The agreed pay increase of 2% for 2019/20 has resulted in an additional pressure of £3.017m. An additional £1.000m has been assumed for 2020/21 and 2021/22. This pay pressure includes increments, employer National Insurance and pension contributions and has been adjusted for non-local authority funded staff. The other £0.005m pay pressure is due to the apprenticeship levy scheme being underfunded in previous years. As the pay bill for the council has increased the Levy should also be increased.

3.5.7. **Other movements:**

Table 8 below sets out the incremental service movements (technical adjustments) within Non-Service budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 8: Other movements by type for Non-Service

Type of Movement	2019/20 (£m)	2020/21 (£m)	2021/22 (£m)
Technical Adjustments	- 2.582	1.243	0.667
Total	- 2.582	1.243	0.667

3.5.8. Technical Adjustments: (£2.582m)/£1.243m/£0.667m

Change to our Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy:

A revised approach to the calculation of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) has been applied, taking advantage of new and more flexible regulations that came into effect from 2018/19. The MRP is a provision made in the accounts for the repayment of long term debt when it becomes due. The revised calculation has reduced the capital financing budget required by £3.714m in 2019/20. This on-going saving has been reduced by pressures of £0.276m in 2020/21; and £0.359m in 2021/22. The MRP policy saving includes a reduction to the estimated cost of the 19/20 capital programme, mentioned below.

- 2018/19 Capital Investment Programme:

The 2018/19 capital programme approved by Full Council on 21st February 2018, created additional revenue pressures of £1.727m in 2019/20 (£2.001m in 2020/21; and £0.481m in 2021/22). The additional cost of the 2018/19 programme has been

partially offset by programme delays (referred to as slippage), that have reduced the estimated cost of borrowing by £0.342m in 2019/20 (£0.365m in 2020/21; and £0.504m in 2021/22).

- Pensions Deficit:

An additional pressure of £0.299m has been identified for the Council's Local Government Pension Scheme deficit repayment in 2019/20, as per the 2016 actuarial valuation report. The 2020/21 and 2021/22 pressure will not be known until the 2019 valuation is concluded but has been estimated as an additional £0.306m for each year. As an element of the pensions deficit is charged to schools and funded through their Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) the budget requirement in 2020/21 has been reduced by £1.000m (on-going) for this recharge.

- Contingency:

In 2018/19 the revenue budget contingency was set at £7.801m; a substantial element was used to support the overspend in Children's Services. A further large sum has been set aside to underpin the confidence ratings of the MTFP proposals for change, although to date that has not been drawn upon. Given that the financial position of the Council is improving as is its financial control, it is appropriate to reconsider the amount of the contingency required in future years. The proposed contingency for 2019/20 is £7.223m and there are future planned reductions in 2020/21 and beyond.

3.5.9. Indicative Service Budgets:

After reflecting the movements above, the indicative budgets for the MTFP period (2019-22) are set out in the table below.

Table 9 shows the indicative three-year budget for Non-Service compared to the current 2018/19 budget.

Service	2018/19 Budget £m	2019/20 Indicative Budget £m	2020/21 Indicative Budget £m	2021/22 Indicative Budget £m
Non-Service	34.697	35.436	39.162	42.817

3.6. Other (Reserves & Capital): Indicative net budget for 2019/20: -£7.342m, net movements: 2019/20 £3.161m; 2020/21 -£0.343m; 2021/22 -£0.448m

This area of the Council's budget covers items such as special grants, and reserves transactions (general fund, earmarked and insurance fund). This also covers capital receipts flexibility transactions and any changes to the capital fund from the capital programme. These items are not part of the council's key services.

3.6.1. Pressure movements:

Table 10 below sets out the incremental service pressures within the reserves and capital area budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 10: Pressure movements by type for Other Services

Area of Pressure	Type of Pressure	2019/20 (£m)	2020/21 (£m)	2021/22 (£m)
Earmarked Reserves	Prior Year Savings Unachievable	0.750	0.250	-
Total		0.750	0.250	-

3.6.2. Prior Year Savings Unachievable £0.750m/£0.250m/£0.000m

A planned prior year thematic saving in regard of “Exploring Regional Services” is now regarded as unachievable. This saving was previously held against a reserve and this is likely to have contributed to its non-delivery. The plans were to draw £0.250m per year from the reserves starting in 2017/18 until 2020/21 (£1.000m in total). The entire £1.000m has been reversed over the MTFP period with £0.750m being reversed in 2019/20.

3.6.3. **Other movements:**

Table 11 below sets out the incremental service movements (savings & adjustments) within the reserves and capital area budgets over the MTFP period followed by an explanation for each.

Table 11: Other movements by type for Other Services

Area of Movement	Type of Movement	2019/20 (£)	2020/21 (£)	2021/22 (£)
Earmarked Reserves	Prior Year Savings	-250,000	-250,000	-
Earmarked Reserves	Technical Adjustments	2,078,525	-708,130	-448,106
General Reserves	Technical Adjustments	-1,912,600	-	-
Insurance Fund	Technical Adjustments	360,500	-103,000	-
Capital Receipts	Technical Adjustments	2,134,400	468,000	-
Total		2,410,825	- 593,130	- 448,106

3.6.4. Prior Year Savings -£0.250m/-£0.250m/£0.000m

See above details on “Exploring Regional Services” saving (R17-043). -£0.250m was planned in 2019/20 and a further -£0.250m in 2020/21.

3.6.5. Technical Adjustments: £2.661m/-£0.343m/-£0.448m

- Earmarked Reserves £2.079m/£0.708m/-£0.448m:

There are plans that have been built into the MTFP period to replenish some of the negative reserves. For this purpose, a one-off contribution of £2.079m will be used to pay off the Buildings Maintenance Indemnity Scheme (BMIS) reserve in 2019/20 with a further £1.370m (one-off) used to pay off the Repairs & Maintenance (R&M) reserve in 2020/21. Due to ongoing funding uncertainty, a prudent proposal is in place to contribute £0.922m to earmarked reserves in 2021/22 to aid longer term

financial resilience.

- General Reserves Fund -£1.912m/£0m/£0m:

There are ongoing plans over the MTFP period to contribute £2.000m to the general fund each year. This may not be needed for 2020/21 and 2021/22 if there are no further draws on the fund in 2018/19 and 2019/20, but at this point the Council is assuming the £2.000m contribution each year will be required. In 2019/20 the Council is making a one-off adjustment of -£1.912m to reduce the contribution to the general fund from £3.913m to £2.000m

- Insurance Fund £0.361m/-£0.103m/£0m:

To increase the resilience of our Insurance Fund, the Council makes an additional contribution each year (of £0.164m) over and above the usual service contributions. As part of the service review for this year's MTFP, a number of historic costs (not recharged to service) were identified. As these costs were reducing the resilience of the Insurance Fund, the Council is proposing to contribute an additional £0.361m during 2019/20. This increase has been reduced by £0.103m in 2020/21 to leave an ongoing contribution of £0.422m from 2020/21.

- Capital Receipts Flexibilities £2.134m/£0.468m/£0m:

The 2015 Spending Review gave local authorities the opportunity to fund the revenue costs of transformation projects from capital receipts.

The 2019/20 budget reduction of £2.134m comprises reducing the 2018/19 base budget of £2.602m for completed elements of transformation (being £1.000m for support services and £1.601m for LD Discovery). This is offset by a budget requirement of £0.468m for further transformational costs in relation to the Discovery contract, to be funded from capital receipts (reversed out in 2020/21).

3.6.6. Indicative Service Budgets:

After reflecting the movements above, the indicative budgets for the MTFP period (2019-22) are set out in the table below.

Table 12 shows the indicative three-year budget for the reserves and capital area budgets compared to the current 2018/19 budgets.

Service	2018/19 Budget £m	2019/20 Indicative Budget £m	2020/21 Indicative Budget £m	2021/22 Indicative Budget £m
Un-ring-Fenced Grants	-12.580	-11.077	-6.332	-6.078
General Reserves	3.913	2.000	2.000	2.000
Earmarked Reserves	-0.900	1.679	0.970	0.522
Insurance Fund Contribution To / (From) Reserves,	0.164	0.525	0.422	0.422
	-2.602	-0.468	-	-

Capitalisation Flexibility and Capital Fund				
Total	-12.006	-7.342	-2.940	-3.134

4. Funding Assumptions

4.1. The Medium Term Financial Strategy (2019-22) report presented to Cabinet on 19 December 2018, included core funding assumptions made, ahead of the Provisional Local Government Financial Settlement, in determining the overall level of resource expected to be available to the Council. This paper is attached here to enable Scrutiny of these overall funding assumptions. The detailed budget report being presented to Cabinet and then full Council in February 2019 will include up-dates as a result of the Provisional Settlement received on 13 December 2018. In addition the Cabinet will receive information on the proposed use of Capital Receipts Flexibilities, which will also be presented to the Audit Committee on 31 January for assurance purposes, alongside the Treasury Management Strategy and the Investment Strategy.

4.2. In addition, the paragraphs below explain the non-service specific assumptions reflected in the budget figures in the Cabinet Strategy paper.

4.3. *Additional Council Tax Collection Fund Surplus in 2019/20 (£3m)*

Whilst collecting council tax, the district councils (referred to as billing authorities) are acting as agents of the Council. At the end of each financial year, this arrangement results in a potential surplus or deficit on each billing authorities Collection Fund account. The year-end position will be largely dependent on the accuracy of the billing authorities tax base estimates and their collection rates. In recent years, the final year-end position has been a surplus in excess of £4m so the Council has prudently estimated a surplus in 2019/20 of £3m. The districts have a statutory obligation to notify the Council of their actual surplus or deficit by 15 January 2019, so this figure will be updated in the final budget report to Cabinet and Full Council in February 2019. There has been no surplus assumed for 2020/21, so the 2019/20 surplus has been reversed out in 2020/21.

4.4. *Business Rates pool gain for 2019/20 (£0.800m)*

The pooling of business rates is a voluntary arrangement between the Council and several local district councils made possible by the Business Rates Retention scheme which allows local authorities to retain locally a proportion of any growth in business rates income. The Pool is funded from "levies" on business rates growth which would otherwise be paid over to central government and is based on the principal that no member will be worse off because of joining the arrangement. Based on the gains received from previous years pooling arrangements, the Council has prudently estimated the benefit of membership in 2019/20 to be £0.800m. This gain is not assumed in 2020/21 as it is not certain whether the option to form a Pool will be available.

5. Further Savings Proposals

- 5.1.** The MTFP Strategy report to Cabinet in December 2018, showed that there was a funding shortfall of £15m to produce a balanced budget for 2019/20. Services have developed proposals for further reductions in service budgets that would ensure a balanced budget for 2019/20 and that, in some cases, also contribute to additional savings in 2020/21.
- 5.2.** Savings proposals totalling £8,512m are detailed in the table at Appendix A and are categorised by those that require a saving decision to take effect from 1 April 2019, and those that require a decision to consult. Of these proposals, £6,955m are on-going and an additional £0.370m has been identified for 2020/21.
- 5.3.** For Policy and Place Scrutiny the detailed proforma's for the relevant Proposals for Change and Impact Assessments for this committee can be found at Appendix B.
- 5.4.** Within the ECI proposals, a £225k savings target relates to Waste Services. There are no detailed proposals for Change submitted as part of Appendix B as Cabinet are asked to endorse the savings target to the Somerset Waste Board to make savings to this value as part of setting its 2019/20 budget.
- 5.5.** In addition, and for your information, there are a number of 2019/20 savings proposals and financial adjustments which total £6,899m, where decisions have already been taken. These decisions have followed due process to meet governance requirements and can therefore be assumed in the overall 2019/20 budget position.
- 5.6.** Therefore, in balancing the £15m funding shortfall for 2019/20, a total of £15,411m of savings have been identified, of which £8,512m require Cabinet endorsement and then Full Council decisions in February 2019.
- 5.7.** Within the budget for each year is a revenue contingency, which is aimed to provide some resilience in the event that some savings cannot be delivered to the extent planned. It has been assessed, through the use of confidence factors, that the contingency sum is sufficient to address any potential shortfalls to allow for a balanced budget in 2019/20.

6. Consultations undertaken

- 6.1.** Some of the savings proposals contained within this report will require consultations. Within appendix A the proposals and values of savings can be seen

7. Implications

- 7.1.** There are significant financial implications and these are identified throughout the report.
- 7.2.** The detailed proposals for change can be seen in appendix B. These detail any legal implications associated with each change proposal.

- 7.3. The nature and scale of the savings required means that there will be HR implications arising from this report these can be seen within the detailed proposals for change in appendix B.

8. Background papers

- 8.1. Revenue Budget 2019/20 and [MTFP Strategy Report](http://democracy.somerset.gov.uk/documents/s9180/Medium%20Term%20Financial%20Strategy%20-%20Report%20v2.pdf) to Cabinet 19 December 2018
<http://democracy.somerset.gov.uk/documents/s9180/Medium%20Term%20Financial%20Strategy%20-%20Report%20v2.pdf>

Appendix A: Summary of Savings Proposals from 2019/20

£,000	Proposals for Decision				Proposals requiring consultation				TOTALS for Proposals for Decision and Proposals Requiring Consultation			
	No. Proposals for Change	Max 19/20	..of which is ongoing savings	<u>Additional ongoing savings from 20/21</u>	No. Proposals for change	Max 19/20	..of which is ongoing savings	<u>Additional ongoing savings from 20/21</u>	No. Proposals for change	Max 19/20	..of which is ongoing savings	<u>Additional ongoing savings from 20/21</u>
Service												
Adults Services	6	2937.0	2937.0	219.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6	2937.0	2937.0	219.0
Children's Services	6	1701.0	925.7	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6	1701.0	925.7	0.0
ECI	25	1651.2	1234.2	20.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25	1651.2	1234.2	20.0
Corporate Services	9	1482.9	1117.9	76.5	2	740.0	740.0	54.2	11	2222.9	1857.9	130.7
Financial Adjustments	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTALS	46	7772.1	6214.8	315.5	2	740.0	740.0	54.2	48	8512.1	6954.8	369.7

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B1: Summary of Savings Proposals for 2019 - 2022 for Policies & Place Scrutiny

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
Adult's – For Decision				
Adults 1920-01	Rationalisation of Extra Care Housing provision in Somerset	As part of MTFP2, ASC funded support to three Extra Care schemes has been de-commissioned of those schemes that are furthest from the desired model and have no or very little support being delivered in them. Going forward, there is a confidence a further 8 out of the 22 remaining schemes do not provide good value for money and as a model do not support good community support or interactions. It is therefore felt that the ASC funded support could be withdrawn and used in better ways. For clarity the schemes will not close, but it is expected that they would continue as either general needs housing suitable for older people or specialist sheltered housing / Assisted living.	604	219
Adults 1920-03	Review of Care Packages	Adult Social Care (ASC) have a statutory responsibility to carry out reviews under the Care Act on an annual basis. There are currently 6,832 people receiving care and support within the community. ASC are committed to improving individual lives by providing the right kind of support however the service has identified that when carrying out a strengths-based person-centred review in line with the 'Promoting Independence' strategy show that savings can be achieved. On the basis of progress in 2018 -19 further savings will be delivered whilst still improving outcomes for individuals.	1100	0
Adults 1920-04	KeyRing Grant Reduction	KeyRing network provides a variety of accommodation and housing related support for clients. Moving forward ASC are looking to re-provide the support that is currently given to members in Glastonbury/Street as information suggests that individuals do not need or require this level of support and people have been successfully integrated back into their communities.	15	0
Adults 1920-08	Recommissioning Care Home Dementia Support	The proposal will review existing high cost complex mental health cases who have complex dementia to identify the most appropriate care is being provided to each individual, and to ensure value for money is being achieved in relation to the associated costs of each package of care. At present there are a number of individuals who have high levels of 1.1 support for whom the quality of experience is	100	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
		not as good as expected. As part of this change and reduction we will be looking to recommission alternative delivery models for this client group that supports them to be independent but is more cost effective.		
Adults 1920-09	Managing Demand / Reduction in placements in residential nursing care	This proposal is aligned to the reduction that has been seen in placements in residential and nursing care and over the last few years and the continued change of approach within the ASC sector. This builds upon the reduced dependency on this model of support both as a result of the 'Promoting Independence' strategy and also the focus on keeping people at home with support.	1068	0
Adults 1920-10	Reduction of Independent Assessor support in the deprivation of Liberty safeguards service	The service currently uses a mix of internal and external assessors to manage MCA assessments. The service is proposing to reduce reliance upon independent Best Interest Assessors (BIAs) (Expensive) and ensure maximum effectiveness of our in-house assessors.	50	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
Children's – For decision				
Chil1920-01	Support for School Improvement	To use the School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant to fund the salaries of the Primary School Improvement Advisers currently funded by the LA.	220.4	0
Chil1920-02	Reduction in support for Early Years capital programmes	Reduction in staffing capacity supporting EY capital programmes as a result of reduced capital programme for 19/20.	13.6	0
Chil1920-03	CSC realignment savings	Proposed realignment of social work services within the county around an east-west split.	573.4	0
Chil1920-04	Children's Staffing Vacancies	Hold a number of positions we have been unable to recruit to as vacant positions for one year.	775.3	-775.3
Chil1920-05	Early Years Entitlements	Changes to processing of payments of the Early Years Entitlement and funding for 2-year olds including the extended entitlement paid to EY providers.	20	0
Chil1920-06	SEN transport	Reducing the cost of providing transport to specialist provision.	98.325	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
Corporate – For consultation				
Corp 1920-07	Restructure of HR Admin and Payroll Service	Savings to be realised due to E processes and other innovation projects.	95	9.2
Corp 1920-12	Corporate Affairs Re-structure	Review of structures across ICT, Commercial Procurement and Customers & Communities and wider organisational efficiencies.	645	45
Corporate – For decision				
Corp 1920-01	Pathway to Employment Budget Reductions	SCC do not support Pathway to Employment and the budget not already committed for 19/20 is permanently released.	115	76.5
Corp 1920-02	Vacant IT Training Manager position	Permanently release current budget for IT Training Manager position.	40.7	0
Corp 1920-03	Vacant HR Advisor position	Permanently release current budget for part time HR Advisor position.	24.5	0
Corp 1920-04	Vacant OD Service Manager position	Permanently release current budget for OD Service Manager position.	47.7	0
Corp 1920-05	Permanent reduction in Learning & Development training budget	Reduction in training budget.	100	0
Corp 1920-13	ICT Contract and Service Change	Contract savings and reductions. SAP, ATP, Express Route, eDOCS.	847	-345

