

# **Appendix B**

## **Business Cases for Investment and Savings Proposals**

## Section A

Service Area :	Highways
Budget Investment Title:	Highways Capital Investment

### Budget Investment Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

To undertake highways capital investment, in addition to the funds already approved, to alleviate any backlog of highways works and ensure a high quality highways network. Works will be focused on the Secondary Corridor, Accident Reduction Areas and a variety of Footways and will be funded by Prudential Borrowing. Additional borrowing of £5.000m will be required to finance the proposed works with the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) calculated in line with the Council's policy, the revenue impact for 2019/20 onwards will be £0.072m

### 2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	-
Income	-
<b>Total</b>	-

### Current Forecast (under) / overspend

	-
--	---

### Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

	-
--	---

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Increase (£000)	0	72	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

### Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
N/A
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
N/A
<b>Organisation</b>
N/A
<b>Workforce</b>
N/A
<b>Communities</b>
Improved Highways across the Borough.
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Improved Highways across the Borough.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

## Section D

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

	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Trade Union</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Public</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Service Users</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Other</b>	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

<b>Finance comments</b>
<p>The additional £5.000m of Prudential Borrowing required to finance the proposed highways capital investment will create additional revenue costs of £0.072m from 2019/20.</p> <p>The MRP has been calculated in accordance with the Council's MRP policy for 2018/19.</p>

<b>Signed RO</b>	Craig Dale
------------------	------------

<b>Signed Finance</b>	Lee Walsh
-----------------------	-----------

## Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Services across the Council</b>
<b>Budget Investment Title:</b>	<b>Investment in crime prevention, improving public safety and tackling environmental crime across the Borough</b>

### Budget Investment Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This proposal is to invest £0.300m in 2018/19 and an additional £0.350m for 2019/20 into a fund which will be used for crime prevention, improving public safety and tackling environmental crime activities across the borough.

Access to this centrally held fund will be via a business case approach with areas bidding for funding to deliver outcomes relating to crime prevention, improving public safety and tackling environmental crime. It is expected that this funding will be used for activities such as those listed below however all bids will be considered.

- Alleygating;
- Flytipping;
- Low Level environmental issues such as littering and dog fouling;
- Equipment for PCSO's; and
- Improving CCTV within districts

### 2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

	<b>£000</b>
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	-
Income	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>

### Current Forecast (under) / overspend

	-
--	---

### Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

	-
--	---

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Increase (£000)</b>	300	350	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

### Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
N/A
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
N/A
<b>Organisation</b>
N/A
<b>Workforce</b>
N/A
<b>Communities</b>
Increased crime prevention and public safety within districts.
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
Funds will be available for services such as Police to deliver the expected outcomes for the fund.

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Police	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Improved crime prevention, public safety and reduced environmental crime across the whole borough.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A



## Section D

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

	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Trade Union</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Public</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Service Users</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Other</b>	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

<b>Finance comments</b>
The additional £0.300m for 2018/19 and £0.350m for 2019/20 will be held as a central fund which services / District Partnerships and partner organisations can bid into to deliver activities with regards to crime prevention, improving public safety and tackling environmental crime across the Borough.

<b>Signed RO</b>	N/A
------------------	-----

<b>Signed Finance</b>	Vickie Crewe
-----------------------	--------------

## BR1 - Section A

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

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :
<p>To resolve disciplinary hearings earlier and reduce costs incurred.</p> <p>In 2017/18 around £0.075m has been paid in salary costs to suspended staff whilst awaiting the progression of their case. An earlier and swifter resolution to disciplinary hearings would result in cashable and non-cashable savings. The cashable savings would arise from not backfilling positions however not all posts are backfilled when a staff member is suspended. In this financial year, suspensions have occurred in both front line and regulatory roles and as a result backfill has been required for around 30% of suspension cases at a cost of £0.022m. With earlier case resolution, this cost would be reduced however, as the degree to which positions are backfilled in the event of suspensions depends largely on the position type as well as the length of suspension period, the amount of permanent saving that can be made will be limited.</p>

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	-
Income	-
<b>Total*</b>	-

\*The budgets for staff on suspension are held as part of the normal service staffing budget. There is no separate budget and as such any saving would be cross cutting across Council services.

