

**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:
<p>Reduction in Rights of Way Service Delivery</p> <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		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>80</td> <td>%</td> </tr> </table> <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>	80	%
80	%	

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 – ECI1920-03 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. 	☐	☒	☐
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. 	☒	☐	☐

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	☐
Review of schedule (informed by consultation results)	28/02/2019	Rob Coate	Ongoing supervision	☐
Promotion of volunteer schemes	Ongoing	Jake Taylor	Ongoing supervision	☐

If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.

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.

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. 	<input 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
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<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	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			
<p>SCC Financial Imperative Actions - Highways - Winter & Emergency Service (Roadside Salt Supplies) – EC1920-09</p> <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. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – see Pregnancy / Maternity implications above. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<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"> <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 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<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. 	<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 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.	<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	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:
The number of posts that might be lost is:

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. 	☒	☐	☐
Disability	No significant impact identified	☒	☐	☐
Gender reassignment	No significant impact identified	☐	☒	☐
Marriage and civil partnership	No significant impact identified	☐	☒	☐

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
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.

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 E

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	
<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. 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:
<p>Dr Morgan's School Site, Bridgwater</p> <p>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.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p>60%</p> <p>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.</p>

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:
<p>Health and Safety System Replacement</p> <p>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.</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:
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