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
Corp 1920-14b	ICT Resource income generation	Opportunity to generate income through charging for resource time.	20	-20
Corp 1920-17	Additional contractual efficiency savings	Deep dive review of Tier 1 Contracts to identify efficiency savings in changing scope, scale and/or re-negotiating price.	168	0
Corp 1920-23	Review of Fees and Charges	Review charge out rates in respect of external customers and time charge rates against capital and grant funded project.	120	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
ECI – For decision				
ECI 1920-01	Remove current countywide 4-yearly planned programme of gully cleaning	Remove the current 4-yearly planned programme of gully cleaning from 2019/2020. This affects approximately 72,000 gullies countywide. Approximately 18,000 gullies cleaned each year, a quarter of the 4-yearly programme is delivered annually. The gullies referred to in this proposal are in predominantly, low risk urban areas. Reactive orders will continue to be raised against these gullies based on demand; identified by the public or from safety and serviceability inspections.	80	0
ECI 1920-03	Reduction in Rights of Way Service Delivery	Reduce the routine vegetation clearance programme on RoW. The annual contract spend is approximately £85k (delivered through a Framework Agreement & competitive process). It is proposed that £25k of this budget is surrendered.	25	0
ECI 1920-04	Implement a 1-swathe width cut across the entire planned verge maintenance programme 2019/2020.	Service currently implements variable swathe width cuts across the network. Saving to be achieved by modifying extent of cutting undertaken in this 16-week countywide programme. Visibility splays and forward sight lines, as defined in the inventory, to remain as part of the agreed service provision.	90	0
ECI 1920-05	Capitalisation of the existing revenue funded Ditches and Grip budget	Works involve creating new, permanent, assets.	60	0
ECI 1920-08	Flood & Water Management Budget	Reduce the funding in the 2019/20 programme by £80,000 (with budget returning to pre-saving level in 2020/21). This will be achieved by: 1) Undertaking fewer flood risk management studies and options appraisals. 2) Designing and constructing fewer flood alleviation schemes.	80	-80
ECI 1920-09	Highways Winter Emergency	Removal of roadside salt supplies for self-help usage by the travelling public in winter conditions. Prior to 2018/2019 SCC policy was for salt to be supplied for this	40	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
	Service - removal of road side salt supplies	operation contained in grit bins and 1 tonne dumpy bags. This service was stopped for the winter of 2018/2019 as a one-off measure. Whilst this has been temporarily reinstated the proposal is to remove this provision as an ongoing measure from 2019/2020 onwards.		
ECI 1920-10	Highways Staff Structure Review	Review staff structure in response to Asset Management Project. Asset management is a well-established discipline for the management of physical assets. Many asset owning organisations have adopted the principles of asset management and as a result, can demonstrate benefits in terms of financial efficiencies, improved accountability and stewardship of the asset, better value for money and improved customer service.	80	0
ECI 1920-11	Reduction of the in-year Reactive Jetting budget	Reduction of the in-year reactive jetting budget to remove £40k from the £158k countywide base budget.	40	0
ECI 1920-13	Highways – Winter & Emergency Service (Gritter Fleet Disposal)	To sell the three gritters which have been replaced by new gritters purchased in advance of the 2018/19 winter season. The gritters are no longer required to support service delivery.	27	-27
ECI 1920-14	Disposal of Land Rover fleet	Following the review and revision of the Winter Service Policy, there is no requirement for SCC operational staff to drive in challenging climatic conditions that would necessitate the specific provision of a 4x4 vehicle. A £75k one off saving for disposal to capital receipts is expected alongside £3.2k ongoing running cost savings.	78.2	-75
ECI 1920-17	Reduce traffic management and parking service revenue costs	Review how Traffic Management and Parking services are undertaken with a view to reducing the revenue budget. This will include ensuring full cost recovery, income generation and service re-design by bringing Parking Services into the Traffic Management service structure.	100	-100
ECI 1920-19	Further reductions in road safety and	Reduce revenue costs by £150,000 in 2019/20 by reducing the Road Safety and Transport Data services towards a statutory minimum funded from SCC budgets. This is a 22% reduction of the total revenue budget.	150	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
	transport data service			
ECI 1920-20	Rights of Way - reduction of town & village green budget & reduction of Exmoor NPA contribution	Surrender Town & Village Green budget of £15k for 2019/20 - A one-off in-year saving of £15k can be surrendered in relation to Town & Village Green registrations. This would be the second year of surrendering this budget. Exmoor National Park Authority (ENPA) contribution – reduce by £5k - The current contribution from the Council to ENPA for delivery of statutory functions in relation to rights of way is £28,046. It is proposed that this could be reduced by £5,000 to £23,046.	20	-15
ECI 1920-21	Monmouth House Lease Surrender	Surrender of under-utilised lease of Monmouth House and move of SWP to Broughton House with associated rental income.	90	0
ECI 1920-22	Vacation and surrender of 1 The Crescent	Surrender of lease of surplus building (leased in) and move of teams to underutilised first floor of Paul Street Library.	85	0
ECI 1920-23	New rental income	This relates to rental for a production kitchen unit on the old St Augustine’s site. The current tenant only paid rental based on profitability as a legacy of the Free School Meals project but has served notice. A new tenant/provider is being sought for the unit.	20	-20
ECI 1920-24	Staff Restructure	Loss of Apprentice role - removing the post in Estates which comes to an end and covering those functions previously carried out by the apprentice through re-distribution of those functions among the remaining team and re-prioritisation of other tasks.	13	0
ECI 1920-24a	Staff Restructure	Flexible retirement - following discussions with one member of staff, there has been an application for flexible retirement which would see a full time post reduced to 3/5.	10	10
ECI 1920-25	Corporate Landlord	This proposal relates to the new Corporate Landlord model for delivering property and asset management, whereby responsibility for our property assets passes to the Corporate Property Group allowing for a consistent and joined up approach to all	50	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
		property matters and enabling savings from rationalisation, increased utilisation and economies of scale.		
ECI 1920-26	Reprographics Review	<p>New model of operations for Reprographics being proposed involving reduced reliance on high cost per click in-house options and reduced overhead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relocate two Multi-functional devices (MFDs) with full colour enabled from elsewhere in County Hall to Reprographics to be used for small-scale print jobs and terminate the lease (3 months' notice) on two large-scale Xerox machines. - Reprographics to act as a broker for print/finish jobs, outsourcing when print quality and/or price is better than in-house. - Set up a dynamic procurement system or increased number of approved external suppliers to 'bid' for each print job. - Review job descriptions for two posts in Reprographics. 	25	0
ECI 1920-27	Beckett House	Savings from running costs assuming new use/disposal - options currently being explored include possible re-use as enterprise centre which could generate income, but this may not hit property budgets and so this proposal relates only to the small annual running costs currently picked up within our group, which would either be passed to tenants or reassigned as the property is disposed of. Proposal will require the relocation of the Registration Service.	3	0
ECI 1920-28	Dr Morgan's School Site	Savings expected from current running costs assuming disposal by October 2019. This proposal relies on the planned relocation of the Libraries West operation to new more suitable premises.	10	10
ECI 1920-29	Health and Safety System replacement	Savings secured through procurement of new supplier for Health and Safety management system. Implementation took place in 18/19 with savings only to be realised in 19/20 due to mobilisation costs.	20	0
ECI 1920-33	Economic Development savings	<p>This proposal includes the following two elements to enable a reduction in the net revenue base budget allocation by SCC for economic development from 2019/20:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capitalisation of SCC's contribution to the annual programme management costs of the Connecting Devon and Somerset programme (£180k) 	230	0

Service Area Ref.	Proposal Title	Brief Summary	Sum of Max Value 2019/20 Saving (£,000)	Sum of Max Value 2020/21 Saving (£,000)
		2. Public Health funding of inclusive growth outcomes via economic development (£50k)		
ECI 1920-Waste	Waste savings	Proposal subject to Somerset Waste Board approval in February 2019. http://democracy.somerset.gov.uk/documents/s9103/Financial%20Performance%20-%20Year%20To%20date%20and%20Draft%20Budget%20Dec%202018.pdf	225	-100

**Appendix B2a:
Corporate Services
Proposals for
Change -
For decision for
2019 - 2022**

Proposal for Change: Corp1920-01 Pathway to Employment Budget Reductions

Corporate Plan Priority:	Corp1920-01
Service Area:	Organisational Development, HR/OD
Director:	Chris Squire
Strategic Manager	Clive Mallon (Service Manager)
SAP Node	EIHA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>The Human Resource/Organisation Development Service (HROD) has a £201,500 annual budget to run the Pathway to Employment Scheme. The scheme, which has been in existence for the past five years, aims to boost the employability of those not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET), vulnerable/disadvantaged young people within Somerset, such as Care Leavers or those with a disability.</p> <p>A number of initiatives fall within the scheme, initiatives include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Experience (both at SCC and partner organisations) • Employability and Training weeks • Internships • Paid work or Apprenticeships (both at SCC and partner organisations) • Bespoke employability programmes with partner organisations, such as Skanska and Viridor. • Taster weeks; where individuals can try a number of vocations • Education and training programmes 	

Only one of the above initiatives is negatively impacted by the proposed budget reductions; paid work or apprenticeships within SCC. Traditionally services have acted as hosts to referred young people in short to medium term fixed term contracts and apprenticeships. Approximately eight people per year are supported within this initiative.

This proposal is to greatly reduce the Pathway to Employment scheme budget to £10,000 per year. Releasing all bar £10,000 of uncommitted budget in 2019/20 provides a saving of £115,000. In 2020/21 a further £76,500 can be offered as a saving.

The retention of a small annual budget, of £10,000, allows for certain work (some of the other bullet points listed above) to continue to take place; such as the annual Care Leaver Employability Programme at Pinkery Resource Centre – these are ‘low-cost, high-impact’ programmes, without a budget these couldn’t happen.

HR/OD will take the opportunity to redesign the scheme including alternative funding arrangements to maximise the scope of support that can be offered from 2019/20.

2a. Confidence level

100 %

Very few people have access to spend against the budget, an immediate stop can be put on spend meaning the saving is guaranteed.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There is limited impact. All those currently on paid placements within SCC will be supported to complete their various opportunities. The impact of this budget reduction is that no new referrals can be made for those people that would be deemed as ready for a paid internal opportunity, supported by the scheme. Organisational Development (OD) will need to redesign the scheme and consider alternative funding arrangements to maximise the scope of support that can be offered from 2019/20.

Please note that the people ‘supported’ mentioned above only relates to those that would have had paid employment directly with SCC. Those that are put forward for partners schemes, such as the Skanska Work Experience/Apprentice Programme are not impacted. SCC can still be a viable employer for people from vulnerable/disadvantaged backgrounds, the only difference being is that host services will need to use their own budget to fund roles rather than receiving money from the Pathway to Employment budget.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

The impacts are minimal; the scheme has paid the salary of individuals in roles which have been used to support corporate meetings/initiatives, such as the Young People’s Champions roles – if these are to continue beyond the current commitments the service will need to fund.

Service areas that have traditionally recruited people from the Pathway to Employment 'pool' are making plans as to how they can continue to recruit without having the financial assistance from the scheme. The service areas are positive that there are alternative arrangements that can be made to have little-to-no impact on future recruitment.

5. Impact on staff:

None (all current roles being supported will continue to the end of their contracts).

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

No resources required to support this change.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Confirmation of the decision being approved	December
Communication to regular supporters of the scheme	December
Communication to those that have ability to spend against the budget (confined to OD)	Immediately following above milestone.

8. Risks and opportunities:

Risks are minimal. We have the opportunity to reimagine the scheme and what support it can offer those groups traditionally referred.

9. Dependencies:

Not applicable.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Impact assessment produced and reviewed by Equalities Manager.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Not required.

12. Legal Implications:

Not required.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£115,000	£	-£	£115,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£76,500	£	-£	£76,500	Ongoing
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£191,500	£	-£	£191,500	Ongoing

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Before completing this EIA please ensure you have read the EIA guidance notes – available from your Equality Officer

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	V1	Date Completed	15/11/18

Decision within the Proposal for Change to reduce Somerset County Council’s (SCC) Pathway to Employment budget (from £201.5k to £10k) - Corp1920-01

Human Resources and Organisational Development (HR/OD) has a £201.5k annual budget to run the Pathway to Employment Scheme. The scheme, which has been in existence for the past five years, aims to boost the employability of NEET (Not in Employment, Education or Training) vulnerable/disadvantaged young people (generally between the ages of 16-24) within Somerset, such as Care Leavers or those with a disability. A number of initiatives fall within the scheme, initiatives include;

- Work Experience (both at SCC and partner organisations)
- Employability and Training weeks
- Internships
- Paid work or Apprenticeships (both at SCC and partner organisations)
- Bespoke employability programmes with partner organisations, such as Skanska and Viridor.
- ‘Taster’ weeks, where individuals can try a number of vocations
- Education and training programmes

Only one of the above initiatives is negatively impacted by the proposed budget reductions; paid work or apprenticeships within SCC. Traditionally services have acted as hosts to referred young people in short to medium term fixed term contracts and apprenticeships. Approximately eight people per year are supported within this initiative.

This proposal is to greatly reduce the Pathway to Employment scheme budget to £10k per year. Releasing all but £10k of uncommitted budget in 19/20 provides a saving of 115k. In 20/21 a further £76.5k can be offered as a saving.

All those currently on paid placements within SCC will be supported to complete their various opportunities. The impact of this budget reduction is that no new referrals can be made for those people that would be deemed as ready for a paid internal opportunity, supported by the scheme.

The other initiatives which fall within the scope of the scheme remain largely unaffected. SCC can still be a viable employer for people from vulnerable/disadvantaged backgrounds, the only difference being is that host services will need to use their own budget to fund roles rather than receiving money from the Pathway to Employment budget.

The retention of a small annual budget allows for certain 'low-cost, high-impact' programmes to continue - without a budget these couldn't happen.

HR/OD will need to redesign the scheme and consider alternative funding arrangements (such as bidding for grant money and the transfer of apprenticeship levy funds to partner organisations) to maximise the scope of support that can be offered from 19/20.

Evidence

What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups? Sources such as the [Office of National Statistics](#), [Somerset Intelligence Partnership](#), [Somerset's Joint Strategic Needs Analysis \(JSNA\)](#), Staff and/ or [area profiles](#), should be detailed here

From the inception of the scheme data has been captured by HR/OD on each individual referred and supported. This data includes key information such as the individuals background, personal data and which initiative they are supported by.

The evidence is clear cut – the majority of the scheme remains exactly the same. The difference is that internal SCC services wanting to host pathway to employment candidates (in paid work) will have to fund the salaries. Work will continue with our partners to expand the scope of their equivalent programmes to continue to maintain, and eventually increase, the number of opportunities available for in-scope individuals.

Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups? If you have not consulted other people, please explain why?				
The proposal was shared with the Strategic Commissioning Group on 15/11/18. The group supported the proposal to reduce the budget.				
Analysis of impact on protected groups				
The Public Sector Equality Duty requires us to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations with protected groups. Consider how this policy/service will achieve these aims. In the table below, using the evidence outlined above and your own understanding, detail what considerations and potential impacts against each of the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty. Based on this information, make an assessment of the likely outcome, before you have implemented any mitigation.				
Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed decision will negatively impact more on younger people, this is due to the majority of individuals referred into the scheme being within the 16-24 age bracket. The authority does now have a well-established apprenticeship scheme (while apprenticeships are available for any age group they do tend to attract younger candidates) which a number of these people would be suitable for. Apprentice numbers have swelled at the authority from 20 Nov 2016 to 192 at present. 	☒	☐	☐

	The real number of people impacted per year could therefore be fewer than eight.			
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme has historically offered roles to people with disabilities. As above, only those that were interested in internal to SCC (paid) opportunities may be impacted. Service areas that have traditionally recruited disabled people from the Pathway to Employment 'pool' are making plans as to how they can continue to recruit without having the financial assistance from the scheme. The service areas are positive that there are alternative arrangements that can be made to have little-to-no impact on future recruitment. 	☒	☐	☐
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst this characteristic hasn't been one in which the scheme has previously had referrals on I would consider them as 'in-scope' and therefore are impacted by this decision. 	☐	☒	☐
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact of this group based on this proposal 	☐	☒	☐
Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact of this group based on this proposal 	☐	☒	☐

Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact of this group based on this proposal 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact of this group based on this proposal 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact of this group based on this proposal – there is an even split between males and females accessing initiatives via the Pathway to Employment scheme. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact of this group based on this proposal 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care Leavers make up the bulk of the NEET's supported by the scheme. With service areas being able to offer fewer paid roles (financed by the scheme) there will be some care leavers that cannot be internally supported. Alongside the Leaving Care service OD will work to expand the range of roles offered in partner organisations to offset the internal reduction. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Negative outcomes action plan Where you have ascertained that there will potentially be negative outcomes, you are required to mitigate the impact of these. Please detail below the actions that you intend to take.				
Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete

<p>The positive news is that the majority of the initiatives and opportunities are not impacted by the reduction in budget.</p> <p>Between the time of writing and the beginning of the 19/20 financial year there is time to redesign the Pathway to Employment Scheme.</p> <p>The redesign of the scheme will need to look at what opportunities there are to replace the element of the scheme that would otherwise not run without the funding; at this point we can also review those that access the scheme to ensure each of the protected characteristics are positively supported.</p> <p>Action: Review opportunities for grant funding, working with partners to provide alternative yet similar roles and update the Young People Strategy in line with the new scope of the scheme.</p>	01/04/2019	Clive Mallon		□
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
Completed by:	Clive Mallon			
Date	19/11/2018			
Signed off by:	Chris Squire			

Date	23/11/2018
Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	Tom Rutland
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Clive Mallon
Review date:	31/03/2019

**Proposal for Change:
Corp1920-02 Permanently release current budget for IT Training
Manager position**

Corporate Plan Priority:	Corp1920-02
Service Area:	Organisational Development, HR/OD
Director:	Chris Squire
Strategic Manager	Clive Mallon (Service Manager)
SAP Node	EIHA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>The IT Training Manager post has been 'frozen' since March 2018 and a temporary management arrangement put in place (covered by existing staff within the service).</p> <p>In the interim period a review of the IT Training team structure has taken place and It has been decided to amend the structure to permanently remove the vacant manager post. To offset this, and put long term management support into the team, one of the existing IT Trainer posts will be upgraded to a manager post, which has been evaluated at a lower grade than the previously frozen post due to a new operating structure. As a result, there will be an overall reduction of one post in the team resulting in a saving.</p>	

2a. Confidence level

100 %

Plans developed and ready to implement.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There is no impact in the removal of this post, plans have been thought through and the interim period without the manager role filled have worked well.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

Impacts are initially minimal; consideration to the future of the IT Training Team and how it works to support the organisation is required (the team has halved in size in recent years yet support for IT and Tech increases).

5. Impact on staff:

None, post is empty.

The number of FTE that might be lost is: 0 (vacant position)

The number of posts that might be lost is: 1 x vacancy

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

No resources required to support this change.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Removal of post from structure

1st April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

No risks identified.

9. Dependencies:

Not applicable.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not required.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Not required.

12. Legal Implications:

Not required.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£40,700	£	-£	£40,700	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£40,700	£	-£	£40,700	Ongoing

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change: CORP1920-03 Vacant HR Advisor Position

Corporate Plan Priority:	Corp1920-03
Service Area:	HR & OD
Director:	Chris Squire
Strategic Manager	Sari Brice
SAP Node	EIHA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Permanent removal of 22.20 hour HR Advisor vacancy. Post has been held vacant since resignation of postholder for duration of 2018/19. By removing this post £24,500 will be saved in 2019/20.

2a. Confidence level
100%
There is no current postholder.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
N/A

4. Impact on other services we provide:

The removal of this post will impact on the resources available within the HR Advisory team and the level of support that can be provided across the organisation, particularly in relation to the team's ability to provide proactive support to the organisation on employee relations matters. Areas that will be affected and are being reviewed are briefing and training sessions for managers on managing disciplinary, grievances, performance management and sickness absence, frequency of link meetings with Strategic Managers, maintaining and updating HR Policies and procedures.

5. Impact on staff:

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

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

No resources required.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

SAP OM structure updated	1 April 2019
--------------------------	--------------

8. Risks and opportunities:

Service is currently reviewing HR Officer workloads to accommodate this reduction.

9. Dependencies:

No dependencies.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

No.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Affected staff are already aware of the proposal and work is being undertaken within the Service to minimise the impact on workloads.

12. Legal Implications:

N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£24,500	£	-£	£24,500	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£24,500	£	-£	£24,500	Ongoing

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change: CORP1920-04 Vacant OD Service Manager post

Corporate Plan Priority:	Corp1920-04
Service Area:	HR Services
Director:	Chris Squire
Strategic Manager	Rachel Ellins
SAP Node	EIHA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Permanent removal of vacant position that was given up for part year in 2018/19 and will now be released permanently.</p> <p>This service manager position sits on the HR Organisational Development Team and will result in a saving of £47,700 in 2019/20.</p>

2a. Confidence level
100%
This position can be fully released.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
No impact on residents, business or other organisations.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

Tasks of this role have been redistributed within the HR Service and some casual support is currently received from an ex member of staff. If still required in 19/20 this will be funded from other areas.

5. Impact on staff:

Removal of 1 vacant position, 0.95 FTE.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:

The number of posts that might be lost is:

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

No resource required.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Updated Organisational Management (OM) Structure

1st April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

- Negative impact on staff morale/engagement.
- Inability to deliver services to expectation

9. Dependencies:

No dependencies

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Following conversations with the Corporate Equalities Manager it was agreed that an Equalities Impact Assessment was not required.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

N/A

12. Legal Implications:

N/A

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidenced based?				Yes, options have been costed by Finance but final structure still to be finalised.	
If no, when is evidence expected?				N/A	
Please note: these figures should be cumulative (as per the approach for MTFP and savings)					
£'s	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£47,700	£	-£	£47,700	Ongoing
2020/21	£0	£	-£	£0	
Total	£47,700	£	-£	£47,700	Ongoing

13b. One off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£s		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£0

Proposal for Change: CORP1920-05 Permanent reduction in Learning & Development Training Budget

Corporate Plan Priority:	Corp1920-05
Service Area:	Organisational Development, HR/OD
Director:	Chris Squire
Strategic Manager	Clive Mallon (Service Manager)
SAP Node	EIHB

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>In 2018/19 £100,000 of the authority-wide Learning and Development (L&D) budget was offered as an 'in-year' saving to meet HR and Organisational Design (HR/OD) contribution to Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). This proposal is to formalise those arrangements and for the budget to be permanently removed from the budget.</p> <p>HR/OD distribute L&D budget annually to Children's and Adults L&D teams, ECI and retain a proportion for corporate training. This proposal would impact on each of those teams. Statutory training is not impacted by the proposed budget reduction.</p>	

2a. Confidence level

100 %

Plans developed and ready to implement.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Each of ECI, Adults, Children's and Corporate L&D budgets will be affected. The majority of the saving will come from the Corporate L&D budget with each of the other business area apportionments being reduced to make up the saving.