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	-
--------------------------------------	---

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

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(3)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

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

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Increased efficiency for earlier resolution and minimal potential cashable savings.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
The saving is not made as a result of potential difficulties within individual cases.	A robust plan will be implemented as soon as an issue occurs, with timelines for resolution agreed.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Earlier resolution to suspension cases.	As and when they arise.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

## Section D

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

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

Finance comments
By their very nature, suspensions and consequential disciplinary hearings vary year to year and in complexity. Speeding up the disciplinary process will reduce the need for backfill, and £0.003m should be attainable on an on-going basis. As there is no specific budget for disciplinary hearings, this saving would be cross cutting across Council services.

Signed RO	Cathy Butterworth
-----------	-------------------

Signed Finance	Mike Ward
----------------	-----------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Support Officer :</b>	<b>Cathy Butterworth</b>
--------------------------	--------------------------

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>People Services</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reduced Sickness Absence through more robust absence management procedures</b>

### Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Consider potential financial savings through reducing sickness absence across the workforce.

The Alternative budget for the 2017/18 financial year included a budget reduction of £0.013m based on achieving an aspirational target of 8 days absence per FTE on average. The actual sickness level for 2016/17 was 3.4% or an average of 8.99 days per FTE. This is still some way above the aspirational target and the £0.013m savings target, however not all savings resulting from reduced absence are cashable which mean there would be a real risk of delivering nil savings from this measure.

There is no calculated sickness absence detail for the current year.

<b>2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	-
Income	-
<b>Total *</b>	-

\*No budgets held for sickness absence, any saving would be cross cutting across Council services

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	-
---	---

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

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(13)	0	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
N/A
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
N/A
<b>Organisation</b>
N/A
<b>Workforce</b>
More robust application of the absence management procedures should have a positive impact on staff attendance through the reduction of sickness absence levels.
<b>Communities</b>
N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

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

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A



## Section D

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

	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Trade Union</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Public</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Service Users</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Other</b>	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

<b>Finance comments</b>
There is no specific budget for sickness and as such any budget reduction would be cross cutting across Council employee budgets.

<b>Signed RO</b>	Cathy Butterworth
------------------	-------------------

<b>Signed Finance</b>	Helen Cairns
-----------------------	--------------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Cross cutting across all areas of the Council</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Review of car allowances paid as a lump sum</b>

<b>Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :</b>
<p>A lump sum car allowance of £500 is paid annually to essential car users, the amount paid in 2016/17 totalled £0.261m and to date for 2017/18 £0.217m has been paid to 568 officers.</p> <p>A Freedom of Information request submitted in 2017/18 revealed that a large number of officers in receipt of the lump sum payment subsequently recorded relatively few miles as part of their role, for example 65% of people (equivalent to 371 officers) claimed under 1,000 miles for the year at a cost of £0.186m.</p> <p>There is a local agreement with Trade Unions regarding the construction and application of the Car Allowance Scheme. The scheme comprises a series of factors, including mileage, and allocates points per factor. There is a current plan to refresh the information held on essential car users to ensure it is accurate. The Liberal Democrats believe that it is not unreasonable for the refresh to reduce the number of essential car users by approximately 100 officers (equivalent to 18% of the total), saving a notional figure of £0.050m.</p> <p>A consultation would need to take place before staff terms and conditions could be amended, therefore there would not be a full year benefit for 2018/19 a part year saving of £0.013m could be achieved with a full year saving from 2019/20 onwards.</p>

<b>2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	261
Income	-
<b>Total*</b>	<b>261</b>

\*The budgets for car allowances are held as part of the normal service staffing budget. There is no separate budget and as such any saving would be cross cutting across Council services.