The value of saving was made in year in 2018/19, this proposal removes the budget on an ongoing basis – whilst challenging it was achievable in 2018/19 with minimal impact therefore it is achievable on a permanent basis. It is worth noting that the value of the authority-wide L&D budget has halved in recent years and will equate to less than £200 per employee from 2019/20, which is incredibly low.

Alongside this proposal work has commenced to centralise L&D across the authority. This plan involves bringing the Children's L&D, Adults L&D and Organisational Development (including IT Training Team) teams together into one L&D function. It is anticipated that better working practices would reduce the required spend on L&D which can be offset against the planned budget reduction.

A detailed investigation on the spend against the L&D budgets is required to further review usage to ensure only true L&D spend is made against the budget; early indications are that there has been spend against the budget for non-L&D activity.

Other areas of development outside of these budgets will be reviewed to be fully made use of; the increase in available qualifications via the apprenticeship levy into 19/20 should further reduce the impact (e.g. SCC current fund years 2 and 3 of Open Uni Social Work Degree courses, this cost should be able to be met by the levy in future years, a 'saving' of £6,000 per student per year is possible).

4. Impact on other services we provide:

As above, minimal impacts identified – and no impact on statutory training.

5. Impact on staff:

None, although more work is required to review the element provided to the Children's L&D team – currently the budget provided to that team pays for staff salaries and there is an 'agreed overspend' to pay for the L&D initiatives the team arranges. This review is taking place within the rebasing of budgets within Children's Services, led by Finance.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

No resources required to support this change.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Post decision sign off, review the spend areas and decide on Business Area L&D apportionments	Dec 2018
Communicate with impacted teams	Jan 2019
New budget values go live	April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

Other than the risks identified above there are none.

9. Dependencies:

The reduction in budget is made easier if the L&D teams amalgamate.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Discussion on proposals with the equalities lead took place on the 20th November 2018 and it was agreed that an impact assessment was not required.

Whilst the budget will reduce the spend level will remain the same as 2018/19 and may in fact increase based on the plans detailed above. The services successfully delivered training to staff without compromising frequency, location etc therefore no staff groups are negatively impacted by this proposal.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Not required

12. Legal Implications:

N/A

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£100,000	£	-£	£100,000	Ongoing

2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£100,000	£	-£	£100,000	Ongoing

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change:

CORP1920-13 ICT Contract and Service Changes

Corporate Plan Priority:	CORP1920-13
Service Area:	Corporate Services
Director:	Simon Clifford
Strategic Manager	Andy Kennell
SAP Node	EII

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>This proposal is aiming to deliver £847,000 in 2019/20, of which £502,000 will be ongoing and £345,000 will be a one-off through;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing licence count and support on a number of ICT contracts • Deferring the implementation of enhanced email security for an additional year • Reducing contract costs based on reduction of hosting infrastructure required. 	

2a. Confidence level	
75	%

There are ongoing negotiations and initiatives with some of the contracts associated with this proposal.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There will be no impact on residents, businesses or other organisations.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

There is a small increase in the level of risk of infection and malware attack against the council that may gain access to mailboxes as a result of not implementing enhanced email security. This risk will be mitigated by further user training and communication around best practice use of email and manual monitoring.

5. Impact on staff:

None.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

An estimate of 3 days of ICT effort to migrate to the alternative connectivity and 1-2 days of effort from ICT to remove unlicensed software and install alternative (open source) versions.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Implement alternative comms to Express route.	By end of 18/19 financial year
---	--------------------------------

8. Risks and opportunities:

There is a small increase in the level of risk of infection and malware attack against the council that may gain access to mailboxes as a result of not implementing advanced email security. This risk will be mitigated by further user training and communication around best practice use of email and manual monitoring.

9. Dependencies:

None

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Following agreement from the Corporate Equalities Manager it was agreed that an Equalities Impact Assessment was not required.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Following agreement with the Consultation Manager it was agreed that there was no need for consultation.

12. Legal Implications:

No legal implications. Basic exchange cloud protection (EOLP) meets the minimum requirements for PCI DSS (Payment card guidance) and PSN (Public Sector Network) but fails to meet industry best practice guidelines.

Also note that this proposal is predicated on the basis that the contract(s) permit the proposed course of action, due process will be followed to ensure this happens to remove the risk of legal challenge.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)? Yes

If no, when is the evidence expected? N/A

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£847,000	£	-£	£847,000	345k one off (review 20/21)
2020/21	£-345,000	£	-£	£-345,000	One off
2021/22					
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£502,000	£	-£	£502,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change: CORP1920-14b ICT Resource Income Generation

Corporate Plan Priority:	CORP1920-14b
Service Area:	ICT
Director:	Simon Clifford
Strategic Manager	Andy Kennell
SAP Node	EII

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>This proposal is aiming to deliver £20,000 of additional one-off income in 19/20 through the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To exploit opportunities to generate income through charging for resource time 	

2a. Confidence level	
<div style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; padding: 2px;">80</div> %	
<p>Based on resource requirements/requests received from Somerset Waste Partnership and neighbouring local authorities we are confident that we can deliver the savings identified.</p>	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There will be no impact on residents, businesses and other organisations.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

There will be no negative impacts on any of the other services that we current provide.

5. Impact on staff:

Some resource will be asked to work flexibly on temporary assignments.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

None required.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Request for resource will be reviewed on a regular basis and will be used as an income opportunity as and when the opportunities arise.

8. Risks and opportunities:

None noted.

9. Dependencies:

This proposal is heavily dependent on neighbouring local authorities and Somerset Waste Partnership continuing to require resource.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Following agreement with the Corporate Equalities Manager it was agreed that a Equalities Impact Assessment was not required.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Following agreement with the Consultation Manager it was agreed that consultation would be not be necessary.

12. Legal Implications:

This proposal is covered by the Local Government (Goods and Services) Act 1970 which gives power to supply services between local authorities and other public bodies to utilise surplus capacity and give benefits of scale

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£	£20,000	-£	£20,000	One off
2020/21	£	£-20,000	-£	£-20,000	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£	£20,000	-£	£20,000	One-off

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change: Corp1920-17-Additional Contractual Efficiency Savings

Corporate Plan Priority:	CORP1920-17
Service Area:	Commercial and Procurement
Director:	Simon Clifford
Strategic Manager	Claire Griffiths
SAP Node	Tbc for individual Services

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>Undertake deep dive contract reviews from a commercial perspective, to identify efficiency savings. These may be derived from a range of sources including de-scoping of services, renegotiation of contract terms, enforcement of financial penalties for non-performance, comparison of invoices against works complete to identify discrepancies, comparison of contract payments versus annual contract value, evaluation of contract performance against contract Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).</p> <p>A long list of contract / groupings of contracts has been compiled from an initial assessment of the Top 100 contracts (ranked on annual value). This list includes individual contracts and frameworks and the final work plan will be discussed and agreed with SLT before being rolled out. Opportunities for synergies with specific contracts identified as part of the 2019/20 MTFP will also be identified. Work has already commenced in ICT and has set the approach for all contract deep dives.</p>	

2a. Confidence level

80%

Until the contract deep dives commence the actual potential for savings cannot be quantified. However, with work to date in ICT there is a high confidence of achieving £68,000 to date.

Service Activity	Saving
Express Route	£53,000
PSN Connection	£15,000

In addition, there is an 80% confidence on £100,000 of mobile phone savings.

This delivers a total to date of £168,000. The remaining £332,000 target will form part of the pipeline of work.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

N/A

4. Impact on other services we provide:

Potentially, particularly if services are de-scoped from a specific contract. An evaluation of the impact of this will be undertaken at that time.

5. Impact on staff:

No impact on staff

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Staff responsible for the operational delivery of contracts/frameworks that are the subject of deep dive will be required to give support to C&P officers. If services are descoped, there may also be resource implications. Yet to be determined. Finance, HR and legal are likely to be required, depending on the outcomes of each contract Deep Dive.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Work to commence November 2018 to achieve savings as far as possible for full financial year but will be an ongoing rolling programme of work

Rolling programme of work

8. Risks and opportunities:

To be identified at an individual contract level.

9. Dependencies:

To be identified at an individual contract level.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

None

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

None at present

12. Legal Implications:

As noted above, the opportunity to renegotiate contract terms, to enforce penalties for non-performance and to take action under other contractual provisions will depend in each case on the terms of each contract concerned.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	No
If no, when is the evidence expected?	January 2019 onwards

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'000's	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£168,000	£	-£	£168,000	On-going
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£168,000	£	-£	£168,000	ongoing

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Proposal for Change:

Review of Fees and Charges

Corporate Plan Priority:	Corp1920-23
Service Area:	All
Director:	All (Lead Alyn Jones)
Strategic Manager	Martin Gerrish
SAP Node	

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>Review charge out rates in respect of external customers and time charge rates against capital and grant funded project. The purpose of the review is to ensure that services are recouping the total costs of providing services where a charge can be made or the costs of deploying staff to capital and third-party projects. This will be achieved by the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verify the overhead recovery rate charged and ensuring it includes all appropriate costs and that they are predicated upon a 19/20 price base. This will include a review of staffing costs, direct costs of providing the service and indirect/overhead recovery costs (including any inflationary costs). • We will also consider benchmarking of recovery rates and costs against our local authority near neighbours. 	

- We will review the legal powers to charge under the Local Government Act 2003 and the Local Authorities (Goods and Services) 1970 and subsequent legislation.

An initial business case will be developed in Economic and Community Infrastructure (ECI) which will then be considered against all relevant services across Somerset County Council.

Savings will be derived by releasing revenue costs in the event of further capitalisation or securing sustainable increases in securing revenue for chargeable activity.

The outcome of the review will set out the standard charging rates across SCC from which on variances can then be documented.

Initial assessments have identified that direct costs associated with a service employing 35 staff could recover direct costs of approximately £70,000.

2a. Confidence level

80 %

This is based on an initial of the potential revenue to be released within ECI (£120,000).

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Potential impact of services users as a result of increased charges.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None

5. Impact on staff:

None

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Finance support to review overhead recovery rates and capital funding rules/guidelines.

Focused legal advice on the legislative parameters for charging for services.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Legal review	14 December 2018
ECI case study to be complete	4 January 2019

Service based budget review to reallocate revenue costs to charges/capital	11 January 19
--	---------------

8. Risks and opportunities:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations of capital requirements. • Services confirm that they are already recouping all relevant costs. • Lack of staff resources to review budgets to required timescale. • Opportunities – increase charging rates and identify total cost for service delivery.

9. Dependencies:
No.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:
No.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:
Engagement with services to identify possible increase in charges. Following this review engagement with service users and capital finance (internal).

12. Legal Implications:
To be determined following legal review. However, reviews of ECI case studies suggest no implications which will limit the ability of this saving to be realised.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?					No
If no, when is the evidence expected?					January 2019
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
<i>£s</i>	<i>Savings</i>	<i>Income Generated</i>	<i>Cost Involved (also see 13b)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Ongoing or One-off?</i>
2019/20	£0	£120,000	-£0	£120,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
2021/22	£0	£	-£0	£0	
Total	£0	£120,000	-£0	£120,000	
£'000's	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£	£	-£	£	
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	

2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£	£	-£	£	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£0

**Appendix B2b:
Corporate Services
Proposals for
Change -
Requiring
Consultation for
2019 - 2022**

Proposal for Change:

CORP1920-07 Restructure of HR Admin and Payroll Service

Corporate Plan Priority:	Corp1920-07
Service Area:	HR Services
Director:	Chris Squire
Strategic Manager	Rachel Ellins
SAP Node	EIHA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
Proposed savings of £95,000 in 2019/20 and a further £9,200 in 2020/21 through a restructure of HR Admin and Payroll Services to reflect the service needs due to a changing customer base, mainly due to Academy Schools and the implementation of electronic processes which have brought efficiencies.	

2a. Confidence level	
100%	We have already seen a reduction in staff numbers from the processes already implemented and are confident that the ongoing work will achieve the further savings.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

N/A

4. Impact on other services we provide:

HR support required as some employees may end up with salary protection or redundancy, although it is thought most of the latter can be managed by voluntary redundancy.

5. Impact on staff:

It is anticipated that there will be a small reduction in staff numbers. This will be achieved via removal of vacant positions, voluntary redundancies and consideration of flexible working requests where possible. A restructure exercise will be required.

There will be some additional changes, due to revised Job Assignments, that may result in protection for some employees and some opportunities for others to increase their grade. There are also some changes of hours that will result in savings overall.

A change in the way Job Evaluation (JE) is managed may release additional savings but this is unlikely to be known until sometime in December or possibly the new year.

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

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

HR to support consultation. Kerry Diamond already informed of the need for support.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Start of staff consultation	November 2018
Other HR activities	December – March 2019
Implementation	April 2019 and July 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

- Negative impact on staff morale/engagement.
- Over estimation of savings that can be realised resulting in detriment to service delivery

9. Dependencies:

N/A

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

N/A

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Staff and trade union discussion as part of wider consultation

12. Legal Implications:

N/A

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based?		Yes, options have been costed by Finance but final structure still to be finalised.			
If no, when is evidence expected?					
Please note: these figures should be cumulative (as per the approach for MTFP and savings)					
£'s	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£	£	-£	£95,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£9,200	Ongoing
Total	£	£	-£	£104,200	Ongoing

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

£'000's		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£0

Proposal for Change: Corp 1920 – 12 Corporate Affairs Restructure

Corporate Plan Priority:	CORP1920-12
Service Area:	ICT and Commercial & Procurement
Director:	Simon Clifford
Strategic Manager	Claire Griffiths/Andy Kennell
SAP Node	EIE / EII

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>The Commercial and Procurement (C&P) team and the ICT team sit within Corporate Affairs. This paper sets out proposals to restructure these services, merging functions where there are natural alignments within teams, aligning resources to corporate priorities, streamlining management functions and ensuring the structures are fit for future purpose. In addition, the C&P restructure will provide clarity of the team's role, re-orientating resources to have a more commercial focus, where appropriate, removing any legacy elements in the current structure. At the same time the restructure will deliver efficiency savings, reducing both the C&P and ICT departments' baseline budgets.</p> <p>Budget savings can only be secured if further income is generated, staffing costs are apportioned to other budget lines, staff opt to work less hours/take unpaid leave or staff numbers reduce with associated activities declining or stopped. All the above options continue to be explored.</p> <p>Staffing occupies the largest proportion of the C&P department's baseline budget costs and therefore the savings outlined in this paper are derived from a proposed</p>	

restructure. ICT has a 50/50 split between staff and contract costs, throughout 2018/19 savings have been made by reducing vacancies and optimising contract spend, which has avoided any reduction in permanent staff. With the further requirement for savings ICT is now focusing on making efficiencies by merging teams and reducing the management layer.

This will deliver proposed savings of £690,000 between 2019 and 2020.

Both of the above restructures will also link in to the Customers and Communities proposed saving of £500,000 which also identifies as part of the overall Corporate £3,262,900 projected saving for MTFP 2019/20.

2a. Confidence level

85%

A detailed proposed structure for C&P is in place and the detail has been worked through for ICT. However, any proposals are subject to the outcomes of staff consultation.

In addition, due to the potential for collective consultation and subject to an agreed date of commencement of the process, the new structure is likely to be in place late in May, rather than by 1 April 2019 so will not deliver quite a full in-year effect, 10 months as opposed to 12.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There will be no impact on resident, businesses and or other organisations.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

Reduced resource across the service will impact on service levels, speed of response and ability to respond to major incidents, particularly in the ICT Service.

5. Impact on staff:

The principles of a proposed approach include;

- Rationalisation of management roles across the Directorate
- Alignment of procurement functions to corporate priorities
- Removing legacy structures in C&P and duplication of tasks with operations
- Focus on commercial activities
- Integrating functions within ICT to form two teams - an Operational and Transformation team
- The ICT restructure will introduce standard change delivery (TSR) as part of the Operations function and separate the Transformational shift to align more closely with Customers

As the outcomes of consultation and potential competency-based interviews for ring-fenced roles cannot be determined at this stage, the number of FTE's is not yet quantifiable.

The number of posts that might be lost is: 21

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

As with all restructures the support and advice of HR is essential throughout the process.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Detailed restructure agreed at Corporate Affairs SLT Monday	19 November 2018
Collective consultation	December 2018 – February 2019
Anticipated end of consultation	Late February 2019
New structure in place	Late May 2019
Full effect of savings from	1st June 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

As with the MTFP2 proposed restructure for C&P and ICT, future workload demand will need to be closely managed with each lead Commissioner to ensure additional commissioning demands against the revised team structure can flex or increase to accommodate and ensure delivery of requirements and reduce service risks.

Risks

- Reduced levels of service delivery as a result of the reduction in resources
- Delayed consultation will impact of 19/20 in year savings

Mitigation

- Prioritisation of workload focussed on organisation priorities and clearly published commissioning intentions
- Closely managed future workload through workload tracking/plans.

However, this restructure is an opportunity to introduce more efficient ways of working, maximising the opportunity for synergies across the Directorate.

9. Dependencies:

The outcome is subject to an internal consultation process with the effected teams and unions. At this formed part of the overall collective consultation of 45 days which started on the 29th November.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Equalities Impact Assessment will be incorporated into the HR Business case.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

A staff and union consultation will be undertaken. This will adhere to the agreed internal process, including staff briefings and 1-2-1's with potentially effected staff.

12. Legal Implications:

Legal have identified the need for an EIA to be completed which will form part of the HR Business Case

In regard to ICT need to be aware that the Applications team supports business critical applications that enable statutory functions, this function could be reduced but not stopped.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Please note that there is a £220,000 CRF dependency for 2019/20 which will be reviewed annually. However, the overall total (£690,000) will remain ongoing as the 2020/21 shortfall as a result of the £220,000 being a one-off will be mitigated by Phase 2/3 of the restructure.

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)? Yes

If no, when is the evidence expected? N/A

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£645,000	£	-£	£645,000	ongoing
2020/21	£45,000	£	-£	£45,000	ongoing
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£690,000	£	-£	£690,000	ongoing

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

**Appendix B3:
ECI Services
Proposals for
Change -
For decision for
2019 - 2022**

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-01 - Remove the current 4-yearly planned programme of gully cleaning from 2019/2020

Routine and Environmental Maintenance Project

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways Maintenance (Operations)
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Remove the current 4-yearly planned programme of gully cleaning from 2019/2020. This affects approximately 72,000 gullies countywide. Approximately 18,000 gullies cleaned each year, a quarter of the 4-yearly programme is delivered annually. The gullies referred to in this proposal are in predominantly, low risk urban areas. Reactive orders will continue to be raised against these gullies based on demand; identified by the public or from safety and serviceability inspections.

2a. Confidence level	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>100 %</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Instruction issued to Skanska in advance of the 2019/2020 gully cleansing programme commencing. • Some uncertainty of gully cleansing contract rates for 2019/2020. 	100 %
100 %	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

1. High impact on communities and business – greater risk of flooding in urban areas where defects or blocked gullies are not identified.
2. The gullies will still be cleaned reactively or as a safety measure – costs transferred to other budgets headings.
3. SCC to continue to work with the SRA in order to seek funding for enhanced maintenance works programmes. The SRA has funded a programme of enhanced gully emptying to those gullies located in flood susceptible areas, (SRA Enhanced Gully Emptying).

4. Impact on other services we provide:

- Likely increases on reactive gully cleaning works to those 4-yearly gullies.

5. Impact on staff:

- No direct impact as a consequence.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

- Limited resource/ support needed to make the change.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Milestone	Date
SCC to inform Skanska of works programmes via Task Order/Service Instruction.	April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

1. This will represent a policy change to reflect the change in approach.
2. Risk of affecting the overall contract turnover and subsequent revenue rebate.
3. Potential for contractual discussions with Skanska (to include potential disposal of gully emptying plant and equipment)
4. Potential for more gully reactive and safety task orders.
5. Potential increase in localised carriageway surface water flooding.
6. Potential insurance implications.
7. Potential accelerated rate of deterioration to the carriageway surface course due to running surface water between blocked gullies. Potential impact on future maintenance costs
8. Potential accelerated rate of deterioration to the highway pavement due to water ingress. Potential impact on future maintenance costs.
9. Potential reputational damage.
10. Managing the transition to a needs-based service delivery.

11. The Highway Authority has a duty to prevent nuisance and danger to adjoining landowners by flooding – this may be compromised.

9. Dependencies:

N/A

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Yes – see EIA

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Communication required with Parish Councils and service users. Communication strategy to be developed. Liaison with SRA.

12. Legal Implications:

There is a risk that if flooding occurs, SCC may be in breach of its duty to protect neighbouring land from flooding, albeit mitigated as the public may request gully cleaning as a reactive service response. There is also the potential for contractual early warning notices and compensation events with Skanska, resulting from their expectation of levels of business.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)? Yes (inventory data – Confirm/ Kaarbontech)

If no, when is the evidence expected? N/A

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£80,000	£	-£	£80,000	On-going
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£80,000	£	-£	£80,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£

	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	1	Date Completed	30/10/2018
Description of what is being impact assessed			
<p>Remove current countywide 4-yearly planned programme of gully cleaning (ECI1920-01)</p> <p>This proposal is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the current 4-yearly planned programme of gully cleaning from 2019/2020. 2. Affects approximately 72,000 gullies countywide. 3. Approximately 18,000 gullies cleaned each year, a quarter of the 4-yearly programme is delivered annually. 4. Predominantly, low risk urban areas. 5. Only reactive orders to be raised against these gullies. <p>The proposal is related to 2019/2020, 2020/2021, 2021/2022 & 2022/2023 savings.</p>			
Evidence			
<p>What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?</p> <p>This information is not available as the impact cannot be predicted at this stage.</p>			
<p>Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?</p> <p>Due to the time constraints there has been no formal consultation. All reactive / emergency needs will continue. The impact will be High.</p>			

Analysis of impact on protected groups				
Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposals may have a greater impact on older residents and children as a reduction in planned gully emptying of highway gullies may cause increased flooding and may impede access to the local network and/or impede pedestrian walk ways. 	☒	☐	☐
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased flooding may impede access to the local network and/or impede access to pedestrian links. 	☒	☐	☐
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased flooding may impede access to the local network and/or impede access to pedestrian links. 	☒	☒	☐
Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐

Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Negative outcomes action plan				
Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
Service reductions are expected to have significant impacts. That said gullies affected are identified as low risk urban locations. In the unlikely event that safety or serviceability issues arise, they will be dealt with using the reactive gully cleaning budget or the safety defect programme of work (which remains unaffected by these proposals). This is a statutory duty of the local authority and remains in place.	01/04/2019	Andrew Turner	The impact managed through the Reactive Safety Defect Programme.	<input type="checkbox"/>
By way of mitigation, SCC will to continue to work with the SRA in an attempt to seek funding for enhanced maintenance works which may occur as a result of this proposal. Bid submitted to SRA. Success of bid to be known December 2018	31/12/2018	Andrew Turner	Through conversations with the SRA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
N/A				

Completed by:	Neil McWilliams
Date	30/10/2018
Signed off by:	Andrew Turner
Date	04/12/2018
Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	03/12/18
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Neil McWilliams
Review date:	01/09/2019

Proposal for Change:

ECI1920-03 - Reduction in Rights of Way Service Delivery

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Rights of Way
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	EHDCCKBA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
Reduction in Rights of Way Service Delivery	
<p>The main revenue activity, aside of salaries, is routine vegetation clearance. The annual contract spend on routine vegetation clearance is approximately £85k (delivered through a Framework Agreement & competitive process). It is proposed that £25k of this budget is surrendered.</p>	

2a. Confidence level	
80	%
<p>Whilst there is a very high level of confidence that the delivery of the saving can be executed by adjusting the vegetation clearance schedule to the available budget, it remains to be seen what the associated impact will be in terms of insurance claims, serving of statutory notices on the Council.</p>	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There will be a likely decrease in the percentage of the network that is deemed 'easy to use' with the potential for an increase in complaints.

Section 56 notices for 'out of repair' may be served where routes become obstructed by growth.

Contractors who have invested in the Vegetation Clearance framework contract will have less income as a result but may partially benefit from the need for a call-off contract to address routes as one-off cuts as opposed to scheduled cuts.

Priority routes (promoted trails and utility routes) will be preserved which should manage the impact to some degree.

A reduction in accessibility of routes could have an impact on the tourism industry and thus the local economy.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

The potential for a decline in the percentage of routes that are accessible could have a consequential but undetermined impact on the wider health objectives (relating to encouraging greater levels of physical activity). Rights of Way play a role in modal shift and therefore any reduction in service delivery could impact on trying to reduce motorised vehicle journeys.

5. Impact on staff:

Vegetation clearance is mainly proactive. Potential that staff will spend more time dealing with complaints about overgrown paths. This may divert resource away from other aspects of service delivery.

It may generate increased uptake in volunteer schemes putting pressure on officer resource to administer these schemes.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

The decrease in service delivery will hopefully encourage greater participation in volunteer schemes, e.g.: strimmer scheme, adopt-a-path. Assuming there is an increase in uptake, an additional budget may be required for capital items – this has been scheduled below.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Parish & Town Council consultation on clearance schedule and path hierarchy	Nov 18 - Jan 19
Review of schedule to fit with budget	Feb 19
Completion	31 st March 19 to take effect for FY 2019/20

8. Risks and opportunities:

Risks: See above and below for main risks, i.e. network accessibility (serving of notices), health, tourism, local economy, modal shift, staff morale/ retention. This reduction could result in a decrease in the competitiveness of tendered rates, as contractors will have to cut paths which are more difficult to cut, having been cut less frequently or not at all. Best value will become less obtainable and the initial schedule review will precipitate into further reduction in future years as prices go up.

Opportunities: Parish Councils and volunteers may help to offset the reduction in service delivery, but this is ultimately reliant on them being willing to do so. In addition, the impact of this proposal may be mitigated by encouraging greater levels of participation from volunteers.

9. Dependencies:

An increase in capital allocation will be required to cope with any upturn in volunteer recruitment. Staff resourcing of volunteer schemes may also need reviewing with a possible role for Business Support, where resources allow.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Yes - an EIA has been produced. Acceptance of this proposal will likely lead to a general decline in service delivery, impacting on all communities of Somerset and the local economy.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Consultation would be required with Parish & Town Councils to review the schedule and to review the network hierarchy (an exercise they last assisted with around a decade ago). User groups and the Local Access Forum would form part of this consultation exercise.

The outcome would need to be communicated with all key stakeholders.

12. Legal Implications:

This proposal could result in SCC not fulfilling its duty of keeping routes free from growth. Roughly 4 out of 5 routes are available and the 20% that are not available are generally down to historic or current obstructions or temporary closures due to failing or missing structures. Obstructed by vegetation could be added to this list if the proposal is accepted.

There is no statutory duty to consult on implementing the proposal, but it would be advisable that any reduction in delivery is informed by those that know the network best, i.e.: the local inhabitants.

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	No
If no, when is evidence expected?	January 2019 The schedule will be revised in accordance with available

				budget and tendered framework rates.	
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (see also 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£25,000	£0	-£0	£25,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£0	£0	-£0	£0	-
2021/22	£0	£0	-£0	£0	-
2022/23	£0	£0	-£0	£0	-
2023/24	£0	£0	-£0	£0	-
Total	£25,000	£0	-£0	£25,000	

13b. One off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£5
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	-£5
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£5
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	-£5
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	-£0
TOTAL		-£10

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	V1	Date Completed	13/11/18
Description of what is being impact assessed			
<p>Reduction in Rights of Way Service Delivery – EC1920-03 The reduction in service delivery will be implemented through reducing the proactive vegetation clearance schedule. This will have an impact on the physical network and is therefore likely to impact on all protected groups; i.e.: anyone who is able to access the public rights of way network could potentially be affected by this reduction in service delivery.</p>			
Evidence			
What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?			
<p>An exercise was undertaken approximately 12 years ago with Parish & Town Councils to categorise their local networks based on levels of use. These categories are used in prioritising how we respond to issues on the network as part of a risk-based approach. Parishes were also consulted in relation to the vegetation clearance schedule. We currently don't have detailed information on accessible routes specifically but where possible this will form part of the consideration as to where and where not reductions are made in the vegetation clearance schedule.</p>			
Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?			
<p>It has not been possible to consult and receive responses prior to the decision being taken. However, Parish & Town Councils, user group representatives and the Local Access Forum will all be consulted prior to implementation of the reduction.</p>			

Analysis of impact on protected groups				
Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for some rights of way to become inaccessible due to vegetation not being cut. Those young and old could be disproportionately affected. If paths become inaccessible then they cannot access the countryside the same way as able-bodied people. 	☒	☐	☐
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for some rights of way to become disproportionately inaccessible due to vegetation not being cut. Wherever possible accessible routes (where known and on the schedule) will continue to be maintained appropriately. If paths become inaccessible then they cannot access the countryside the same way as able-bodied people. 	☒	☐	☐
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disproportionate impact. 	☐	☒	☐
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disproportionate impact. 	☐	☒	☐
Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disproportionate impact. 	☐	☒	☐
Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disproportionate impact. 	☐	☒	☐
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disproportionate impact. 	☐	☒	☐
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disproportionate impact. 	☐	☒	☐

Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disproportionate impact. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those who use isolated lowly-used rights of way could be disproportionately affected. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Negative outcomes action plan				
Action taken/to be taken	Target Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
Consultation on vegetation clearance schedule and path categories	31/01/2019	Jake Taylor	Ongoing supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Review of schedule (informed by consultation results)	28/02/2019	Rob Coate	Ongoing supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Promotion of volunteer schemes	Ongoing	Jake Taylor	Ongoing supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
<p>Whilst the above measures will hopefully mitigate for the reduction in service delivery, there are likely to be occasions where paths become overgrown and reports of such are lodged with the Rights of Way Service. Volunteer action could be called upon to resolve the issue, but where this is not possible, then any available revenue budget can be used to cut the vegetation reactively instead of proactively. Well used routes and accessible routes will be high priorities where they are not already on the schedule. Where there is insufficient revenue budget then there is the risk that either the overgrowth will increase and become a bigger task to clear, or someone may serve a notice upon the Highway Authority asserting that a route is out of repair.</p>				
Completed by:	Pete Hobley			
Date	13/11/18			

Signed off by:	Pete Hobley
Date	13/11/18
Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	13/11/18
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Pete Hobley
Review date:	28/02/19

Proposal for Change: Verge Maintenance.

ECI1920-04 - Implement a 1-swathe width cut across the entire planned verge maintenance programme 2019/2020

Routine and Environmental maintenance Project

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways Maintenance (Operations)
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
To implement a 1-swathe width cut across the entire planned verge maintenance programme 2019/2020. (Commencing May 2019). The service currently implements variable swathe width cuts across the network. Saving to be achieved by modifying extent of cutting undertaken in the 16-week countywide programme. Visibility splays and forward sight lines, as defined in the inventory, to remain as part of the agreed service provision.

2a. Confidence level
90%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCC to inform Skanska via Task Order/Service Instruction in advance of the 2019 verge maintenance cutting programme. April 2019. • Uncertainty of verge maintenance rates for 2019/2020.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

- Low impact on communities and business. Whilst the change would see a reduction in operational output, the overall verge maintenance programme would still deliver/align with the current SCC policy. A and B network, inclusive of visibility splays, cut twice; C and unclassified network, inclusive of visibility splays, cut once. Sensitive sites cut last.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

- No direct impact as a consequence.

5. Impact on staff:

- No direct impact as a consequence.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

- No resource/support needed to make the change.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
	SCC to inform Skanska via Task Order/Service Instruction	April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

12. Risk of affecting the overall contract turnover and subsequent revenue rebate.
13. Whilst a there is a very low risk there maybe contractual Early Warning Notices/Compensation event with Skanska.
14. Visibility splays must remain as part of this programme.
15. Reduction in service can positively enhance wildlife and flora protection and enable creation of new habitats.
16. The change to working practices would better align the current verge maintenance operations with the Somerset County Council 'Highways Bio-diversity Manual'.
17. Potential insurance implications.
18. Self-seeded trees will be allowed to establish creating a greater maintenance liability in future.
19. Potential for reputational damage.

9. Dependencies:

N/A

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Yes – see EIA

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Yes – communication strategy to be developed.

12. Legal Implications:

N/A

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes (inventory data – Confirm)
---	--------------------------------

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£90,000	£	-£	£90,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£90,000	£	-£	£90,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	1	Date Completed	30/10/2018
Description of what is being impact assessed			
<p>Implement a 1-swathe width cut across the entire planned verge maintenance programme (EC11920-04).</p> <p>This proposal is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement a 1-swathe width cut across the entire planned verge maintenance programme 2019/2020. (Commencing May 2019). 2. Currently variable swathe width cuts across the network. 3. Saving to be achieved by modifying extent of cutting undertaken in this 16-week countywide programme. 4. Visibility splays and forward sight lines, as defined in the inventory, to remain. 			
Evidence			
What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?			
This information is not available as the impact cannot be predicted at this stage.			
Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?			
There is no requirement for formal consultation as this is a service adjustment.			

Analysis of impact on protected groups				
Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposals may have a greater impact on older residents and children as increased verge vegetation growth may impede access to safe points of refuge adjacent to the highway network and/or impede access to pedestrian walk ways. 	☒	☐	☐
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased verge vegetation growth may impede access to the local network and/or impede access to pedestrian links. 	☒	☐	☐
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased verge vegetation growth may impede access to the local network and/or impede access to pedestrian links. 	☒	☒	☐
Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐

Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	□	⊗	□
Negative outcomes action plan				
Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
Service reductions are expected to have significant impacts. That said, in the unlikely event that safety or serviceability issues arise, they will be dealt with using the reactive safety defect programme of work (which remains unaffected by these proposals). This is a statutory duty of the local authority and remains in place.	01/04/2019	Andrew Turner	The impact managed through the Reactive Safety Defect Programme.	□
SCC local Area Highways Offices (AHO) to pursue enforcement of the powers afforded by the HA1980 and utilise recharge process.	01/04/2019	AHO's	Through conversations with the AHO's & R&E project.	□
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
N/A				
Completed by:	Neil McWilliams			
Date	30/10/2018			
Signed off by:	Andrew Turner			
Date	31/10/2018			

Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	03/12/2018
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Neil McWilliams
Review date:	01/09/2019

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-05 - Capitalisation of the existing revenue funded Ditches and Grips budget

Routine and Environmental maintenance Project

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways Maintenance (Operations)
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director – Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capitalisation of the revenue funded Ditches and Grip budget spend. 2. Works involve creating new, permanent assets.

2a. Confidence level	
80 %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed that this activity does comply with capital funding requirements. The creation of new ditch and grip assets can be undertaken using capital funding.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impact. Operational delivery would continue.

4. Impact on other services we provide:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No direct impact. Operational delivery would continue.

5. Impact on staff:

- No direct impact as a consequence.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

- No resource/support needed to make the change.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Milestone	Date
SCC to Instruct Skanska via Service Instruction/Task Order.	April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

- No impact. Operational delivery would continue.

9. Dependencies:

N/A

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

N/A

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

N/A

12. Legal Implications:

N/A

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes - Taken from base budget for Ditches & Grips.
If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£60,000	£	-£	£60,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£60,000	£	-£	£60,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-08 - Flood and Water Management Budget

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Economic and Community Infrastructure
Director:	Michele Cusack (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	
SAP Node	109442

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>In-year saving from the Flood and Water Management Programme of works. This proposal is to reduce the funding in the 2019/20 programme by £80,000. This is the third successive year of this budget reduction.</p> <p>This will be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertaking fewer flood risk management studies and options appraisals. • Designing and constructing fewer flood alleviation schemes. <p>This proposal is for an £80,000 reduction in 2019/20 only, with the budget returning to the pre-saving level in 2020/21. The savings identified are a continuation of those accepted in 2018/19 for one additional year. The value of the saving is based on reducing the number of studies undertaken to identify flood risk areas and medium to long term scheme options, which would be used to secure external funding in future years. This approach to flood risk management programming forms part of the Lead Local Flood Authority's service improvement plan. The level of saving proposed has been based on ensuring we can deliver our statutory duties and continue with income generating projects, particularly those that support statutory functions.</p>	

2a. Confidence level

100 %

The programme of works for 2019/20 will be set based on the funding allocated. There is therefore a high confidence in delivery.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Accepting this in-year saving will delay identification of flood alleviation measures and reduce our ability to secure funding contributions for larger programmes of work, for example using Flood Defence Grant in Aid.

This work cannot be taken forward by another authority. These services are linked to the County Council's duties as a Lead Local Flood Authority. This means the powers/responsibilities rest with the county council and not another authority. The nature and types of work it is proposed to defer are not suitable for community led initiatives.

While SCC could apply for additional funding for projects from the Somerset Rivers Authority (SRA) it was created to provide locally raised funding for enhanced protection and flood works in Somerset. Bidding for funding for activities that are part of SCC's core business whilst making savings will likely attract scrutiny and reputational damage for the council and potentially also for the SRA itself. SCC has sought funding for appropriate projects and initiatives in 2019/20 that meet the aims of the SRA. These applications are being assessed and the outcome is awaited.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None

5. Impact on staff:

These proposals do not include an impact on staff numbers. There may be an impact on staff morale as the service provision aligns to the more statutory aspects of the role at the expense of long-term funding for better strategic outcomes.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

None

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Key decision		February 2019
Implement		March 2019
Proposal takes effect		Start of 2019/20

8. Risks and opportunities:

Reducing the number of studies that can be undertaken for a third successive year will delay our ability to implement service improvements aimed at securing funding for larger flood alleviation schemes. This approach is set out in the County

Council's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for Somerset, the production of which is a statutory duty under the Flood and Water Management Act. This can lead to reputational damage and undermine the potential for collaborative working.

For example, as a Flood Risk Management Authority SCC is represented on the Wessex Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Cllr David Hall). As a Lead Local Flood Authority SCC is expected to play its part in delivering on the national capital programme – in particular the national target of 300,000 better protected from flooding by 2020. SCC can make this contribution by applying for Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) funding to deliver flood mitigation schemes. To secure funding there is a robust application and assessment process. Applying for funding allows us to maximise the outcomes achievable from our own budget as well as demonstrate our commitment to working with partners. To meet these requirements SCC needs to have identified candidate schemes and this is achieved by undertaking studies to assess flood risk and consider and evaluate potential mitigating measures.

Not proceeding with these studies will delay the implementation of this service improvement and prevent the preparation of robust business cases for FDGiA and other funding.

As a key contributor and host of the Somerset Rivers Authority partners may question our commitment to flood risk management activities at a time when additional funding is being raised through council tax for enhanced levels of flood protection.

9. Dependencies:

None

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

No equality impacts are immediately apparent. The saving will be a one-off reduction in 2019/20 with the £80,000 being reinstated to the budget in 2020/21.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

None

12. Legal Implications:

These proposals are for non-statutory activities. While not undertaking these activities could impact on our ability to deliver statutory services it is not envisaged this will be to an extent that would lead to a failure to deliver a statutory duty.

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	See section 2 above
If no, when is the evidence expected?	
Please note: these figures should be cumulative	

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£80,000	£	-£	£80,000	One-off
2020/21	-£80,000	£	-£	-£80,000	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£	£	-£	£	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-09 - Highways – Winter & Emergency Service – Removal of Roadside Salt Supplies

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways Operations
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	EHDCFC

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Removal of roadside salt supplies for self-help usage by the travelling public in winter conditions. Prior to 2018/2019 SCC policy was for salt to be supplied for this operation contained in grit bins and 1 tonne dumpy bags. This service was stopped for the winter of 2018/2019 as a one-off measure. Whilst this has been temporarily reinstated the proposal is to remove this provision as an ongoing measure from 2019/2020 onwards.

2a. Confidence level
100 % The service has demonstrated that it is able to deliver this saving by removing this service.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
This is a service that has traditionally been supplied by the County Council in order to promote self-help by the travelling public, residents, local businesses etc. This approach is promoted in Council publicity material and is supported on a national basis by the Department for Transport.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

Greater demand from the travelling public, residents, local businesses, District/Town/Parish Councils, Elected Members and others for additional roads to be included on the County Council's precautionary Salting Network.

5. Impact on staff:

No impact on staff.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

None – will be managed within the service area.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Decision		February 2019
Implementation		31 st March 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

The proposal may adversely affect the ease of use and travel across the highway network in winter conditions.

The proposal will reverse the Council's current approach to the distribution of salt for self-help usage.

A Community Snow Warden scheme is to be piloted through winter 2019/20 to mitigate the effects of this service adjustment.

9. Dependencies:

Will rely upon the co-operation of the travelling public, residents, local businesses, District/Town/Parish Councils, Elected Members and others.

Any reduction in the Skanska budgets issued through the Annual Plan may affect the contractual revenue rebate.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Yes. This affects access to the highway network for all.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Yes. Direct communication with District/Town/Parish Councils, Elected Members and others will be required. Communicating these changes to the wider public would require press release(s) and follow up interviews through local media channels. In order to mitigate the potential impact on communities the County Council has developed a proposal to offer to top up grit bins as a chargeable service. Changes to County Council publicity documents promoting the self-help approach and changes to the County Council website would be required.