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	-
---	---

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

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(13)	(37)	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	On going
--	----------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
N/A
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
N/A
<b>Organisation</b>
N/A
<b>Workforce</b>
Certain members of staff will have their entitlement to car allowance payments reconsidered.
<b>Communities</b>
N/A
<b>Service Users</b>
N/A
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
N/A

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Achieving a budget reduction resulting in less pressure to make reductions to essential services.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
The car allowance may be taken from users who do travel a large number of miles but have not fully recorded them in the past.	Communicate to all users the importance of fully recording all mileage undertaken as part of their role.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Staff consultation completed.	November 2018.
Implementation of amended terms and conditions.	December 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

## Section D

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

	Start	Conclusion
Staff		
Trade Union		
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

Finance comments
<p>The refresh of essential car users is likely to generate movements between car user categories therefore any savings may be offset by movements into the essential car user category. Revenue budgets for car allowances are held across the Council therefore any savings generated from the refresh would be cross cutting.</p>

Signed RO	N/A
-----------	-----

Signed Finance	Helen Cairns
----------------	--------------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area:</b>	<b>Cross cutting across all areas of the Council</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in the number of Agency staff, Interims and Consultants</b>

### Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

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

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

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

The proposal is to reduce the costs of agency staff and Interims where their costs are higher than those that are budgeted for established posts.

<b>2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	-
Income	-
<b>Total*</b>	-

\* There are no specific individual budgets for agency or interim staff as the costs are offset generally by staffing savings if available any saving would therefore be cross cutting across Council services.

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	-
---	---

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

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(50)	0	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

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

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Savings generated would contribute towards bridging the Councils budget gap.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

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

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Not engaging agency staff or interims.	As and when the situation arises.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A



## Section D

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

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

Finance comments
There is currently no specific budget for the use of agency, interims or consultants as expenditure is financed from vacancies or underspending of project budgets. The saving will therefore be applied across relevant services using this type of support.

Signed RO	N/A
-----------	-----

Signed Finance	Helen Cairns
----------------	--------------

## BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Marketing and Communications
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduction in the Communication and Marketing team

<b>Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :</b>
<p>This proposal is to reduce the number of staff within the Communications and Marketing team by 4 FTE.</p> <p>The Communication team's role is to ensure that information and key messaging about Council services, decisions and campaigns are equally accessible to all of the borough's residents, our staff and our partners. Its work is to raise awareness in areas like public health; influence attitudes and behaviour; support Council services; inform, support and reassure during times of crisis; plan and handle all events going on in the borough; enhance and preserve the reputation of Oldham Council and the wider borough with stakeholders and external audiences.</p> <p>The team complete statutory functions across many areas of the Council such as designing and publishing the Statement of Accounts, Council Tax Leaflet and Highway notices. As such the team is recharged out across the Council as part of the Central Support Service recharges. The team also generates additional external income through selling services to various external organisations such as Leading GM.</p> <p>There are currently 19 FTE's within the Communication and Marketing Team and it is proposed to reduce this number by 4 FTE to 15 FTE from 2018/19 onwards. This reduction will still enable the team to deliver its statutory functions.</p> <p>This reduction would be in addition to the Administration's proposals for 2018/19 at a total value of £0.026m:          Permanent reduction in Reputation Tracker £0.011m; and          Reduction in non-pay budget £0.015m.</p>

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	792
Other Operational Expenses	143
Income	(164)
<b>Total</b>	<b>771</b>

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
--------------------------------------	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	19
--	----

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(180)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(4.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

## Section B

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

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
The Council would need to re-evaluate all communications activity and cut some areas that are seen less as a priority and not statutory. This may mean some of the Council's clients simply go elsewhere to get the work they need done which may ultimately cost them more or result in a poorer product with less impact. It could also lead to some areas of the Council controlling their own activity and messaging instead, which would have significant risks for the Oldham Council brand and the consistency of the approach taken. Capacity to continue daily support for services and implementing changes which residents, staff and partners need to understand would also be impacted.
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
The Council's ability to deliver behaviour change with staff, residents and partners and to engage properly with them would be impacted. This would impact on the ability to deliver behaviour changes like 'channel shift' which are designed to produce significant budget savings across the organisation.
<b>Organisation</b>
Less communication with staff would lead to them being less informed and impact negatively on the Council's drive to make them ambassadors who understand the aims and objectives for the Borough as a whole. It would make the job of leadership more difficult.
<b>Workforce</b>
Less communication with staff would lead to them being less informed and impact negatively on the Council's drive to make them ambassadors who understand the aims and objectives for the Borough as a whole. It would make the job of leadership more difficult.
<b>Communities</b>
Less informed resident's means less satisfaction with services, falling trust - and the search for alternative sources of information that may not be objective or factually accurate. A lack of understanding by residents is also likely to lead to them being unwilling to 'do their bit'. This would impact on the success of the co-operative approach and ultimately lead to a greater impact on front line services and budgets.
<b>Service Users</b>
A reduction in capacity would mean less staff available to deal in engaging with residents, media and staff. Slower response times and less time to ensure the correct answer and messages are given are likely to feed into a further erosion of trust.
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
The Council needs partners to be able to understand its narrative. Any dilution of work on that front could lead to partners feeling less well informed. In turn they might seek information direct from other services, which would simply move the response burden elsewhere and not necessarily save any money.

### Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Partners who currently buy Council Services	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

<b>Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements</b>
Budget reduction

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
The Communication and Marketing Team will be unable to meet demand.	Priorities will need to be reviewed and action taken accordingly to ensure statutory duties are carried out.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Mandatory – Completion of EIA & Consultation within Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value For Money Select Committee.	February 2018
Budget reduction approval.	Full Council meeting 28 February 2018.
Undertake staff consultation and on conclusion start to implement restructure to take into account reduction in 4 FTE.	Early 2018/19.

## Section D

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

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	TBC	TBC
Trade Union	TBC	TBC
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

Finance comments
This proposal to further reduce the established posts within these teams by 4 FTE's will realise annual savings of £0.180m including on-costs, with effect from 2018/19.

Signed RO	Carl Marsden
-----------	--------------

Signed Finance	Mike Ward
----------------	-----------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Marketing and Communications</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Cease the Borough Life Publication</b>

### Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

It is proposed to cease the Borough Life magazine satisfying statutory requirements by alternative means. This would generate a budget reduction of £0.028m.

This proposal is in addition to the Administration's proposal 'Reduction in Borough Life Publication' at a value of £0.014m, which is proposing to reduce the Borough Life publication from four to three publications per annum.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	792
Other Operational Expenses	143
Income	(164)
<b>Total</b>	<b>771</b>

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	12
---	----

<b>Number of posts (Full time equivalent)</b>	19
---	----

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(28)	0	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

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

<b>Property</b>
N/A
<b>Service Delivery</b>
<p>Borough Life is the only publication that is seen by each of the 93,000 households across the borough – and multiple residents in each. Unlike using channels such as newspapers – which rely on residents buying them – and Social Media – which depend on people accessing and using them – it is the only guaranteed way that the Council’s information has a chance to be seen by every resident because it drops through every door. Important changes to service delivery need to be communicated throughout the year as do announcements including Council Tax levels, the impact of cuts to funding, new campaigns etc. Terminating this publication would significantly hamper the prospects of keeping residents well informed. Service changes in some instances would then have to be communicated by other methods – including leaflets - to affected households, reducing any savings made.</p> <p>Our latest Reputation Tracker data confirms again that residents who have seen Council communication channels are significantly more likely to say that they feel informed about what the Council is doing. It also found that the channel with the most impact on how informed residents feel is Borough Life, where two thirds (65%) of those who have seen the publication feel informed. It also showed that around half (48%) of residents have seen it – the highest level by a significant margin over all other channels.</p>
<b>Future expected outcomes</b>
<p>The Council’s ability to deliver behaviour change with staff, residents and partners - and to engage properly with them - would be impacted. This would impact on its ability to deliver behaviour changes like ‘channel shift’ which are designed to produce significant budget savings across the organisation. Informed levels in Oldham – which are below the national average – are likely to fall significantly further through the removal of the Council’s key channel. It is accepted across the Local Government sector that less informed residents’ means less satisfied residents.</p>
<b>Organisation</b>
<p>The removal of Borough Life would take away the most important channel that the organisation has in communicating directly with residents. This would make residents less well informed which would impact on the Council’s drive to explain our aims, rationale for decisions, and objectives for the Borough as a whole. It would make the job of leadership much more difficult.</p>
<b>Workforce</b>
<p>More than 70 per cent of the Council’s staff live within the borough. The Borough Life publication is another means of keeping them well informed about what is going on outside their own teams and units at work – especially in an era where there is no longer a daily newspaper. Less informed staff would lead to them being less confident and knowledgeable about what the Council is doing. That would impact negatively on the Council’s drive to make them ambassadors who help to inform other residents and partners and foster co-operative working and behaviour change.</p>
<b>Communities</b>
<p>By ceasing this publication, the effect on communities could be significant. Awareness of local issues, campaigns and changes to services are vital updates and not having this publication would limit the Council’s ability to keep people informed. Awareness and dates/details of events would not be possible to produce one full year in advance, so this would also be likely to impact on take-up of important services that can help residents in their daily lives and also help communities to mix and share positive experiences.</p>
<b>Service Users</b>
<p>In addition to the above, a less informed public may resort to getting information or contact through other sources such as telephone and, face to face contact, thus driving up demand and impacting on other service areas.</p>
<b>Partner Organisations</b>
<p>Partners also rely on Borough Life to keep informed about the Council’s wider plans. An alternative method of keeping them informed would have to be found – and funded - otherwise the close working that is underway in so many areas would be impacted. Mutual understanding is key to co-operative working and less informed partners would require additional communications to plug this gap in order to keep our objectives and aspirations aligned.</p>

## Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Oldham Leadership Board organisations and all the myriad of organisations the Council works co-operatively with across the borough	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

The information will be communicated via a range of channels and will ensure a budget reduction for the Council.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Residents do not feel informed.	Information will be streamlined and communicated via a range of channels.

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Council approval.	28 February 2018
Implementation.	April 2018.



## Section D

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

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

Finance comments
The Administration have proposed to reduce the Borough Life magazine by one issue per annum at a value of £0.014m. This proposal will cease the Borough Life publication altogether for an additional budget reduction of £0.028m in 2018/19 onwards.

<b>Signed RO</b>	Carl Marsden
------------------	--------------

<b>Signed Finance</b>	Mike Ward
-----------------------	-----------



## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Legal and Democratic Services</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in the number of hard copy committee papers</b>

### Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

It is proposed to reduce the number of hard copy committee papers for meetings with Councillors and other external meetings.

One copy of large agenda items or appendices is provided to each political group for all meetings except for the annual Budget report papers which are provided to each Member. This is imperative as it ensures all Members have access to all relevant information before making a decision on the budget.

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

1. Go paperless and invest in the infrastructure to enable this i.e. every Member is issued with an Ipad or alternative to take to committees, ICT support when needed (the technology in terms of Modern.gov is already in place to do this).
2. Have an 'opt out of paper agendas' system. All committee papers are available electronically as a matter of course and are sent via the Modern.gov system to Members for each meeting they attend.

As the public expectation and requirement is that the Council becomes more digital, as Members we must lead by example wherever possible and reduce the volume of printing for external committee papers. Reports on some public meeting agendas can be quite lengthy as sometimes publications, appendices and background documents that Members are asked to consider in taking a decision or approve are printed with the meeting papers. The volume of printing could be reduced by an estimate of £0.005m if further changes were made to some of the more lengthy papers that include a lot of background information and appendices.

### 2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

	<b>£000</b>
Employees	263
Other Operational Expenses (including recharges)	113
Income	(373)
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>

### Current Forecast (under) / overspend

	(48)
--	------

### Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

	7
--	---

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(5)	0	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

### Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

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

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

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

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

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

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
From 1 April 2018 when meetings are scheduled, each one will be considered as to whether a full set of papers is needed.	As and when papers need to be produced.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

## Section D

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

	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Trade Union</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Public</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Service Users</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Other</b>	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

<b>Finance comments</b>
The current budget for Constitutional Services, includes £0.017m for Office Expenses incorporating the External Printing of Agendas. A continuation of the move to paperless agendas will attain a saving of £0.005m per annum.

<b>Signed RO</b>	Liz Drogan
------------------	------------

<b>Signed Finance</b>	Mike Ward
-----------------------	-----------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Communications across all Council areas</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in the number of publications/leaflets produced in hard copy</b>

<b>Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :</b>
<p>To reduce the number of publications and leaflets that the Council produces in hard copy format.</p> <p>To extend further the Administration's 2017/18 agreed proposals on Housekeeping by a value of £0.010m in relation to the number of publications/leaflets produced in hard copy.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are Administration proposals in 2018/19 to permanently reduce the number of Borough Life publications and reputation trackers alongside some non-pay budget reductions totalling £0.040m.</p> <p>As the public requires the Council to become more digital there is less of a need to print items for public usage. The Council already uses social media to advertise and it holds electronic copies of most, if not all of the publications on the Internet. It is recommended that further savings could be made by not producing hard copies of publications, especially in glossy, colour and photographic formats.</p> <p>This is not restricted to corporate communications but applies to all leaflets and publications that the Council produces.</p>

<b>2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses *	913
Income	0
<b>Total*</b>	<b>913</b>

\* This reduction would be cross cutting across all Council services.

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	0
---	---

<b>Number of posts (Full time equivalent)</b>	0
---	---

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(10)	0	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

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

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Users of leaflets and publications	

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

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

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

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

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
From 1 April 2018 when publications come up for renewal, each one will be considered separately.	As and when needed to be reproduced.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A



## Section D

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

	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Trade Union</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Public</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Service Users</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Other</b>	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

<b>Finance comments</b>
The £0.010m saving in addition to the Administration's savings proposals in this area, make a total budget reduction of £0.050m, representing 5.45% of the total available budget for Office Expenses, photocopier charges and publicity expenses. These budgets cover more than just hard copy publications and leaflets, however the additional £0.010m is attainable.

<b>Signed RO</b>	N/A
------------------	-----

<b>Signed Finance</b>	Mike Ward
-----------------------	-----------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Cross cutting across all areas of the Council</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in Council Subscriptions, Professional affiliations and associated expenses</b>

<b>Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :</b>
<p>The Council subscribes to a range of publications and professional bodies across the organisation for a variety of reasons. As information moves online, the need to subscribe reduces and as such, it is proposed to reduce the Council subscriptions, professional affiliations and associated expenses budget by 10% of the current budget (£0.310m) at a value of £0.031m.</p>

<b>2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	310
Income	-
<b>Total*</b>	<b>310</b>

\* This reduction would be cross cutting across all Council services

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	-
---	---

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

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(31)	0	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

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

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Budget reduction.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
The information currently received is not available online.	Only subscriptions where the information is available in a digital format will be reduced.
There is a cost to access the information digitally.	There will be a cost saving between the information available online and a paper format.
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Review of all Council Subscriptions.	Early 2018/19
Implementation.	Early 2018/19
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

## Section D

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

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

Finance comments
The implementation of this budget reduction proposal would generate an on-going saving of £0.031m per annum. Revenue budgets for subscriptions, professional affiliations and associated expenses are held across the Council and this saving would therefore be cross cutting.

Signed RO	N/A
-----------	-----

Signed Finance	Helen Cairns
----------------	--------------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Soft Facilities Management</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Increase in Bus Lane Enforcement</b>

### Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

As part of the budget setting process for 2017/18, the Administration agreed an option with regard to bus lane enforcement for 3 routes within the Borough. It is proposed to increase this enforcement to another 4 routes (5 areas) that have flow bus lanes in operation:

- Ashton Road
- St Marys Way
- Oldham Road, Royton x 2
- Rochdale Road, Oldham

To enable the implementation of this budget reduction, the relevant infrastructure will need to be purchased or put in place i.e. purchase of cameras (capital), maintenance, signage, highways works, advertising and reviewing of CCTV (revenue). Any revenue costs, including the revenue implications of the capital expenditure, will be offset by income generated by Penalty Notice Charges (PCN's) issued.

Based on income received to date for the bus lane enforcement currently in place, the Opposition proposes that net revenue savings could be made on the above routes at a value of £0.180m per annum (circa £0.036m per bus lane).

Due to the infrastructure required to implement this option and the length of time this will take, it is proposed that a part year reduction of £0.090m is applied in 2018/19 with a full year saving being achieved in 2019/20.