A Community Snow Warden scheme will also be promoted following winter 2018/19.

12. Legal Implications:

None

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
If no, when is evidence expected?	N/A

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (see also 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£40,000	£	-£	£40,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£40,000	£	-£	£40,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	V1	Date Completed	31/10/2018
Description of what is being impact assessed			
SCC Financial Imperative Actions - Highways - Winter & Emergency Service (Roadside Salt Supplies) – EC1920-09			
<p>This proposal concerns roadside salt supplies for self-help usage by the travelling public in winter conditions. The proposal is to remove this provision of roadside salt (grit bin replenishment, 1 tonne dumpy bags and 25kg bags) for the winter of 2019/20 onwards.</p>			
Evidence			
What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence will be collated for this proposal through winter 2018/19 which will see this proposal implemented as a result of Cabinet decision dated 12 September 2018. • The local knowledge of the Somerset County Council (SCC) Highways Group of the Somerset highways network. • Suitably qualified and experienced personnel (SQEP) who have considerable experience in managing winter service. • Bench-marking against ‘Well Managed Highways – Code of Practice (2016)’ Minimum Winter Network. • Many years’ experience of contacts with local stakeholders who use the Somerset highways network. • SCC’s “Equality Act: Protected Characteristics – January 2013”. Although five years old, the data in relation to the protected characteristics that are relevant to this analysis are still appropriate. 			
Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?			

No formal consultation has been carried out with any protected groups who may be impacted by this proposal. However, as this proposal is being implemented through 2018/19, there will be dialogue with communities to manage and mitigate changes in service levels, in particular, the development of a Community Snow Warden Scheme. Further mitigation will be achieved by utilisation of farming contractors and other ad hoc activities depending on available resources.

SCC will invite Parish Councils to pay to have their grit bin topped up. This will enable engagement to happen with those most impacted by the proposal and allow for a better assessment of any issues that arise. A record of this will be maintained and will inform a review of the **Somerset County Council Winter & Emergency Policy Plan**.

Analysis of impact on protected groups

Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposals do have a greater impact on rural areas. Rural areas do have a larger proportion of older residents than urban areas. The proposals could impact access to schools and education facilities for children and young people. 	☒	☐	☐
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The removal of roadside salt supplies will make the urban highway network, including footways, less accessible and more hazardous than previously. 	☒	☐	☐
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	☐	☒	☐
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	☐	☒	☐

Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The removal of roadside salt supplies will make the urban highway network, including footways, less accessible and more hazardous than previously. It will thus be less available for use by pregnant and new mothers and their support team and, if used, more hazardous to drive on. 	☒	☐	☐
Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	☐	☒	☐
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	☐	☒	☐
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – see Pregnancy / Maternity implications above. 	☐	☒	☐
Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	☐	☒	☐
Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Carers</u>. The removal of roadside salt supplies will make the urban highway network, including footways, less accessible and more hazardous than previously. It will thus be less available for use by carers accessing people who require care and, if used, more hazardous to drive on. <u>Socio-economic</u>. The removal of roadside salt supplies will make the urban highway network, including footways, less accessible and more hazardous than previously. It will thus be less available for use by people getting to work or accessing other services and, if used, more hazardous to drive on. <u>Rurality</u>. The proposals do have a greater impact on rural areas. The removal of roadside salt supplies will make the urban highway network, including footways, less accessible and more hazardous than previously. It will thus be less available for use by people travelling around rural areas and, if 	☒	☐	☐

	<p>used, more hazardous to drive on. Any public bus services will have a less accessible and more hazardous network to drive on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Isolation</u>. The proposals do have a greater impact on isolated groups, especially in rural areas. The removal of roadside salt supplies will make the urban highway network, including footways, less accessible and more hazardous than previously. It will thus be less available for use by people travelling around rural areas and, if used, more hazardous to drive on. Any public bus services will have a less accessible and more hazardous network to drive on. 			
Negative outcomes action plan				
Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
Publicity by SCC in advance of the 2018/2019 winter season to alert all road users as to the changes to the network compared to the winter of 2017/2018 – to be replicated for future winter seasons.	01/04/2019	David Peake	Record kept of media interactions, internet and social media postings, direct communications with parish/town councils and elected members. Record of responses received from the travelling public, parish/town councils and elected members.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Section 3.3.1 of the Somerset County Council Winter & Emergency Policy Plan states that 'where conditions or events are unusual they are to be responded to by	01/04/2019	David Peake	Record kept of the number of requests	<input type="checkbox"/>

contacting a Client Representative and/or operative to carry out appropriate treatment'. This may be used to mitigate any impact to the equalities protected groups outlined above where it is deemed 'unusual'. The policy specifically references pregnant women going into labour.			that SCC Highways Group receives.	
Somerset County Council Winter & Emergency Policy Plan to be updated to ensure it is fit for purpose in light of these short term changes.	01/04/2019	David Peake	Record kept of the number of requests that SCC Highways Group receives	<input type="checkbox"/>
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
To be reviewed.				
Completed by:	David Peake			
Date	31st October 2018			
Signed off by:	Andrew Turner			
Date	31st October 2018			
Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	3/12/2018			
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	David Peake			
Review date:	01/04/2019			

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-10 - Highways Staff Structure Review

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways Maintenance (Operations)
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director – Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>Asset management is a well-established discipline for the management of physical assets. Many asset owning organisations have adopted the principles of asset management and as a result, can demonstrate benefits in terms of financial efficiencies, improved accountability and stewardship of the asset, better value for money and improved customer service.</p> <p>The primary purpose of this Proposal for Change is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfil the Highway Commissioning intentions set out in the Service Plan dated 2017/18 and 2018/19 for the creation of asset management function within ECI Operations after developing a risk-based approach based on 'Well managed highways infrastructure'. • To map out the approach in developing and implementing the asset management framework; • Provide the organisational platform for cohesive asset management across the service areas; • Facilitate the production of subsequent business cases for related investment (e.g. DfT Incentive funding, SRA funding, etc); • Enable the development of corporate planning and the setting of associated budgets; and • Allow the identification and provision of best value investment opportunities across all highway assets; and above all 	

- Inform the resources and staffing structure to deliver the above.

However, whilst this service redesign activity is undertaken, a number of posts in the Highways Operations service will be held vacant. This will enable an equivalent saving to be delivered in the short to medium term (0-9months) prior to determining the changes to the service structure.

2a. Confidence level

80%

The asset management project is in its early stages and the Project Initiation Document (PID) is currently in draft form. As such, there is a significant amount of work to do to meet the key deliverables of the project which are:-

- An integrated asset management plan;
- Lifecycle plans for each service area; and
- Review of policy and levels of service.

Whilst there is potential and likelihood for restructure, it is too early in the project timeline to be definitive on the grades / numbers of staff in scope.

An equivalent saving will be realised in the short to medium term by holding vacancies within the service.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

No

4. Impact on other services we provide:

The asset management project will be seeking to provide an integrated approach across Highways Operations so the function and output of the various teams may be in scope.

5. Impact on staff:

A small number of posts might be lost and will be identified through a restructure at the appropriate time.

The number of FTE that might be lost is:

The number of posts that might be lost is:

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Project management resource has been secured – a dedicated Project Manager is assigned to this task working (approx. one day per week)

Project support officer support is required but this resource has not been secured.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Project completion		31 March 2019

Staff consultation	Late spring / early summer 2019
Restructure implementation	Autumn 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

- Savings not realised through staff restructuring;
- Integration of disparate service areas proves unviable;
- Robustness and futureproofing of operating systems for management and interpretation of data requiring the need for further changes; and
- Fundamental shift from Central Government funding structures.

9. Dependencies:

The proposed restructuring will also be considered in conjunction with other restructuring opportunities across ECI.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not required

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Staff consultation but will be required at a later date. To be undertaken at the completion of the asset management project after work stream activities are defined and therefore greater clarity on resources is required to fulfil tasks.

12. Legal Implications:

This proposal is at an early stage and so will need to be considered when developed fully. Once proposals are finalised, specific legal advice may be required

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	No
If no, when is the evidence expected?	Qtr1 19/20

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£80,000	£	-£	£80,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£80,000	£	-£	£80,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-11 - Reduction of the Reactive Jetting budget

Routine and Environmental maintenance Project

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways Maintenance (Operations)
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director – Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Proposal to reduce the reactive jetting budget. This proposal would remove £40k from the overall £158k countywide base budget.

2a. Confidence level
<input type="text" value="100"/> % <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjustment required to Annual Plan • Service Instruction issued to Skanska in advance of the 2019/2020 financial year commencing.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium impact on communities and business. The change would see a reduction in operational output.

4. Impact on other services we provide:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly probable direct increases in revenue spend on reactive gully cleaning works.

5. Impact on staff:

- No direct impact as a consequence.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

- No resource/support needed to make the change.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Milestone	Date
SCC to Instruct Skanska via Service Instruction/Task Order.	April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

20. Risk of affecting the overall contract turnover and subsequent revenue rebate.
21. Potential for contractual early warning notices/Compensation event with Skanska.
22. Potential for more gully reactive works orders to be raised.
23. Potential increase in localised carriageway surface water flooding, accidents, third party damage.
24. Potential insurance implications.
25. Potential accelerated rate of deterioration to the carriageway surface course due to running surface water between blocked gullies. Greater future maintenance liability costs to rectify damage.
26. Potential accelerated rate of deterioration to the highway pavement due to water ingress. Greater future maintenance liability costs to rectify damage.
27. SCC to continue to work with the SRA in order to seek funding for enhanced maintenance works programmes
28. Reputational damage.

9. Dependencies:

N/A

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not applicable

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

N/A

12. Legal Implications:

There is a risk that if flooding occurs, SCC may be in breach of its duty to protect neighbouring land from flooding. There is also the potential for contractual early warning notices and compensation events with Skanska, resulting from their expectation of levels of business.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes – Taken from base budget for Jetting
---	--

If no, when is the evidence expected?

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£40,000	£	-£	£40,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£40,000	£	-£	£40,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	1	Date Completed	30/10/2018
Description of what is being impact assessed			
<p>The reduction to the reactive jetting budget (ECI1920-11) This proposal is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the Reactive Jetting budget. • Remove £40k from the original, countywide, base budget. 			
Evidence			
What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?			
The impact is expected to be low.			
Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?			
No formal consultation required as this is a service reduction. All reactive / emergency works will continue as required.			
Analysis of impact on protected groups			
Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome
			Positive outcome

Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposals may have a greater impact on older residents and children as a reduction in jetting of blocked drainage systems may cause increased flooding and may impede access to the local network and/or impede pedestrian walk ways. 	☒	☐	☐
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased flooding may impede access to the local network and/or impede access to pedestrian links. 	☒	☐	☐
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased flooding may impede access to the local network and/or impede access to pedestrian links. 	☒	☒	☐
Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐
Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	☐	☒	☐

Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A. The proposal is a reduction in operations only, not a change or deviation from existing policy. 	□	⊗	□
Negative outcomes action plan				
Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
Service reductions are not expected to have any significant impacts. In the unlikely event that safety or serviceability issues arise, they will be dealt with using the reactive safety defect programme of work (which remains unaffected by these proposals). This is a statutory duty of the local authority and remains in place.	01/04/2019	Andrew Turner	The impact managed through the Reactive Safety Defect Programme.	□
By way of mitigation, SCC will to continue to work with the SRA in an attempt to seek funding for enhanced maintenance works which may occur as a result of this proposal. Bid submitted to SRA. Success of bid to be known December 2018	31/12/2018	Andrew Turner	Through conversations with the SRA	□
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
N/A				
Completed by:	Neil McWilliams			
Date	30/10/2018			
Signed off by:	Andrew Turner			

Date	31/10/2018
Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	3/12/18
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Neil McWilliams
Review date:	March 2019

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-013 - Highways – Winter & Emergency Service (Gritter Fleet Disposal)

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	EHDCFC

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
To sell the three gritters which have been replaced by new gritters purchased in advance of the 2018/19 winter season. The gritters are no longer required to support service delivery.

2a. Confidence level
100 % The gritters are no longer required.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
No impact on residents, businesses and other organisations. SCC will still retain enough gritters to undertake the routes in the identified in the current winter service policy

4. Impact on other services we provide:
None

5. Impact on staff:
No impact on staff.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Resources required from Fleet Management to dispose of the gritters.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Winter of 2018/2019		31 st March 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

No risks as the three gritters are redundant fleet.

9. Dependencies:

There are no dependencies associated with the 19/20 saving.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not applicable

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

None

12. Legal Implications:

None

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes				
If no, when is evidence expected?	N/A				
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£27,000	£	-£	£27,000	One off
2020/21	£-27,000	£	-£	£-27,000	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£	£	-£	£	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£

	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Proposal for Change:

ECI1920-14 - Highways - Disposal of Land Rover Fleet

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Highways
Director:	Alyn Jones (lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	EHDCFC

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>Following the review and revision of the Winter Service Policy, there is no requirement for SCC operational staff to drive in challenging climatic conditions that would necessitate the specific provision of a 4x4 vehicle.</p> <p>The fuel saving resulting from the disposal of the Land Rover fleet is estimated to be almost £16,000 (£3,200 per annum) based on approximate running costs of a Land Rover with an average staff mileage of around 8,500 miles per year over a five-year period.</p> <p>Additionally, there will be a capital receipt estimated around £75,000 associated with the disposal of the Land Rover fleet.</p> <p>Additional reasons to support the disposal include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the exception of one vehicle, the Land Rover fleet are all blue in colour which is inconsistent with the requirements of Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual, Part 2; • The vehicles are uncomfortable and difficult to drive over prolonged periods, especially on the urban network whilst undertaking safety and serviceability inspections. The discomfort has attracted complaints from operational staff; 	

including two occasions of back strains due to prolonged use of the vehicles.

- The expense associated with poor fuel efficiency.
- The emissions are proportionally higher than a conventional vehicle.

2a. Confidence level

100 %

The five Land Rovers are no longer required for operational service requirements due to adjustments in working practices and service contingencies.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

No impact on residents, businesses and other organisations.

SCC will retain access to 4x4 vehicles on a 'call-off' basis in the event service-critical highway staff require transportation to their work place during periods of severe inclement weather.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None

5. Impact on staff:

No impact on staff.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Resources required from Fleet Management to dispose of the Land Rover fleet.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
	Winter of 2018/2019	By 31 st March 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

The only occasion when 4x4 vehicles would be required is to transport service-critical staff to their work place. A mitigation/ transportation plan is currently being concluded to ensure service resilience in the event of severe inclement weather.

9. Dependencies:

None

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not applicable

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

None

12. Legal Implications:

None

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?					Yes
If no, when is evidence expected?					N/A
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£3,200	£	-£	£3,200	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£3,200	£	-£	£3,200	

13b. One off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'s		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£75,000
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£75,000
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£75,000

Proposal for Change:

ECI1920-17 – Reduce Traffic Management and Parking Services revenue costs

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Traffic Management and Road Safety
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Bev Norman
SAP Node	EHDF

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Review how Traffic Management and Parking services are undertaken with a view to reducing the revenue budget by £100K. This will include ensuring full cost recovery, income generation and service re-design by bringing Parking Services into the Traffic Management service structure.</p> <p>Resources to support the development and implementation of these proposals including the Parking Review have been made available by refocusing existing traffic engineering resources.</p> <p>Local SCC Traffic Engineers no longer deal with individual and very local traffic engineering requests that benefit a small number of individuals, including requests for new or amendments to existing signing, lining, speed limits, HGVs restrictions, disabled parking bays etc but focus on those schemes which have the greatest benefit. These minor requests will be included in the wider parking review for the area and form part of the evidence base for road safety and congestion issues.</p>

2a. Confidence level

90%:

An additional £100K saving from the revenue budget will be achieved through full cost recovery, income generation and service re-design.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

The service re-design, particularly in relation to a Parking Review may impact on residents and businesses, however individual impact assessments will be undertaken as required.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None identified

5. Impact on staff:

Resources to support the development and implementation of these proposals including the Parking Review have been made available by refocusing existing traffic engineering resources.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

None identified

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
	Review existing structures in Traffic Management and Parking Services and implement any changes	End Feb 2019
	Review chargeable services to ensure full cost recovery	End Feb 2019
	Commence Countywide Traffic and Parking review (key decision 21/12/18)	Jan 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

Any risks and opportunities will be identified as an outcome of the area reviews described above.

9. Dependencies:

None.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

No not at this stage

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

There will be extensive consultations as part of each review.

12. Legal Implications:

All of the services delivered in Traffic Management, Parking and Road Safety are statutory duties. Under the Traffic Management Act 2004, if the authority fails to perform its duty to manage the highway network, the Department for Transport can appoint a traffic director to ensure that the duty is performed properly. The Local Authority will be expected to pay the full costs of this.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	[N/A]
If no, when is the evidence expected?	[]

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£50,000	£50,000	-£	£100,000	One off but reassess following 19/20
2020/21	£	£	-£	£-100,000	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£	£	-£	£	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-19 - Further reduction in Road Safety and Transport Data service.

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Traffic Management and Road Safety
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director – Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Bev Norman
SAP Node	EHDF

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>Reduce revenue costs by £150,000 in 2019/20 by reducing the Road Safety and Transport Data services towards a statutory minimum funded from SCC budgets. This is a 22% reduction of the total revenue budget.</p> <p>These savings will be achieved by reducing the money spent on road safety education, including events and data analysis as well as raising income to cover some of this activity through external sponsorship.</p> <p>Service delivery will be maintained to ensure compliance with the relevant statutory requirements (set out below).</p>	

2a. Confidence level	
90	%
<p>SCC has only very recently developed its Road Safety Strategy and part of SCC's commitment is to work with our partners to make every journey in Somerset Safer. With reduced revenue funding this is going to be very difficult for us to achieve. There is a commitment to adopt a Safer Systems approach to road safety in the County.</p>	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There is a potential impact for all users of Somerset’s highway network as a result of reduced road safety education not being as available; increased congestion as a result of delays caused by road traffic accidents; and increased costs to other partners and stakeholders i.e. emergency services.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

The road safety strategy has direct links to public health objectives associated with increasing activity levels. If roads are perceived to be less safe, then this impacts on the County Vision for promoting healthy residents. These activities could be supported through sponsorship and income generation.

5. Impact on staff:

A small number of posts might be lost and will be identified through a restructure at the appropriate time

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

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Income and sponsorship funding could help to offset some of this change, and to provide additional income to support service delivery.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Implementation	1 st April 2019
----------------	----------------------------

8. Risks and opportunities:

Risks
The reduction in road safety delivery risks could influence the number of people hurt in road collisions, including those fatally and seriously injured. Less data resources will make the team less responsive to requests for data including local communities, and for input into schemes and highway monitoring.

Opportunity
The road safety team are already planning to launch a sponsorship programme to try to support our work. Income through charging to be reviewed.
A procurement exercise to cover the Transport Data database has been approved, as with less resources we need access to the most flexible, modern, easy to use, and best value system to enable the data to be accessed and manipulated with minimum input.

9. Dependencies:

None

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Yes – an EIA has been produced

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No external consultation required in addition to general MTFP consultation.

12. Legal Implications:

While central government sets the regulatory framework for roads, vehicles and road users, and national road safety strategies, road safety delivery occurs primarily at the local level with Local Government being the lead delivery agent, working in partnership with many other agencies and stakeholders.

Local Authorities Local authorities have various statutory duties related to road safety:

The Road Traffic Act 1988 (Section 39) requires local authorities in Great Britain to

- take steps both to reduce and prevent accidents
- prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety
- carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles on roads or part of roads, other than trunk roads, within their area
- take such measures as appear to the authority to be appropriate to prevent such accidents

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (Section 122) requires local authorities in Great Britain to

- to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians)

The Traffic Management Act 2004 (Section 16) requires local authorities in England and Wales to manage and maintain their road networks to

- secure the expeditious movement of traffic on, and the efficient use of, their road networks
- avoid, eliminate or reduce road congestion or other disruption to the movement of traffic on their road network or a road network for which another authority is the traffic authority.

We do not believe that a reduced service will affect SCC's ability to fulfil its statutory responsibility for Road Safety.

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?

Yes

If no, when is evidence expected?

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'000's	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (see also 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£150,000	£	-£	£150,000	ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£150,000	£	-£	£150,000	

13b. One off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's	N/A	
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	1	Date Completed	2/11/18
Description of what is being impact assessed			
<p>EC119 Reduce the budgets allocated to the Road Safety Trainer and Projects delivery of the road safety training and education.</p> <p>These budgets enable road safety education delivery to children, older road users and other vulnerable road users group such as motorcyclists and young drivers. Reduce Road Safety Project Support post to 10 hours. Total Saving £30,000. This a 50% reduction of the budget in these areas.</p>			
Evidence			
What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?			
<p>The Road Traffic Act states that local authorities must carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles. The above are part of the team which leads the evidenced based approach to road safety delivery, which can demonstrate a reduction in people injured on Somerset’s roads, particularly those killed and seriously injured.</p> <p>Any reduction in service will have an impact across all groups that use our highway network, including drivers, pedal cyclists, pedestrians, mobility scooter users, children, the elderly, and those with mobility impairments.</p> <p>The Road Safety Service currently deliver to around 30,000 people per year, some aspects generate income, as some programmes are performed for other authorities. If resources are reduced then this may not be feasible.</p> <p>Research has indicated that social deprivation is associated with increased injury and fatality levels in road traffic collisions, therefore Somerset residents living in deprived areas may suffer more under this proposal.</p> <p>The proposal could also impact on schools and education facilities for children and young people, as well as their parents and grandparents, and disabled people. Joint Strategic Needs Assessment highlights that children are affected by the physical environment in which they are brought up. http://www.somersetintelligence.org.uk/joint-strategic-needs-assessment-2015/16.pdf</p> <p>For example, some communities have been described as “obesogenic” – encouraging obesity and overweight in people who live there. This can be because exercise is difficult, with limited open space and sports facilities, including in schools. It may be difficult</p>			

to incorporate exercise into daily life in some communities; walking or cycling to school or playing in the street are far less attractive when traffic is busy and the infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists is poor, or there are fears about unsafe travel. This could also lead to increased congestion and lower air quality if parents/carers decide to drive their children to school. The Somerset Children and Young People's Plan 2016-2019 highlights promoting healthy outcomes and giving children the best start in life. If people feel travel is less safe affecting the likelihood of cycling and walking.

Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?

There has been no specific consultation with affected groups. A local authority can determine how it delivers its service in this area. Consultation did take place earlier this year over the new Road Safety Strategy, this was supported by the respondents.

Analysis of impact on protected groups

Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced ability to carry out road safety remedial education work. Older road users are the age group in our injury collision statistics which are currently not reducing in line with our target. There is a risk that this will lead to an increase in deaths and other injuries. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	No significant impact identified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender reassignment	No significant impact identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marriage and civil partnership	No significant impact identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Pregnancy and maternity	No significant impact identified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race and ethnicity	No significant impact identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	No significant impact identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sex	No significant impact identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	No significant impact identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those within the community who live in deprived areas are more likely to be involved in road injury collisions therefore this group could be affected by the reduced capacity in Road Safety Education. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Negative outcomes action plan				
Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
Alternative funding sources will be sought	28/01/2019	Nick Cowling	Sponsorship will be recorded	<input type="checkbox"/>
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
It is not guaranteed that funding will be available.				

Completed by:	Nick Cowling
Date	18/11/18
Signed off by:	Bev Norman
Date	3/12/18
Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	3/12/18
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Nick Cowling
Review date:	March 2019

Proposal for Change:

ECI1920-20 - Rights of Way - reduction of Town & Village Green budget and reduction of Exmoor National Park Authority contribution

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	ECI Operations - Highways
Director:	Alyn Jones (Lead Director – Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Andrew Turner
SAP Node	EHDCK

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Surrender Town & Village Green budget of £15k for 2019/20</p> <p>A one-off in-year saving of £15k can be surrendered in relation to Town & Village Green registrations. This would be the second year of surrendering this budget.</p> <p>Exmoor National Park Authority (ENPA) contribution – reduce by £5k</p> <p>The current contribution from the Council to ENPA for delivery of statutory functions in relation to rights of way is £28,046. It is proposed that this could be reduced by £5,000 to £23,046. This would be the second year of a reduction in the contribution.</p>

2a. Confidence level		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>100</td> <td>%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Both savings are deliverable.</p>	100	%
100	%	

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Where there are Town & Village Green applications local inhabitants will possibly be denied access to the potential Greens. There is no guarantee that the applications will succeed. The oldest application dates from 2010. There are currently no applications that are holding up development.

The performance of ENPA in relation to rights of way may start to decline. They generally provide to a higher standard than the Council can afford to do across the rest of the County. Any decline in the 'ease of use' of ENP's rights of way may have an impact on tourism and local businesses.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

N/A

5. Impact on staff:

N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

N/A

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Milestone	Date
Inform ENPA of the reduction in revenue contribution.	Following MTFP decision

8. Risks and opportunities:

Risks:

Not processing a Town & Village Green application for 2 years running could lead to applicants having to wait up to 9 years and could lead to a claim of failing to process these applications under the Commons Act 2006 and/or a complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman. There are currently 6 applications awaiting determination.

Reducing the contribution to ENPA could lead to a decline in the accessibility of the rights of way and may have a knock-on effect on tourism linked to walking, riding and cycling.

Opportunities:

ENPA already has a volunteer workforce, and a further reduction in budget may be an opportunity for greater involvement of the volunteers in rights of way work. Businesses may also see it as an opportunity to help where they can.

ENPA also has an opportunity to bid for funding from the RoW capital budget in relation to capital rights of way works, subject to available allocation.

9. Dependencies:

N/A

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

N/A

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

N/A

12. Legal Implications:

Following consultation with the ENPA it has been agreed that a 5k reduction will be implemented for 2019/20. The ENPA will continue to manage and maintain the relevant statutory functions in relation to Rights of Way without any significant implications to level of service. SCC is satisfied that adequate measures are in place in relation to Rights of Way

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	
---------------------------------------	--

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

Town & Village Green saving

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£15,000	£0	-£0	£15,000	One off
2020/21	-£15,000	£0	-£0	-£15,000	
2021/22	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
2022/23	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
2023/24	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
Total	£0	£0	-£0	£0	

ENPA contribution saving

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£5,000	£0	-£0	£5,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
2021/22	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
2022/23	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
2023/24	£0	£0	-£0	£0	
Total	£20,000	£0	-£0	£20,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£

	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-21 - Monmouth House Lease Surrender

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJC

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Monmouth House Lease Surrender</p> <p>Surrender of under-utilised lease of Monmouth House (leased in) and move of Somerset Waste Partnership to Broughton House (SCC owned property) with associated rental income.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p>100%</p> <p>This change is already in the delivery phase, but securing the saving will depend upon the readiness of the new accommodation (works are required to make it ready for occupation) and the timing of the move.</p>

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
<p>No impact on residents.</p> <p>There is clearly an impact on the Somerset Waste Partnership and we have been working closely with them to ensure the replacement accommodation is suitable.</p>

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None.

5. Impact on staff:

None

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

None save property, legal and SWP staff in implementing the change. The majority of work in this respect has been completed and is therefore in the nature of sunk cost.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Implementation		31 Jan 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

N/A

9. Dependencies:

No dependencies on other teams – delivery is dependent upon getting the required works to the property completed on time

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not relevant in this instance.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No.

12. Legal Implications:

N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes (current costs saved and agreed rental to be paid)
--	--

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£90,000	£	-£	£90,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£90,000	£	-£	£90,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
TOTAL		£0

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-22 - Vacation of 1 The Crescent, Taunton

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJL

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Vacation of 1 The Crescent, Taunton and Lease Surrender
Surrender of lease of surplus building (leased in) and move of teams to underutilised first floor of Paul Street Library.

2a. Confidence level
100%
This change is already in the delivery phase, but securing the saving will depend upon the readiness of the property (works/activities are required to make it ready for occupation) and the timing of the move.
This proposal is about early delivery of savings identified through the A Block project.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
No impact on residents.
There is clearly an impact on the teams involved and we have been working closely with them and the Library Service to ensure a smooth transition.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None.

5. Impact on staff:

N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

None save property, legal and service staff in implementing the change. The majority of work in this respect has been completed and is therefore in the nature of sunk cost.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Milestone	Date
Implementation	1/4/2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

N/A

9. Dependencies:

No dependencies other than on those already directly engaged in the project.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not relevant in this instance.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No.

12. Legal Implications:

N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes (current costs saved and agreed rental to be paid)
--	--

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£85,000	£	-£	£85,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£85,000	£	-£	£85,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
TOTAL		£0

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-23 - New Rental Income

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJHC

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
New Rental Income for Production Kitchen	
<p>This relates to rental for a production kitchen unit on the old St Augustine's site. The current tenant only paid rental based on profitability as a legacy of the Free School Meals project but has served notice. A new tenant/provider is being sought for the unit.</p>	

2a. Confidence level	
60%	There is a risk that no tenant or new provider can be found to take on the unit or that a deal is done which again relies on profitability and is therefore less assured. Our group is not in control of delivery.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:	
None.	

4. Impact on other services we provide:	
None.	

5. Impact on staff:
N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:
Procurement and Childrens' have an input here as we understand a replacement provider is wanted, otherwise property would seek a tenant in the normal way.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:	
Milestone	Date
Implementation	August 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:
N/A

9. Dependencies:
Procurement/Education input/delivery needed – further discussion required.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:
Not relevant in this instance.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:
No.

12. Legal Implications:
N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?					Yes
If no, when is the evidence expected?					N/A
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£	£20,000	-£	£20,000	One-off
2020/21	£	£-20,000	-£	£-20,000	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£	£	-£	£	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0

2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
TOTAL		£0

Proposal for Change:

ECI1920-24 – Staff Restructure

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJJB

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Restructure</p> <p>Loss of Apprentice Role – as an apprenticeship in our Estates Team comes to an end, this proposal would involve removing that post from the structure and covering those functions previously carried out by the apprentice through re-distribution of those functions among the remaining team and re-prioritisation of other tasks.</p>

2a. Confidence level
100 %

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
None

4. Impact on other services we provide:
None

5. Impact on staff:
<p>The number of FTE that might be lost is: <input type="text" value="1"/></p> <p>The number of posts that might be lost is: <input type="text" value="1"/></p>

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Finance and HR advice required

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Milestone	Date
Implementation date	Jan 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

Loss of staff in Estate and CHSU may have compliance implications and make it more likely that Health and Safety risks are less closely managed.

9. Dependencies:

None

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not in this instance

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No

12. Legal Implications:

None

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)? Yes

If no, when is the evidence expected?

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£13,000	£	-£	£13,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£13,000	£	-£	£13,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£

	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Proposal for Change:

ECI1920-24a – Staff restructure

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Property Services
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJM

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Flexible Retirement – following discussions with one member of staff, there has been an application for flexible retirement which would see a full time post reduced to 3/5.

2a. Confidence level
60 % Further work is needed on viability and service impact and the flexible retirement in particular will need to be agreed with input required from the individual, Finance and HR.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
None

4. Impact on other services we provide:
We will be less able to respond to enquiries from other services, Members partners and the public. We will be asking other members of staff to take on more.

5. Impact on staff:	
<i>The number of FTE that might be lost is:</i>	0.4
<i>The number of posts that might be lost is:</i>	0.4

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:
Finance and HR advice and agreement needed.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:	
Milestone	Date
Implementation date	Oct 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:
Losses of staff in Estate and CHSU may have compliance implications and make it more likely that Health and Safety risks are less closely managed.

9. Dependencies:
Figures for flexible retirement awaited.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:
Not relevant in this instance

11. Consultation and Communications plan:
No

12. Legal Implications:
N/A

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?			Yes – although validation of figures awaited		
If no, when is the evidence expected?			Enter date		
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£10,000	£	-£	£10,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£10,000	£	-£	£10,000	Ongoing
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£20,000	£	-£	£20,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£

	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-25 - Corporate Landlord

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJHA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Corporate Landlord</p> <p>This proposal relates to the new Corporate Landlord model for delivering property and asset management, whereby responsibility for our property assets passes to the Corporate Property Group allowing for a consistent and joined up approach to all property matters and enabling savings from rationalisation, increased utilisation and economies of scale.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p>70%</p> <p>A key dependency for this proposal is the centralisation of property and FM budgets due to take place from April 2019. Work continues on identifying the relevant budgets and ensuring all expenditure and income is identified to avoid built in overspends.</p> <p>Further work is required to determine the details of delivery and source of savings.</p>

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
<p>The County Council remain committed to meeting its duties under the reasonable adjustment elements of the Equality Act 2010</p>

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None anticipated at present.

5. Impact on staff:

None

The County Council remain committed to meeting its duties under the reasonable adjustment elements of the Equality Act 2010

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Finance support and input from services needed.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Completion of budget review and establishment of shadow budgets		30/11/18
Implementation date for Corporate Landlord Model		01/04/19
Detailed savings plan in place		30/06/19

8. Risks and opportunities:

None identified at present.

9. Dependencies:

Continued SLT support for implementation across the board.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

No not at present.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No.

12. Legal Implications:

N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Not yet (see above)
--	---------------------

If no, when is the evidence expected?	April to June 2019
---------------------------------------	--------------------

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£50,000	£	-£	£50,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	

2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£50,000	£	-£	£50,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
TOTAL		£0

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-26 - Reprographics Review

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJLBF

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
Reprographics Review	
New model of operations for Reprographics being proposed involving reduced reliance on high cost per click in-house options and reduced overhead.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate two Multi-functional devices (MFDs) with full colour enabled from elsewhere in County Hall to Reprographics to be used for small-scale print jobs and terminate the lease (3 months' notice) on two large-scale Xerox machines. Reprographics to act as a broker for print/finish jobs, outsourcing when print quality and/or price is better than in-house. Set up a dynamic procurement system or increased number of approved external suppliers to 'bid' for each print job Review job descriptions for two posts in Reprographics. Review job descriptions for two posts in Reprographics. 	

2a. Confidence level	
	70%

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
None anticipated at present.

4. Impact on other services we provide:
None anticipated at present.

5. Impact on staff:
No impacts identified at this time.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:
Finance support needed for further validation work. Procurement already providing support to review.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:	
Milestone	Date
Implementation	Jul 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:
None identified at present.

9. Dependencies:
Support of all services

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:
Not relevant in this instance.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:
No.

12. Legal Implications:
N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Not yet (see above)
If no, when is the evidence expected?	December 2018

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£25,000	£	-£	£25,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	

Total	£25,000	£	-£	£25,000	
--------------	----------------	----------	-----------	----------------	--

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
TOTAL		£0

Proposal for Change ECI1920-27 - Beckett House

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJC

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Beckett House, Williton</p> <p>Savings expected from current running costs assuming new use or disposal – options currently being explored include possible re-use as enterprise centre which could generate income, but this may not hit property budgets and so this proposal relates only to the small annual running costs currently picked up within our group, which would either be passed to tenants or reassigned as the property is disposed of. This proposal will require the relocation of the Registration Service.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p>70%</p> <p>Further work is required to determine the details of delivery and source of savings and it is simply too early to be more confident.</p>

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
None anticipated at present.

4. Impact on other services we provide:
Possible impacts on Registration Service and Economic Development.

5. Impact on staff:
N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:
Further discussions needed with affected services.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:	
Milestone	Date
Implementation	Oct 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:
None identified at present.

9. Dependencies:
None identified at present.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:
Not relevant in this instance.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:
No.

12. Legal Implications:
N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?					Yes
If no, when is the evidence expected?					
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£3,000	£	-£	£3,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£3,000	£	-£	£3,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0

	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
	TOTAL	£0

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-28 - Dr Morgan's School Site

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJLBB

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Dr Morgan's School Site, Bridgwater
Savings expected from current running costs assuming disposal by October 2019. This proposal relies on the planned relocation of the Libraries West operation to new more suitable premises. This project is well underway.

2a. Confidence level
60%
The project to relocate the current occupying services is well underway, but delivery is not yet certain and further work is needed to confirm both the level of savings and timing of the disposal which is reliant upon finding a buyer.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
None anticipated at present.

4. Impact on other services we provide:
None other than in relation to the relocation of services.

5. Impact on staff:

N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Further discussions needed with affected services. Legal support regarding disposal and new lease arrangements.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Implementation		July 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

Market risks for disposal.

9. Dependencies:

Completion of new lease.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not relevant in this instance.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No.

12. Legal Implications:

N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?

Yes

If no, when is the evidence expected?

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£10,000	£	-£	£10,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£10,000	£	-£	£10,000	Ongoing
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£20,000	£	-£	£20,000	

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

£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0

	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
	TOTAL	£0

Proposal for Change

ECI1920-29 - Health and Safety System Replacement

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Corporate Property
Director:	Paula Hewitt
Strategic Manager:	Claire Lovett
SAP Node	EIJM

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:
Health and Safety System Replacement
Savings secured through procurement of new supplier for Health and Safety management system. Implementation took place in 18/19 with savings only to be realised in 19/20 due to mobilisation costs.

2a. Confidence level
100%

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
None.

4. Impact on other services we provide:
None.

5. Impact on staff:
N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:
None.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:	
Milestone	Date
Implementation	April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:
None.

9. Dependencies:
None identified at present.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:
Not relevant in this instance.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:
No.

12. Legal Implications:
N/A.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidence based (evidence should be included with this template)?					Yes
If no, when is the evidence expected?					
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£20,000	£	-£	£20,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£20,000	£	-£	£20,000	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0

2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
	TOTAL	£0

Proposal for Change: ECI1920-33 - Economic Development savings

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Economic and Community Infrastructure
Director:	Michele Cusack (Lead Director Paula Hewitt)
Strategic Manager	Paul Hickson
SAP Node	EEA

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

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>Economic Development savings - this proposal includes the following two elements to enable a reduction in the net revenue base budget allocation by SCC for economic development from 2019/20:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Capitalisation of SCC's contribution to the annual programme management costs of the Connecting Devon and Somerset programme – Connecting Devon and Somerset is a major infrastructure programme designed to enable the roll-out of superfast broadband infrastructure in areas where the market will not provide this. Because of the scale and “step change” nature of the Connecting Devon and Somerset programme (enabling greater digital service delivery in communities and greater digital access to services) there is scope to finance all of SCC's share of these programme management costs for the remaining delivery period of the programme via capital receipts on the basis of flexibilities with capital in the case of transformational projects and services. It is estimated that the programme will need to run for a further two financial years (2019/20 and 2020/21) need coverage of these costs via capital receipts for this period. This would enable a £180,000 pa reduction in revenue budget provision for economic development.</p> 	

2. Public Health funding of inclusive growth outcomes via economic development – Deployment of part of SCC’s public health grant to facilitate SCC’s economic development service to develop evidence and focus strategic and commissioning capacity on inclusive growth approaches in line with the emphasis on this agenda in the Heart of the South West productivity strategy and Somerset improving lives strategy. Scope has been identified to allocate £50,000 of SCC’s public health grant for this purpose in 2019/20. **This would enable an on-going £50,000 revenue budget saving in economic development in 2019/20.**

2a. Confidence level

100 %

Subject to the confirmation of the availability of funds via capital receipts and deployment of public health grant these proposals are deliverable.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

There are no significant impacts for businesses, residents or other organisations resulting from these proposals.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

Corporate/cross service impacts:

1. Need for SCC to generate sufficient annual capital receipts for the remainder of the Connecting Devon and Somerset programme to ensure that its programme management costs can be financed via capital receipts flexibilities. The current expectation is that the period of this requirement will be the 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years.

Service level impacts:

1. Public Health – greater linkages in evidence base, strategy and resulting commissioning priorities between economic development and public health. This will have positive impacts given that levels of individual economic well-being and opportunity are determinants of public health and because improvements in the health of the workforce contribute to improvements in business productivity.

5. Impact on staff:

No significant impacts on staff

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

ECI Director and Finance Director level support to ensuring that capital receipts are applied to financing SCC’s contribution to the programme management costs of the Connecting Devon and Somerset programme until it is completed.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date

Identification of means to deliver revenue funded savings related to economic development expenditure	October 2018
Drafting and finalisation of change proposal documentation	October/November 2018
Decision to implement revenue funded savings associated with this change proposal	December 2018
Implementation of revenue funded savings effective	April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

Risks

1. **Financial risk – insufficient capital receipts generated by SCC to finance the annual Connecting Devon and Somerset programme management costs.** This is considered a low level risk as these programme management costs do not necessitate a large amount of capital receipts being generated

Opportunities

1. **Strategic opportunity** – increased levels of corporate working between SCC economic development and public health services. Planning and delivery of this saving is a catalyst to the development of closer collaborative working between public health and economic development, particularly linked to the pursuit of more inclusive outcomes from economic growth.

9. Dependencies:

Delivery of this saving dependent on SCC generating sufficient capital receipts to finance Connecting Devon and Somerset programme management costs in its remaining period.

Interdependency with SCC public health commissioning and improving lives strategy for realisation of part of this saving.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Not identified as being required.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

1. No statutory consultation requirements associated with this proposal.
2. No external consultations or communications necessary for this proposal as no impacts upon SCC's partners and stakeholders
3. There will be a need to accompany the public health grant deployment element of this saving with communications to economic development staff so that the associated focus on inclusive growth outcomes is understood and given appropriate focus in work programmes.