<b>2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employees	92
Other Operational Expenses	1,897
Income	(2,057)
<b>Total</b>	<b>(68)</b>

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	0
---	---

<b>Number of posts (Full time equivalent)</b>	3.50
---	------

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	(90)	(90)	0	0
<b>Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

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

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
NSL	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Highways	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Improved traffic control across the Borough.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Level of PCN's issued reduces below expected income levels.	Regular updates on PCN's issued and action plan developed for any adverse reduction in income generated.
Negative publicity.	Clear communication plan developed.
N/A	N/A

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Programme of infrastructure and camera installation works are implemented.	Early 2018/19.
Implementation of bus lane enforcement.	Mid 2018/19.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A



## Section D

<b>Consultation required?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
	<b>Start</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Staff</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Trade Union</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Public</b>	TBC	TBC
<b>Service Users</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Other</b>	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

<b>Finance comments</b>
To enable the implementation of this budget reduction, the relevant infrastructure will need to be purchased or put in place i.e. purchase of cameras (capital), maintenance, signage, highways works, advertising and reviewing of CCTV (revenue). Any revenue costs will be offset by income generated by Penalty Notice Charges (PCN's) issued.
As mentioned above there will be a small amount of capital expenditure linked to the proposal, the revenue implications of which have been considered as part of the estimate of achievable income.

<b>Signed RO</b>	Angela Lees
------------------	-------------

<b>Signed Finance</b>	Matt Kearns
-----------------------	-------------

## BR1 - Section A

<b>Service Area :</b>	<b>Civic and Political Support</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Title:</b>	<b>Reduction in the number of Councillors from 60 to 40 and a review of the Electoral Cycle</b>

### Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The proposal is a reduction in elected members from 60 to 40 and review of the current electoral cycle.

The current basic allowance is £0.009m per annum (plus associated national insurance costs) and therefore this would represent a saving of £0.190m per annum.

Currently, in three out of every four years, a third of Councillors are required to be elected. In the fourth year, there is no local election. Councillors serve a four year term of office. There are currently 60 Councillors serving 20 wards with 3 members per ward.

Current legislation does not permit Metropolitan Councils, such as Oldham, to have elections on a biennial basis and the recommendation requires representations to be made to the Secretary of State to give this additional power.

The Council would require an Electoral Review to execute the proposal. The review would be carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). The objective of the review would be to consider and identify the appropriate number of Councillors for each ward. There would be a need for a review application to be made to the LGBCE outlining the reasons why the review is required. The Commission follow a timetable which is approximately 10-14 weeks long. Based on the timelines from the Boundary Commission this process would take at least 12 months from the Council approving the principle decision. It should be noted that the recommended decision of the LGBCE may be different from that presented in this report. If agreed, there would also be a change to the frequency pattern of local elections, resulting in a saving of one local election every four years, this is equivalent to a £0.100m saving over the four year period.

<b>2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment</b>	<b>£000</b>
Members Allowances	1,018
Other Operational Expenses	0
Income	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,018</b>

<b>Current Forecast (under) / overspend</b>	0
---	---

<b>Number of posts</b>	60
------------------------	----

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)</b>	0	(190)	0	0
<b>Proposed Reductions in posts (Members)</b>	0	(20)	0	0

<b>Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?</b>	Ongoing
--	---------

## Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

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

Who are the key stakeholders?

<b>Staff</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Residents</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Local business community</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Trade Unions</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>External partners (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	
<b>Other (if yes please specify below)</b>	<b>No</b>
N/A	

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

Budget reduction.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
By reducing the number of Councillors from 60 to 40 it has the potential to limit the access constituents currently have with Councillors. Members will need to consider their approach to managing their constituency workloads. A reduction in the number of Councillors may also impact on the number of outside bodies' places that Oldham Council currently have.	Support would need to be put into place for members if there were a reduction to enable a successful transition to new ways of working. One way would be through the Local Leader's programme.
Each Member will have to review their constituency base and their workload arrangements.	Support required to Members to allow the review.
There may be potential implications for ways of working within the District Partnerships.	Support required to Members to allow the review.
The reduction in budget to reflect the change in electoral cycle may put the service at risk if there are any unanticipated by-elections.	A proportion of the savings from non-election years should be retained in a reserve to fund any unanticipated elections.

### Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.	Early 2018/19.
Implementation.	2019/20.
N/A	N/A

## Section D

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

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

### Equality Impact Screening

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

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

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

## Section E

Finance comments
<p>The implementation of this proposal would generate an on-going saving of £0.190m per annum from the budget for Members' Allowances which is set at £1.018m in 2018/19.</p> <p>A saving of £0.100m over the four year period would be achieved from the proposed change in the electoral cycle however it would not be achieved until after 2019/20.</p>

Signed RO	Paul Entwistle
-----------	----------------

Signed Finance	Pam Myrie
----------------	-----------