12. Legal Implications:

1. No legal implications associated with this proposal.

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:					
Are the savings evidenced based? (evidence should be included in the proforma)?					Yes
If no, when is evidence expected?					N/A
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£'s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (see also 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£230,000	£	-£	£230,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£230,000	£	-£	£230,000	Ongoing

13b. One off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£'000's		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£0
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£0
	Capital Receipts	£0
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£0
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£0
	Sub-total	£0
TOTAL		£0

This page is intentionally left blank

Month 8 Revenue Budget Monitoring

Lead Officer: Peter Lewis Director of Finance

Author: Peter Lewis, Director of Finance

Contact Details: 01823 359028

Cabinet Member: Mandy Chilcott, Cabinet Member for Resources

Division and Local Member: All

1. Summary

- 1.1. It is notable that this report outlines, for the first time in this financial year, a projected revenue outturn underspend for 2018/19; of £0.921m. This projection is based upon actual spending to the end of November 2018 (month 8) and compares to the available budget of £317.882m. The last reported projection, based on spend to the end of October, was an overspend of £2.368m. The contingency has a residual sum of £3.382m uncommitted at this stage.
- 1.2. The main change between the month 7 and month 8 projections is that a revised approach to the calculation of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) has been applied, taking advantage of new and more flexible regulations.

2. Issues for consideration / Recommendations

- 2.1. The Committee is asked to comment on the projected revenue outturn for 2018/19, whether there are any suggestions for additional management actions or alternative options that they would like to recommend to the Cabinet.
- 2.2. The Committee is asked to consider any issues or information they would like to be addressed or included in future reports.

3. Background

- 3.1. The Cabinet report at Appendix A shows that there is a projected underspend of £0.921m, compared to the recently reported projected overspend and provides further detail on the budget monitoring for comment by Scrutiny Members

4. Consultations undertaken

- 4.1. See Appendix A

5. Implications

- 5.1. There are significant financial implications and these are identified throughout the report in Appendix A.
- 5.2. There are no specific legal implications arising from this report.

6. Background papers

6.1. Appendix A - Month 8 Budget Monitoring Report to Cabinet 23rd January 2019.

Note For sight of individual background papers please contact the report author

Decision Report – Cabinet
Decision date – 23 January 2019

Revenue Budget Monitoring Update

Cabinet Member(s): Cllr Mandy Chilcott – Cabinet Member for Resources
Division and Local Member(s): All
Lead Officer: Peter Lewis, Director of Finance
Author: Peter Lewis, Director of Finance
Contact Details: 01823 359028

	Seen by:	Name	Date
	County Solicitor	Honor Clarke	Sent 14 Jan 19
	Monitoring Officer	Scott Wooldridge	14 Jan 19
	Corporate Finance	Peter Lewis	14 Jan 19
	Human Resources	Chris Squire	14 Jan 19
	Property	Paula Hewitt / Claire Lovett	14 Jan 19
	Procurement / ICT	Simon Clifford	14 Jan 19
	Senior Manager	Peter Lewis	14 Jan 19
	Commissioning Development Team	commissioningdevelopments@somerset.gov.uk	Sent 14 Jan 19
	Local Member(s)	All	
	Cabinet Member	Mandy Chilcott	14 Jan 19
	Opposition Spokesperson	Liz Leyshon	Sent 14 Jan 19
	Relevant Scrutiny Chairman	Cllr Anna Groskop for Scrutiny Place	10 Jan 19
Forward Plan Reference:	FP/18/11/07		
Summary:	<p>It is notable that this report outlines, for the first time in this financial year, a projected revenue outturn underspend for 2018/19; of £0.921m. This projection is based upon actual spending to the end of November 2018 (month 8) and compares to the available budget of £317.882m. The last reported projection, based on spend to the end of October, was an overspend of £2.368m. The contingency has a residual sum of £3.382m uncommitted at this stage.</p> <p>The main change between the month 7 and month 8 projections is that a revised approach to the calculation of the</p>		

	<p>Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) has been applied, taking advantage of new and more flexible regulations. The MRP is a provision made in the accounts for the repayment of long term debt when it becomes due. The revised calculation has reduced the budget required for MRP by £4.178m in 2018/19. It is, however, important to recognise that the adoption of the MRP approach for 2018/19 (and future years) is subject to formal consideration by the Council in February 2019; should this approach not be approved at that time then the impact on the projected outturn for 2018/19 will need to be reassessed.</p> <p>Controlling the 2018/19 budget has been a priority of the Council for several months and is it welcome that the focus and efforts are producing the benefit of a projected underspend. This is particularly important considering the challenging financial position the Council must address from 2019/20 onwards to ensure a financially sustainable position. Delivering robust control of current spending is essential to laying the foundations for managing a challenging budget for 2019/20. In addition, producing an underspend in 2018/19 will enable a partial replenishment of the reserves, which will improve the resilience of the Council and hence its ability to address the financial uncertainties beyond 1 April 2020.</p> <p>This report is only a summary, highlighting the main differences between month 7 and month 8; more detail will be presented in the next quarterly report.</p>
<p>Recommendations:</p>	<p>It is RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. comments upon the contents of this report and particularly notes the progress being made with controlling the budget for 2018/19, including the intention to partially replenish earmarked and General Fund reserves to improve the resilience of the Council for future years; 2. supports the use for urgency and agrees the expansion of the Capital Investment Programme to incorporate the recently announced additional funds from the Department for Transport for Local Highways Maintenance. 3. Delegates to the Council's Chief Finance (S151) Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources, the authority to sign a new Building Schools for the Future Public Finance Initiative (PFI) contract on behalf of the Council if the evidence shows that it will be a long-term benefit to the Council. See paragraph 2.9 <p>Note – the Chair of Scrutiny Committee for Policies and Place has agreed the case for urgency for the decision relating to recommendation 2 to enable that decision to be</p>

	<p>taken by Cabinet and reported to the next meeting of Full Council.</p>
<p>Reasons for Recommendations:</p>	<p>Preparing a coherent, confident and realistic budget for the County Council is essential to ensure that the corporate plan and service delivery priorities of the Council can be achieved, and that financial sustainability can be secured. Furthermore, closely monitoring spend against the agreed budget is necessary to ensure that the Council delivers its priorities within its means. This report requires action to be taken so that this objective can be met.</p> <p>The recently announced funding from the Department for Transport for Local Highways Maintenance implies an alteration to the approved Capital Programme, upon which a decision must be made. A decision is now required so that the Council can make use of this welcomed additional funding. Alterations to the approved Capital Programme are for Full Council to agree but there is provision in the Constitution for decisions to be taken urgently where it is not practical to convene or wait for a Full Council meeting. In this instance the approval of the Chair of the relevant Scrutiny Committee is required.</p> <p>There is an investigation ongoing into the potential benefits of refinancing the Building Schools for the Future project, which, if advantageous, may require a final decision to be made in a very short timeframe.</p>
<p>Links to County Vision, Business Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy:</p>	<p>The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) sets the funding for the County Vision and the use of those funds is then monitored, via this report, throughout the year to ensure delivery of Council objectives and actions within the resources available.</p>
<p>Consultations and co-production undertaken:</p>	<p>Information and explanations have been sought from directors on individual aspects of this report and their comments are contained in the report. Due process and consultations will be carried out where required for any further specific proposals for change.</p>
<p>Financial Implications:</p>	<p>The financial implications are identified throughout the report.</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p>	<p>There are no specific legal implications arising from this report.</p>
<p>HR Implications:</p>	<p>There are no HR implications arising directly from this report, but remedial actions may have such implications. These will be dealt with in any subsequent reports.</p>

Risk Implications:	<p>Our corporate risk register recognises the risk to containing spend within budget in the face of service pressures, reducing funding and the challenges of delivering ever more savings and efficiencies.</p> <p>As winter approaches and economic uncertainty continues, there are several budgets which may see demands vary at short notice leading to adverse variations late in the financial year. These include: highways and emergency costs, transport and waste volume costs. Although social care costs are also often impacted by winter, the Government have recently announced additional winter funding to mitigate these. To an extent further mitigation to spend volatility would be possible through the Council's corporate contingency.</p> <p>Although broader market uncertainty exists in view of the current Brexit negotiations, at this stage any precise implications are not known. The Council needs to be alert to potential implications as negotiations develop and respond accordingly at the time.</p> <p>The Children's Services budget has now been rebased but remains under pressure. The risk of further overspending continues to be mitigated by an improved understanding of the budget, better and more timely monitoring information and improved control of expenditure within the service.</p> <p>As noted within the text, this projection depends on the Council's approval of the revised MRP Policy; should this approval not be given then the reduced spend projected would need to be reversed. In addition, there is the potential that the external auditors may challenge the approach as the accounts for 2018/19 are prepared and audited.</p> <p>This Organisational Risk (00043) has a broad perspective, encompassing both current year spending and future years' budgets. Hence, while the projected outturn position has improved, it is still not appropriate for the "likelihood" score to be reduced at this time given that there are more steps in the democratic process to resolve the budget for 2019/20.</p>				
	Likelihood	5	Impact	5	Risk Score

<p>Other Implications (including due regard implications):</p>	<p><u>Equalities Implications</u></p> <p>There are no specific equalities implications arising from the contents of this report.</p> <p><u>Community Safety Implications</u></p> <p>There are no community safety implications arising from the contents of this report.</p> <p><u>Sustainability Implications</u></p> <p>There are no sustainability implications arising from this report.</p> <p><u>Health and Safety Implications</u></p> <p>There are no health and safety implications arising from this report.</p> <p><u>Privacy Implications</u></p> <p>There are no privacy implications arising from this report.</p> <p><u>Health and Wellbeing Implications</u></p> <p>There are no health and wellbeing implications arising from this report.</p>
<p>Scrutiny comments / recommendation (if any):</p>	<p>This report will be presented to Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee, also on 23rd January 2019; comments arising will be made available to the Cabinet at a subsequent meeting.</p>

1. Background

- 1.1. Since 2010, the Council has delivered savings and efficiencies of around £143m and closely controlled its revenue and capital budgets to ensure it meets its duty to ensure expenditure does not exceed resources available. In September 2018 the Cabinet accepted proposals for change across a range of budgets to address the then projected overspend for the current financial year.
- 1.2. Consultation with other bodies was necessary before some of these agreed actions could be implemented. These consultations have now been concluded and means that all the agreed actions from the September Cabinet have now been reflected in the budget monitoring forecast.
- 1.3. A detailed review of the contingency, has identified that the sum remaining uncommitted at the end of November is £3.382m. This balance remains unallocated at this time; consideration as to how and when it can be released to

contribute to the general revenue budget underspend will be given in the quarter 3 monitoring report (due to be presented to the Cabinet meeting in February 2019).

- 1.4. This report shows that there is a projected underspend of £0.921m, compared to the recently reported projected overspend.
- 1.5. The table showing the projected outturn, and variances from month 8, are set out in Appendix A. The paragraphs below offer short explanations of the major parts of those variances.
- 1.6. In the Government's November Budget, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced an additional £420m of funding for Local Highways Maintenance for the current financial year. The allocation to Somerset County Council is £9.98m and plans are being finalised to spend this sum. As this is a change to the Capital Programme then formal approval of the change is required.

Alterations to the approved Capital Programme are for Full Council to agree but there is provision in the Constitution for decisions to be taken urgently where it is not practical to convene or wait for a Full Council meeting. The Chair of Scrutiny Committee for Policies and Place has agreed the use of urgency for this proposed decision to alter the approved Capital Programme to incorporate this additional funding.

The allocation of the additional funding received will be a matter for the relevant SLT Director in consultation with the Director of Finance.

2. Key Variances

2.1. Children's Services (*Net budget £86.508m, £1.062m projected overspend, a favourable movement of £3.739m since month 7*)

The budget benefits arising from the changed Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy, £4.178m, explained further in the Non-service paragraphs 2.5 below, have been added to the Children's Services base budget from month 8, taking the service base budget from £82.330m to £86.508m. This compares to the rebased budget £88.635m that is assessed to be a realistic budget for the service, hence an overspend is still shown. Against this revised base budget, the projected variance is explained in the paragraphs below.

It is also worth commenting on the current forecasts for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which is ring-fenced and not currently a liability for the Council. The current position shows a total overspend at the end of the year of £5m with the main area of pressure in High Needs. The Department for Education allocated an additional amount of grant for both 2018/19 and 2019/20 to help address some of the pressures seen nationally although this is not sufficient to meet the current pressures. This additional grant for Somerset in 2018/19 was £1.171m and has been included in the forecast deficit outturn. To help support the recovery of the pressures on the high needs budget a request has been made to the Secretary of

State to transfer funds from the school's block element of the DSG to the high needs block in 2019/20. The government is adopting new reporting requirements where LA's are forecasting DSG overspends of more than 1% of the gross annual budget. The Authority on behalf of Schools Forum will need to submit a detailed report to the Secretary of State at the end of the financial year, with a 3-year plan showing how the Authority and Forum intend to balance the DSG during this timescale.

Children & Learning Central Commissioning: favourable £0.478m; movement adverse £0.228m

The Home to School transport projected position showed an increased overspend by £0.308m, the majority of which was due to 3 significant route costs not being included on previous Capita reports. Because of this Transporting Somerset will check and validate the data held in Capita to ensure future forecasts are not adversely affected.

Further savings, mainly due to staff leaving the service earlier than anticipated increased the Getset underspend by £0.058m.

Children & Families Operations: adverse £1.540m; movement favourable £3.967m

As well as the budget movement of £4.178m from Non-service to Children's Services due to the revised MRP policy, projected expenditure on external placements has increased by £0.171m due to an increase in secure costs and extended remand and semi-independent placements for 16 and 17-year olds.

As the year has progressed there is greater level of certainty of the forecast of Children's Social Care transportation costs taking account of the volatility of this budget area. As a result, there is an additional pressure of £0.170m now being reported.

This increase has been offset in part by reductions across the service, in particular staffing costs where vacancies are being held.

2.2. Adults Services (*Net budget £133.829m, £0.000m projected on budget, a minor variance of £0.001m since month 7*).

Adult Services: on budget £0.000m movement adverse £0.001m

Since period 7 there is no significant change in the final variance for Adult Services. Previous projections had included a planned £1.000m for allocation for winter, based on previous years and predicted increases in activity and support required. As such some of the schemes were already in place and funded prior to the announcement of additional government funding, thereby releasing the projected spend. Monitoring of the spend against the £2.5m winter pressures funding is via monthly return to central government and NHS England.

Learning Disabilities is now also forecasting a positive variance due to a reduction of £0.500m of costs associated with previously assumed contractual transformational costs.

It is planned to use both positive variances (£1.500m in total) to reduce the balance on the Learning Disabilities equalisation reserve, which will have an equal, beneficial effect on the General Fund reserve, hence improving the Council's resilience as shown on its balance sheet.

This month has also seen some small increases in placements for Mental Health, which have been offset by a reduction in salary spend. Within Learning Disabilities, there has been a small reduction within homecare and two backdated funding agreements for Continuing Health Care (CHC) packages, which have been offset against the recalculation of joint funding.

2.3. Public Health (*Net budget £0.928m, £0.500m projected underspend, no movement since month 7*).

Public Health: favourable £0.500m: no movement £0.000m

The Public Health budget is made up of two elements. The ring fenced Public Health Grant (£20.723m), which is projected to be fully spent, and £1.098m of Somerset County Council funding. The projected underspend against the County Council element of this money continues to be £0.500m.

2.4. Economy and Community Infrastructure (*Net budget £64.843m, £1.852m projected underspend, an improvement of £0.653m since month 7*).

Economy & Community Infrastructure: favourable £1.817m movement; favourable £0.618m

Economy and Community Infrastructure's (ECI) forecast has improved by £0.618m resulting in an underspend position of £1.817m.

There are a number reasons for the increased underspend in ECI. An increase in throughput in the Highways Term Maintenance Contract is forecast to result in an increased rebate, the current estimate is an increase of £0.072m. Traffic Management and Parking income levels are higher than anticipated (£0.287m movement). Waste tonnages remain low and to date are 2.6% down on the same period last year. The forecast now assumes tonnage trends will be lower than the budgeted 1.5% annual growth (£0.107m movement). Transporting Somerset reported an underspend during this period following a review of Concessionary Fares, County Ticket and contract bus subsidies. The review was undertaken to ensure accurate forecasting (favourable movement of £0.108m).

There are still several factors that may change forecasts including winter and emergency costs, any upturn in waste volumes and Concessionary Fares. For example, last year's late and severe weather conditions resulted in additional costs of over £0.500m in Highways.

2.5. Corporate and Support Services (*Net budget £21.241m, £0.255m projected overspend, an improvement of £0.055m since month 7*).

Corporate and Support Services: adverse £0.255m; movement favourable £0.055m

Corporate and Support Services is showing an overspend of £0.255m. This is an improvement of £0.055m from the month 7 position.

This is due to reductions in forecasts within Commercial and Procurement (-£0.039m movement) from in year vacancies and reduced legal costs. HR & OD (-£0.030m movement) due to the increased underspend reported within Adults L&D due to anticipated spend on the Grow Your Own social work programme not being realised because of student deferment and recent reviews decisions (in terms of essential/critical tasks) to support the ongoing financial imperative situation. The underspend in Legal Services has reduced due to increased expert's fees and Coroners pathologists costs (+£0.030m movement). There are also a few other small downward movements from month 7.

2.6. Non-Service (*Net budget £10.533m, £0.770m projected overspend, an adverse movement of £0.122 since month 7*).

Non-Service: overspend adverse £1.770m; movement adverse £1.122m

There is an adverse movement of £1.122m which includes:

- An MRP saving of £0.154m (reported in non-service in month 7) that has been allocated to children's services, as part of the month 8 additional re-base; and a favourable variance of £0.023m as the net saving from repaying one of our market loans early (£0.069m interest saving less the £0.046m amortised annual charge for the loan premium we had to pay as part of the extinguishment); and
- A £1.000m contribution to the general reserves fund as per section 2.7 below that had not been budgeted for.

There has been a significant change in approach to the Minimal Revenue Provision (MRP), as mentioned in the summary above. Under Regulation 27 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 [as amended], local authorities are required to charge a MRP to their revenue account in each financial year. Before 2008, the 2003 Regulations contained details of the method that local authorities were required to use when calculating MRP. This has been replaced by the current Regulation 28 of the 2003 Regulations, which gives local authorities flexibility in how they calculate MRP, providing the calculation is 'prudent'.

An underpinning principle of the local authority financial system is that all capital expenditure must be financed either from capital receipts, capital grants (or other contributions) or eventually from revenue income. The strategic aim of prudent provision is to require local authorities to put aside revenue over time to cover their Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) and ensure enough provision

has been put aside to repay outstanding debt when it falls due. In doing so, the Council is required to align the period over which it charges MRP to one that is commensurate with the period over which the capital expenditure provides benefit. To ensure compliance with the new requirements, the plan is to adopt an MRP policy comprising two distinct sections; 1) a charge based on the useful economic life of loans-funded capital expenditure; and 2) an additional incremental charge each year to ensure the provision has enough put aside to repay debt when it falls due. It should be noted that as the debts are repayable at the full term, having a different MRP profile, with lower earlier payments, does not incur additional interest charges for the Council.

This revised MRP policy is yet to be formally adopted by members, going to Audit Committee for scrutiny in January 2019 and onwards to full Council in February 2019 for decision.

This revised MRP policy will result in a cost of £1.439m for the financial year-ending 31st March 2019, which represents a reduction of £4.349m when compared to the original 2018/19 budget (of £5.788m) based on the old methodology. Of this favourable variance, £0.171m has already been reported at Month 4 (and included in the MTFP2 rebase) with the remaining £4.178m being allocated to Children's services during Month 8 as an additional re-base.

As the full saving has been allocated to Children's services, there is no impact to Non-Service of the revised charge in Month 8.

2.7. Trading Units: *(Net budget £0.00m, £0.000m projected outturn position, no movement since month 7).*

Dillington House: adverse £0.250m: movement adverse £0.073m

Dillington House is forecast to overspend by £0.250m in 2018/19. This includes the repayment costs of a long-term outstanding loan (£0.170m per annum) that was used for capital works to improve conference facilities at the venue and because of reduced levels of income for the first 8 months of the year. This will be added to existing deficit held in an earmarked reserve bringing the total to £1.135m. Work is under way to develop a business plan that brings the operation into profit and sets out repayment proposals for the accumulated deficit.

Support Services for Education: favourable £0.278m: movement favourable £0.067m

Increased traded income and vacancy savings across SEN Services and Central Support have resulted in an increased surplus of £0.067m.

2.8. Improving Financial Resilience

As mentioned in the month 7 report, opportunities will be sought to use 2018/19 underspends to partially replenish reserves to strengthen the balance sheet and hence improve the financial resilience of the Council. This is especially important

given that the financial outlook for 2020/21 is not yet known and reserves may be required to absorb any shocks from unexpectedly poor financial settlements for future years. This projection assumes that a further £1.000m will be added to the General Fund reserve during 2018/19, in addition to the planned contribution of £2.000m.

As part of the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement received on 18 December 2018, it was announced that the Government is to distribute to local authorities an excess sum that they had top sliced as part of the National Non-Domestic Rates levy arrangements, £180m nationally. The county has been notified that the value for Somerset County Council is £1.031m and this is expected to be paid to the Council in 2018/19. Any further relevant details will be reported in the Quarter 3 monitoring report, alongside the proposed application.

2.9. Building Schools for the Future – Private Finance Initiative Refinance Opportunity

Somerset County Council has an existing Private Finance Initiative under Building Schools for the Future. This commenced in 2011 and was established over 25 years. Formal contracts and management are in place. The outstanding liability on the existing agreement will be £43.3m at March 2019. Recently a number of authorities have achieved financial savings through refinancing such arrangements to take advantage of the current low interest rates. The existing contract provides for such activity and SCC wishes to take the benefit of such an opportunity if one arises.

It is expected that options for a new deal could be available to the Council in the coming weeks but due to the nature of these financing arrangements, which alter according to daily changes in the finance markets, the Council would need to act quickly. As a result, it is proposed that the Chief Finance (S151) Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources be delegated with the authority to sign a new PFI contract subject to a conclusion that it will be in the long-term benefit to the council.

3. Options considered and reasons for rejecting them

- 3.1. There is no alternative but to undertake effective and thorough budget monitoring to follow through with appropriate actions to address any variances.

4. Background Papers

- 4.1. Month 7 Revenue Budget Monitoring report to Cabinet – 19 December 2018.

Appendix A – Revenue Budget Monitoring month 8 – Headline Summary Table

Service	Original Base Budget	Budget Movements	Total Budget Approvals	Negative (+) Variances	Positive (-) Variances	Planned Use of Earmarked Reserves	Planned Use of Capital Receipts Flexibility	Net Variance Under (-) / Overspend		Previous Cabinet Report *	Movement from Previous Report
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	£m
Adults and Health	141.284	-7.455	133.829	8.892	-7.835	1.500	-2.557	0.000	0.00%	-0.001	0.001
Children and Families - Operations	46.279	15.346	61.625	3.031	-1.441	0.000	-0.050	1.540	2.50%	5.507	-3.967
Children and Learning - Commissioning	19.750	5.132	24.882	0.603	-0.766	-0.197	-0.118	-0.478	-1.92%	-0.706	0.228
Public Health (SCC funding)	1.026	-0.098	0.928	0.000	-0.500	0.000	0.000	-0.500	53.88%	-0.500	0.000
ECI Services	66.745	-1.902	64.843	5.300	-4.672	-1.657	-0.788	-1.817	-2.80%	-1.199	-0.618
Key Services Spending	275.084	11.023	286.107	17.826	-15.214	-0.354	-3.513	-1.255	-0.44%	3.101	-4.356
Corporate and Support Services	20.106	1.135	21.241	4.584	-3.108	1.283	-2.504	0.255	1.20%	0.310	-0.055
Non-Service Items (Inc Debt Charges)	22.692	-12.158	10.534	1.904	-0.134	0.000	0.000	1.770	16.80%	0.648	1.122
Trading Units	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.462	-0.490	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.00%	0.000	0.000
Support Services and Corporate Spending	42.798	-11.023	31.775	6.950	-3.732	1.311	-2.504	2.025	6.37%	0.958	1.067
Updated Business Rates Receipts	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.338	-2.029	0.000	0.000	-1.691	0.00%	-1.691	0.000
SCC Total Spending	317.882	0.000	317.882	25.114	-20.975	0.957	-6.017	-0.921	-0.29%	2.368	-3.289

Original Base Budget = Budget set by the Council on 21 February 2018

Budget Movements = Transfers between services, not affecting the total budget for 2018/19

Total Budget Approvals = Revised budget after movements

Positive variance = one that improves the projected outturn position

Negative variance = one that deteriorates the projected outturn position.

Scrutiny for Policies and Place Committee Work Programme

Agenda item	Meeting Date	Lead Officer
	23 January 2019	
Medium Term Financial Plan		Peter Lewis
Revenue Budget Monitoring Report – Month 8		Peter Lewis
	06 March 2019	
CDS Programme Update		Katriona Lovelock
Leisure Services Update		Jon Doyle
Revenue Budget Monitoring Report		
	22 May 2019	
Revenue Budget Monitoring Report		
Hinkley Point C Update		Andy Coupe/Paul Hickson
	19 June 2019	
Rights of Way		Peter Hobley/Andrew Turner/Alyn Jones
SCC's Capital Investment Strategy		Peter Lewis/Elizabeth Watkin
	10 July 2019	
Property Disposal and County Farms Update		Claire Lovett/Paula Hewitt
	18 September 2019	
	09 October 2019	
	04 November 2019	
	11 December 2019	
Temporary Labour Contract Update		

Note: Members of the Scrutiny Committee and all other Members of Somerset County Council are invited to contribute items for inclusion in the work programme. Please contact Jamie Jackson, Service Manager Scrutiny, who will assist you in submitting your item. jjackson@somerset.gov.uk 01823 359040

To add:

Flood and Water Management – Land Drainage Enforcement Policy

This page is intentionally left blank

Somerset County Council Forward Plan of proposed Key Decisions

The County Council is required to set out details of planned key decisions at least 28 calendar days before they are due to be taken. This forward plan sets out key decisions to be taken at Cabinet meetings as well as individual key decisions to be taken by either the Leader, a Cabinet Member or an Officer. The very latest details can always be found on our website at:

<http://democracy.somerset.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=134&RD=0&FD=1&bcr=1>

Regulation 8 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 defines a key decision as an executive decision which is likely:

(a) to result in the relevant local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the relevant local authority's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or

(b) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions in the area of the relevant local authority.

The Council has decided that the relevant threshold at or above which the decision is significant will be £500,000 for capital / revenue expenditure or savings. Money delegated to schools as part of the Scheme of Financial Management of Schools exercise is exempt from these thresholds once it is delegated to the school.

Cabinet meetings are held in public at County Hall unless Cabinet resolve for all or part of the meeting to be held in private in order to consider exempt information/confidential business. The Forward Plan will show where this is intended. Agendas and reports for Cabinet meetings are also published on the Council's website at least five clear working days before the meeting date.

Individual key decisions that are shown in the plan as being proposed to be taken "not before" a date will be taken within a month of that date, with the requirement that a report setting out the proposed decision will be published on the Council's website at least five working days before the date of decision. Any representations received will be considered by the decision maker at the decision meeting.

In addition to key decisions, the forward plan shown below lists other business that is scheduled to be considered at a Cabinet meeting during the period of the Plan, which will also include reports for information. The monthly printed plan is updated on an ad hoc basis during each month. *Where possible the County Council will attempt to keep to the dates shown in the Plan. It is quite likely, however, that some items will need to be rescheduled and new items added as new circumstances come to light.* Please ensure therefore that you refer to the most up to date plan.

For general enquiries about the Forward Plan:

- You can view it on the County Council web site at <http://democracy.somerset.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=134&RD=0&FD=1&bcr=1>
- You can arrange to inspect it at County Hall (in Taunton).
- Alternatively, copies can be obtained from Scott Wooldridge or Michael Bryant in the Democratic Services Team by telephoning (01823) 357628 or 359500.

To view the Forward Plan on the website you will need a copy of Adobe Acrobat Reader available free from www.adobe.com
Please note that it could take up to 2 minutes to download this PDF document depending on your Internet connection speed.

To make representations about proposed decisions:

Please contact the officer identified against the relevant decision in the Forward Plan to find out more information or about how your representations can be made and considered by the decision maker.

The Agenda and Papers for Cabinet meetings can be found on the County Council's website at:
<http://democracy.somerset.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=134&Year=0>

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
<p>FP/18/10/09 First published: 30 October 2018</p>	<p>7 Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care</p>	<p>Issue: AIS Renewal and Replacement Contract Award Decision: Extension of the current support and maintenance contract for the Adults Information System (AIS), the Council's existing Adult Social Care (ASC) case management application and approves the award of the call-off contract for an Adult Social Care software application</p>	<p>Renewal & Replacement of the Adults Information System Tender Evaluation Report - Replacement Adults Social Care System_111218 AIS Replacement_Key Decision_Project Risks Appendix 3_261118 AIS KMD Glossary</p>		<p>Stephen Chandler, Director of Adult Social Services Tel: 01823 359025</p>
<p>FP/18/11/03 First published: 16 November 2018</p>	<p>14 Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport</p>	<p>Issue: Parking Policy Review and Implementation Plan Decision: It is proposed to carry out a comprehensive review of each towns on-street parking controls on a rolling programme, looking at each community in turn to ensure a fair balance between the needs of residents, businesses and visitors. Consideration will also be given to ensuring safety; keeping the key routes free of congestion and the appropriateness of existing restrictions. A full consultation exercise for each town will take place with all stakeholders (District, Town/Parish Councils) and the community to identify all issues.</p>	<p>Parking review Key Decisions Nov 2018 v5 (003)_ Parking Review and Implementation Plan Nov18 - Appendix A V4 Parking Review and Implementation Plan - Appendix B V3</p>		<p>Bev Norman, Service Manager - Traffic Management, Traffic & Transport Development Tel: 01823358089</p>

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/18/12/106 First published: 17 December 2018	Not before 21st Jan 2019 HR & OD Director	Issue: Step-Up to Social Work Contract Extension Decision: To agree to continue the contract ith the University of the West of England			Vickie Wright
FP/18/11/11 First published: 21 November 2018	Not before 21st Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care	Issue: Decision to conclude the establishment of an Open Framework Agreement for Reablement Providers in Somerset Decision: To award an open framework that will ensure continued and new supply of reablement care across the county,mirroring the current arrangement for homecare. This follows interim contractual arrangements that were put in place following the unsuccessful			Tim Baverstock, Strategic Commissioning Manager - Strategic Commissioning
FP/18/10/03 First published: 23 October 2018	Not before 23rd Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Education and Council Transformation	Issue: A change to the protocol for schools converting to a sponsored academy retaining any surplus revenue balances, and the charging for academy conversions by the authority Decision: To consider the report			Ken Rushton, Service Manager - School Finance Tel: 01823356911

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/18/07/05 First published: 17 July 2018	23 Jan 2019 Cabinet	Issue: Equality Objectives 2019 - 2023 and Equality Commitment Decision: Asking Cabinet to agree a new set of Equality Objectives for 2019 - 2023 and the new Equality Commitment			Tom Rutland Tel: 01823 359221
FP/18/11/04 First published: 16 November 2018	23 Jan 2019 Cabinet	Issue: Proposed Capital Investment Programme 2019/20 Decision: To consider the proposed Capital Investment Programme for 2019/20+ and to recommend this to Council for approval			Peter Lewis, Interim Director of Finance
FP/18/11/07 First published: 16 November 2018	23 Jan 2019 Cabinet	Issue: Revenue Budget Monitoring Update Decision: To provide an update on the 2018/19 Revenue Budget and agree any management actions required			Peter Lewis, Interim Director of Finance
FP/18/10/08 First published: 30 October 2018	23 Jan 2019 Cabinet	Issue: Admission Arrangements for Voluntary Controlled and Community Schools for 2020/2021 Decision: To agree the admission arrangements for voluntary controlled and community schools for 2020/21			Jane Seaman, Access and Admissions Manager Tel: 01823 355615

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
<p>FP/19/01/02 First published: 3 January 2019</p>	<p>Not before 28th Jan 2019 Interim Finance Director</p>	<p>Issue: Acceptance of European Regional Development Funding for the Heart of the South West Inward Investment Project Decision: Approval for Somerset County Council (SCC), in its capacity as the accountable body for the Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership, to accept £1,181,308 of European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) for the Heart of the South West Inward Investment Project and to enter into an associated funding agreement with the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)</p>			<p>Paul Hickson, Strategic Manager - Economy and Planning Tel: 07977 400838</p>
<p>FP/18/12/08 First published: 18 December 2018</p>	<p>28 Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Children and Families</p>	<p>Issue: Decision to extend contracts for Pathway to Independence (P2i) service for young people in Somerset Decision:</p>			<p>Rowina Clift-Shanley, Senior Programme Manager , Business Change</p>
<p>FP/18/12/07 First published: 20 December 2018</p>	<p>28 Jan 2019 Director for Economic and Community Infrastructure Commissioning</p>	<p>Issue: Decision to make a funding agreement with Taunton Deane Borough Council for a contribution to the M5 Junction 25 Improvement Scheme Decision: To sign a funding agreement and accept a £1.5m contribution to the construction of the highways improvement scheme.</p>			<p>Sunita Mills, Service Commissioning Manager Tel: 01823 359763</p>

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/18/10/11 First published: 30 October 2018	28 Jan 2019 Director of Corporate Affairs	Issue: Microsoft Software Supplier Decision: To agree a 3 year contract award for the supply o Microsoft software licences and support			Andy Kennell Tel: 01823359268
FP/18/03/04 First published: 12 March 2018	Not before 28th Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Issue: Procurement for the construction of traffic signals improvements at the Rowbarton junction in Taunton Decision: To commence the process to secure a contractor to deliver the scheme to improve the traffic signals at Rowbarton junction in Taunton			Sunita Mills, Service Commissioning Manager Tel: 01823 359763
FP/18/02/08 First published: 13 February 2018	Not before 28th Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Issue: Taunton Transport Strategy Decision: To agree to adopt the joint (with TDBC) Taunton Transport Strategy			Lucy Bath Tel: 01823 359465
FP/17/09/04 First published: 11 September 2017	Not before 28th Jan 2019 Director of Finance, Legal and Governance, Director of Commissioning and Lead Commissioner for Economic Community Infrastructure	Issue: iAero (Yeovil) Aerospace Centre (2,500 sq m) Acceptance of ERDF Funding Decision: The acceptance of the offer of ERDF funding (£3.5 million), for the iAero (Yeovi) Aerospace Centre			Lynda Madge, Commissioning Manager – Economy & Planning Tel: 01823 356766

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/18/11/01 First published: 13 November 2018	28 Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Issue: Decision to extend the contract for Parking Enforcement and Related Services Decision: To extend the existing contract until June 2022 with appropriate break clauses			Steve Deakin, Parking Services Manager, Parking Services, Community and Traded Services Tel: 01823355137
FP/18/08/01 First published: 7 August 2018	Not before 28th Jan 2019 ECI Operations Director	Issue: Award of Concession Contract for the Provision of Cashless Parking Services Decision: To award a 5 year contract with an option for a further 2 year period to provide a "pay by phone" option for payment of car parking charges at Council locations within Somerset			Steve Deakin, Parking Services Manager, Parking Services, Community and Traded Services Tel: 01823355137
FP/19/01/03 First published: 3 January 2019	28 Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Cabinet Member for Resources and Economic Development	Issue: Somerset County Council Land Drainage Enforcement Policy Decision: To approve and agree the implementation of a Land Drainage Enforcement policy for the County Council's powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991			Martin Young, Finance Strategy Manager Tel: 01823 359057
FP/18/06/08 First published: 19 June 2018	Not before 28th Jan 2019 Director of Commissioning and Lead Commissioner for Economic Community Infrastructure	Issue: To approve the appointment of a supplier to deliver the Wiveliscombe Enterprise Centre and Wells Technology Enterprise Centre Decision: To approve the appointment of a supplier			Nathaniel Lucas, Senior Economic Development Officer Tel: 01823359210

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FO/18/12/03 First published: 10 December 2018	Not before 28th Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Issue: Allocation of Budget 2018 Maintenance Grant Decision: To consider this report			Mike O'Dowd-Jones, Strategic Commissioning Manager – Highways and Transport Tel: 01823 356238
FP/18/12/02 First published: 10 December 2018	Not before 28th Jan 2019 Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Community Infrastructure	Issue: Somerset County Council Land Drainage Enforcement Policy Decision: To approve and agree the implementation of a Land Drainage Enforcement for the County Council's powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991			Daniel Martin, Service Manager – Flood Risk Management Tel: 01823356994
FP/18/11/10 First published: 20 November 2018	4 Feb 2019 Economic and Community Infrastructure Commissioning Director, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Community Infrastructure	Issue: Decision to approve revisions to the Connecting Devon and Somerset phase 2 deployment contracts Decision: To approve revisions to the Connecting Devon and Somerset phase 2 deployment contracts			Nathaniel Lucas, Senior Economic Development Officer Tel: 01823359210
FP/18/12/09 First published: 20 December 2018	Not before 4th Feb 2019 Cabinet Member for Resources	Issue: Disposal of part of the Six Acres Day Centre site, Taunton Decision: Disposal of part of the Six Acres Day Centre site, Taunton			Charlie Field, Estates Manager, Corporate Property Tel: 01823355325

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
<p>FP/18/11/09 First published: 20 November 2018</p>	<p>Not before 4th Feb 2019 Director of Children's Services</p>	<p>Issue: Framework for the delivery of Food Produce to SCC properties Decision: Decision to award contract(s) to the successful supplier(s) following a competitive procurement exercise</p>			<p>Simon Clifford, Customers & Communities Director Tel: 01823359166</p>
<p>fp/18/11/08 First published: 16 November 2018</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019 Cabinet</p>	<p>Issue: Revenue Budget Monitoring Update and Capital Investment Programme update - Quarter 3 2018/19 Decision: To receive an update on the 2018/19 Revenue Budget and Capital Investment Programme delivery as at Q3 2018/19 and agree any management actions required</p>			<p>Peter Lewis, Interim Director of Finance</p>

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
<p>fp/18/11/05 First published: 16 November 2018</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019 Cabinet</p>	<p>Issue: Medium Term Financial Plan 2019-2022 and Annual Budget 2019/20 Decision: To consider the proposed MTFP 2019-2022 and Annual Budget 2019/20, including the nature of expenditure, income and proposals for change (across all council services) required to produce a balanced and robust budget, along with proposed council tax levels and precepts to district councils, prior to recommending these to Full Council for approval in February 2019. Details of the specific proposals for change will be considered by the three Scrutiny Committees during January 2019.</p>			<p>Peter Lewis, Interim Director of Finance</p>
<p>FP/18/12/07 First published: 18 December 2018</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019 Cabinet</p>	<p>Issue: Investment Strategy Decision: To consider a proposed Investment Strategy for the council in order to support the delivery of council priorities</p>			<p>Peter Lewis, Interim Director of Finance</p>
<p>FP/18/11/06 First published: 16 November 2018</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019 Cabinet</p>	<p>Issue: Treasury Management Strategy 2019/20 Decision: To consider the proposed strategy prior to recommending this to Full Council for approval</p>			<p>Peter Lewis, Interim Director of Finance</p>

Weekly version of plan published on 1 January 2019

FP Refs	Decision Date/Maker	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring it to be considered in private?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/18/12/04 First published: 10 December 2018	20 Mar 2019 Cabinet	Issue: Award of Contract Bridgwater Special School Decision: To consider the report			Phil Curd, Service Manager: Specialist Provision and School Transport Tel: 01823 355165
FP/18/12/01 First published: 4 December 2018	14 Feb 2019 Cabinet Member for Education and Council Transformation, Director of Commissioning and Lead Commissioner for Economic Community Infrastructure	Issue: Creation of New Academies in Somerset Decision: Brent Knoll Church of England Primary School; Charlton Horethorne Church of England Primary School; North Cadbury C of E Primary School; Pawlett Primary School			Elizabeth Smith, Service Manager – Schools Commissioning Tel: 01823 356260
FP/18/12/05 First published: 10 December 2018	Not before 1st Apr 2019 Cabinet	Issue: The Somerset Children and Young Peoples Plan 2019-2022 Decision: The Children and Young Peoples Plan 2019-2022 is a multi-agency partnership vision for all children, young people and thier families to be happy, healthy and well-prepared for adulthood.			Philippa Granthier, Assistant Director - Commissioning and Performance, Children's Services Commissioning Tel: 01823 359054
FP/18/04/06 First published: 30 April 2018	Not before 3rd Jun 2019 Director of Commissioning and Lead Commissioner for Economic Community Infrastructure	Issue: Procurement of the HotSW Growth Hub Service Decision: To undertake the procurement of a Business Support Service (Growth Hub) on behalf of the HotSW LEP			Melanie Roberts, Service Manager - Economic Policy Tel: 01823359209